

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

1-1-2009

April 4, 1968: Death, Difference, and Dialogue

Kristine Marie Warrenburg
University of Denver

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Warrenburg, Kristine Marie, "April 4, 1968: Death, Difference, and Dialogue" (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 950.

<https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/950>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

APRIL 4, 1968: DEATH, DIFFERENCE, AND DIALOGUE
ROBERT F. KENNEDY ANNOUNCES THE ASSASSINATION OF
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of Arts and Humanities
University of Denver

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Kristine Warrenburg
August 2009
Advisor: Darrin Hicks, Ph.D.

©Copyright by Kristine Warrenburg 2009

All Rights Reserved

Author: Kristine Warrenburg

Title: APRIL 4, 1968: DEATH, DIFFERENCE, AND DIALOGUE ROBERT F. KENNEDY ANNOUNCES THE ASSASSINATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Advisor: Darrin Hicks, Ph.D.

Degree Date: August 2009

ABSTRACT

Robert Kennedy's announcement of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., in an Indianapolis urban community that did not revolt in riots on April 4, 1968, provides one significant example in which feelings, energy, and bodily risk resonate alongside the articulated message. The relentless focus on Kennedy's spoken words, in historical biographies and other critical research, presents a problem of isolated effect because the power really comes from elements outside the speech act. Thus, this project embraces the complexities of rhetorical effectivity, which involves such things as the unique situational context, all participants (both Kennedy and his audience) of the speech act, aesthetic argument, and the ethical implications.

This version of the story embraces the many voices of the participants through first hand interviews and new oral history reports. Using evidence provided from actual participants in the 1968 Indianapolis event, this project reflects critically upon the world disclosure of the event as it emerges from those remembrances. Phenomenology provides one answer to the constitutive dilemma of rhetorical effectivity that stems from a lack of a framework that gets at questions of ethics, aesthetics, feelings, energy, etc. Thus, this work takes a pedagogical shift away from discourse (verbal/written) as the primary place to render judgments about the effects of communication interaction.

With a turn to explore extra-sensory reasoning, by way of the physical, emotional, and numinous, a multi-dimensional look at public address is delivered. The rhetorician will

be interested in new ways of assessing effects. The communication ethicist will appreciate the work as concepts like answerability, emotional-volitional tone, and care for the other, come to life via application and consideration of Kennedy's appearance. For argumentation scholars, the interest comes forth in a re-thinking of how we do argumentation. And the critical cultural scholar will find this story ripe with opportunities to uncover the politics of representation, racialized discourse, privilege, power, ideological hegemony, and reconciliation. Through an approach of multiple layers this real-life tale will expose the power of the presence among audience and speaker, emotive argument, as well as the magical turn of fate which all contributes the possibility of a dialogic rhetoric.

Acknowledgements

This work is a result of several thoughtful conversations, genuine reflection, and a sincere interest to uncover moments of connection despite difference. Beginning as a historical research project, this work has evolved from my M.A. thesis, Butler University 2003, through many turns as class and conference presentations, some parts published in proceedings, and is presented here now as my most collective reflection of April 4, 1968. I thank the following advisors, friends, and family: Michelle Mannering, Ph.D., Robert Cornet, Ph.D., Darrin Hicks, Ph.D., Roy Wood, Ph.D., Christina Foust, Ph.D., Ann Doybns, Ph.D., and others; fellow HCOM colleagues - Sue, Rob, Kate, Alexa, Dave, Rachel, Michelle, Bert, and others; those who are closest to me, especially the Backs and Warrenburgs, Vince, Diane, Ryan and Jonathan - who have provided support, both intellectual and otherwise, in stressful times and in liberation.

An introductory version of this paper was delivered as a conference paper and published in the proceedings as part of *The Sixth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*, June 2006. More recently, parts of the visceral chapter were delivered as a conference paper and are to be published in the proceedings as part of the *Argumentation Cultures* conference, sponsored by the *Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation*, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, June 2009. Reviewers, panel and audience members, present at these and the following academic meetings deserve acknowledgment for appraising portions of this dissertation project: National Communication Association Annual Conference 2004, 2007, 2006; Rhetoric Society of America Biennial Conference 2006; Central States Communication Association Conference,

2006; the Rocky Mountain Interdisciplinary History Conference, 2003; and the Indiana Association of Historians Conference, 2003. I also thank Sara Veglahn, Ph.D., for her editorial review.

Other resources, including those audience members willing to share their memories of April 4, 1968, are essential to this dissertation project. Furthermore, the “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird © 2008 Covenant Productions provide layers of meaning unattainable without the assistance of these other researchers. My gratitude is great. The legacy and leadership of both Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., is also paramount to the work you read here. It is because of their courage, action, and influence, that so many are inspired to follow messages of hope.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: THE INTRODUCTION: THE STORY: APRIL 4, 1968: SCENE, SITUATION, WORDS, AND BEYOND	1
Robert F. Kennedy Hits the Campaign Trail	2
A Tragic Turn	2
The News	4
The Decision	9
17 th & Broadway: A Dark & Stormy Night	11
Kennedy Arrives on Site	14
Kennedy Takes the Stage	17
Crowd Responds Nonviolently	26
The Power of Kennedy’s Appearance: What the Crowd Remembers	27
The Conclusion	31
CHAPTER TWO: THE PROBLEM: MULTIFACTED ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTRIBUTION TOWARD RHETORICAL EFFECTIVITY	34
The Problem: Accounting for the Multifaceted Effects	35
Kennedy’s Announcement of King’s Assassination: A Review of Literature ..	40
Biography	42
Words/Arguments	50
The Conclusion	57
CHAPTER THREE: THE METHOD: PHENOMENOLOGY AS METHOD: ACCOUNTING FOR CONTEXT IN ARGUMENTATION	61
Immediacy, Risk, and Fusion Found in the Rhetorical Situational Context	62
Traditional Views of Argument and the Repression of Multimodality	69
Context and Constitutive Effects	73
Accounting for Multimodal Contexts	74
The Multiple Modes of Reasoning: Conceptualizing the Tasks at Hand	76
The Logical Mode of Reasoning	77
The Visceral Mode of Reasoning	79
The Emotional Mode of Reasoning	80
The Kisceral Mode of Reasoning	82
The Conclusion: Phenomenology & Multi-Modal Reasoning	84
CHAPTER FOUR: THE VISCERAL: POLITICS IN A RACED SPACE: VISCERAL REASONING IN CRITICAL COMMUNICATION	86
The Racial Contract	87
The Body: Visceral Argumentation, Risk, and Impact	92
Visceral Argumentation and Bod(ies) at Risk	93
Kennedy’s Body: A Rhetorical Enactment of Visceral Argumentation	97
The Space: 17 th & Broadway	100

Broadway Christian Center: An Unsafe Neighborhood	102
Spatial Subjectivity: The Visceral Terms of Racial Demarcation	104
Suspending the Terms of the Racial Contract: A Visceral Interruption	109
The Subjective Scene: A Militant, Marked, and Supportive Crowd	110
Rumors Surmount and Racial Tensions Build:	
The Physical Fear is Real.....	116
Breaking the Racialized Terms of Visceral Reasoning	120
The Visceral Impact: Subjective Space and Embodied Rhetoric	124
CHAPTER FIVE: THE EMOTIONAL: A COMMON TRAGEDY: THE RHETORICAL POWER OF EMOTIONAL REASONING.....	126
A Common Tragedy: Kennedy Connects to His Audience with Emotional Reciprocity	132
Locating Sentiment through the Physical Manifestations of Emotion	141
Genuine Gestures	144
Kennedy Cries: Facial Expressions and Visceral Emotions	145
Emotions Embedded in Kennedy's Voice: Rate, Pauses, Tone.....	147
The Gasp! An Emotional Reaction.....	148
A Peaceful Disposition: The Indianapolis Audience is Calm.....	152
The Conclusion: The Power of Emotional Reasoning on Rhetorical Effects...	156
CHAPTER SIX: THE KISCERAL: ETHICAL REASONING THROUGH KISCERAL CONNECTIVITY IN THE DIALOGIC MOMENT.....	160
The Ethical Argument: Using Levinas to Expand on Kisceral Reasoning	162
Levinasian Phenomenology	164
Responding to the Call: An Intersubjective Risk of Immediacy	166
Intersubjective Responsibility & Transcendence.....	170
Death, Canonization, and Memory: The Rhetorical Implications of Shifting Grief	174
Levinasian Death & A Call of Legacy.....	175
The Martyred King	177
A Decorous Occasion: A Grieving Community	182
The Conclusion: The Trace of Kisceral Reasoning	185
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE CONCLUSION: DIALOGIC DIMENSIONS OF KENNEDY'S ANNOUNCEMENT: AUTHENTIC CONNECTION IN THE SITUATIONAL MOMENT	189
A Dialogic Rhetoric: Using Phenomenology to Understand April 4, 1968	192
Rhetoric and Phenomenology: A Likely Pair?	192
Dialogic Rhetoric: A Philosophical Account.....	195
Situational Context and Immediate Claims	197

Locating Dialogue in a Rhetorical Approach to Argumentation	198
April 4, 1968: Exposing Dialogic Rhetoric in Public Address	203
Dialogic Rhetoric Involves Risk: The Visceral	205
Dialogic Connectivity and Sentimental Embodied Rhetoric:	
The Emotional.....	209
Traces of Ethics in Dialogic Rhetoric: The Kisceral	214
A Strategic vs. Tactical Rhetoric	218
Kennedy is His Whiteness	221
RFK: Not a Typical Politician	226
17 th & Broadway: Not a Typical Audience	229
The Conclusion	235
ENDNOTES	239
Chapter One: The Introduction	239
Chapter Two: The Problem.....	246
Chapter Three: The Method.....	249
Chapter Four: The Visceral.....	253
Chapter Five: The Emotional.....	261
Chapter Six: The Kisceral.....	268
Chapter Seven: The Conclusion.....	274
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	282

Chapter One

The Introduction: The Story

April 4, 1968: Scene, Situation, Words, and Beyond

Political campaigning is what brought Robert Kennedy to Indianapolis on April 4, 1968; however, mere chance and what some have called a miracle placed him in one of the most impoverished neighborhoods of the city to relay the horrific news that the great civil rights leader, Martin Luther King, Jr., had been assassinated. However, unlike other U.S. cities, Indianapolis remained calm in spite of King's assassination. An event of such political, cultural, rhetorical, and historical magnitude deserves closer examination. To reveal the deeper meanings of this rich narrative is to look closer at a part of our cultural history when one U.S. city chose peace over violence.

The public memory of this event is captured in an array of individual oral histories, newspaper reports, biographies, historical narratives, interviews, academic reports, audio renditions, visual documentaries, etc., to name a few. Collectively, these sources work to provide the contextual force of multilayered sentimental argumentation, which, as we will see, is sparked in the moment of most terrible times. The story that lies in wait provides an opportunity to capture trials of conscience by giving insight into the tensions of tragedy. Particular attention will be paid to the details of that night retained from memories of actual participants. Thus, we return to this story looking closely at the shift in occasion as Kennedy heard, for the first time, that King had been shot.

Robert F. Kennedy Hits the Campaign Trail

After waiting for hours, Indianapolis community members and campaign staffers alike were expecting more of the animated, humorous Robert Kennedy who had appeared only hours before at Notre Dame University in South Bend and Ball State University in Muncie.¹ “April the fourth was an eventful day because I think it was the first day that the campaign really kicked off in Indiana,” recalls Jim Tolan, national Kennedy advance man, who had been in the Hoosier state since April 1st finalizing the details of the senator’s visit.² While working the campaign trail in the 1968 presidential primary, Sen. Kennedy asserted the message that most Americans desire reasonable thought and decent actions. There was little resistance to the Vietnam War among the more traditional and conservative Hoosier voters; thus, the campaign concentrated on capturing the ethnic votes of the region since Kennedy’s anti-war position would most likely not gain traction. His strategy to capture ethnic votes was dramatized by an April 4th appearance in an urban Indianapolis neighborhood, an area frequently referred to by city newspapers as a ghetto.³

Following his two campus visits, Kennedy traveled on a chartered plane to Indianapolis that same day. An outdoor rally was scheduled for that evening on 17th & Broadway, an area selected for its weak voter registration.⁴ While all of the campaign events began with similar enthusiasm, only this rally in Indianapolis on April 4th would witness the tragedy that would unfold.

A Tragic Turn

In a cold shift, Kennedy’s vision of hope and reconciliation was challenged that same day in Memphis, Tennessee where Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was supporting

striking sanitation workers through his work with the Poor People's Campaign. King's presence in Memphis was part of his nonviolent efforts to promote justice for scores of African American poor in cities throughout the United States. King and his compatriots abandoned that day's agenda to attend a dinner at the home of local minister, Samuel Kyles. A few minutes before six o'clock, King decided to step out onto his second-floor balcony when one shot exploded and shattered his jaw. The block fell to an eerie quiet. King was rushed to St. Joseph's Hospital where he was pronounced dead at five minutes past seven.⁵ King's assassination spread shock and rage across the country. King had brought revolutionary tactics of peace to the forefront of social movements across the world. Paradoxically, his death elicited derision and destruction from those same citizens he urged towards peaceful resolution.

Rioting and racial disturbances exploded across the country the night of King's death and continued for the next two days in Washington, D.C., Boston, New York, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Detroit, and Chicago, as well as in over a hundred smaller cities and towns.⁶ Cities burned and people raged. Racial division hit the streets in fervent form. Hundreds of U.S. cities were surrounded by National Guard troops as fires erupted and looters took to the streets. President Johnson quickly moved Federal troops into the nation's capital. Newspapers reported that over 10,000 federal troops were called into action. In Chicago, over a hundred people were arrested in connection to the riots and over 200 people were treated for injuries. Memphis also fell victim to racial violence. Over twenty-five fire bombings were reported to have exploded in Memphis the night of King's assassination.⁷

The News

At Ball State, following a heckler, Kennedy was questioned by an African American student concerned about the willingness of white America to *really* address issues of race and poverty. “There were,” Kennedy said, “extremists on both sides of the issue.” But, he added, “Most people want to do the decent thing.”⁸ Concurrently, an alternative answer was being played out in Memphis. Leaving Ball State for the Hoosier capital, Kennedy was sitting aboard his chartered plane when he received the startling news that King had been shot. *New York Times* reporter Johnny Apple told him. Kennedy “sagged. His eyes went blank,” recalled Apple.⁹ Kennedy was distraught, remembering what he told the young black student only moments before. “You know, it grieves me,” Kennedy said to *Newsweek* reporter, John J. Lindsay, who was also on the short flight to Indianapolis. “I just told that kid [that white people want to do the decent thing] and then walk out and find out some white man has just shot their spiritual leader.”¹⁰ Before more details were available, the plane took off. Kennedy instructed Fred Dutton, one of his assistants, to find out two things immediately upon arrival at Weir Cook Airport in Indianapolis. What was King’s condition, Kennedy wanted to know, and what was the state of the African American neighborhood (17th & Broadway) in which he was scheduled to speak.¹¹

“After I had heard that Dr. King was shot, I was in touch with the campaign headquarters in Washington D.C.,” recalls Jim Tolan. “I believe it was in that conversation or immediately prior there to that it was confirmed that Dr. King was dead.”¹² Such news triggered curious questions, seeped with moral pungency, as to what

Kennedy's next move should be. There are several hundred eager, anxious individuals waiting for Kennedy to show up in inner city Indianapolis. Tolan continues,

The question then came, what should the candidate do that evening. I have a note here from that night which I wrote to myself, which basically said that Washington was suggesting that everything be cancelled out of respect for Dr. King and that a statement should be issued along those lines. To be sure that there was no indication given that there was any concern about the security of Robert Kennedy. This was suggested to be cancelled solely out of respect for Dr. King. And the plane landed and I went on board and basically confirmed that Dr. King was dead, told the Senator what the people in Washington had thought. It was decided to cancel the festive opening of the headquarters in downtown Indianapolis. And the question then arose—what about the rally at 17th & Broadway? And the rally at 17th & Broadway was unique in a sense that it was a predominately, if not all, black neighborhood. There was quite a bit of poverty there. Quite a bit of depressed area and should the Senator go there. I can remember either the Senator or Fred Dutton asking me, “What's it like down there now?” And I had just been on the phone with the person who was down at 17th & Broadway and he told me that it was quiet, there was nothing eventful. And so I relayed that and the Senator...didn't want a lot of police, very quiet, one or two cars instead of the usual. And that's what it was. I think there was maybe one or two police cars. And it was no more than three regular cars that went down there. There was some press obviously, but it was very quiet, there was no horns, there were no sirens blowing. It was just a very quiet ride down there and approach to where the rally was going to be.¹³

As Dutton hurried to the airport police office to make several calls, Kennedy waited aboard the plane, scribbling some notes and undoubtedly questioning whether he should continue with his visit to the urban community. When Dutton returned with the news, it was dreadful; King was dead. As for the situation in the neighborhood in which he was to speak—everything was calm. The news of the assassination had not reached the residents yet. Bob Gigerich, a Kennedy campaign volunteer, and the driver scheduled

to pick up Ethel, Kennedy's wife, recalls the shift in the immediate situation that night when he arrived at Weir Cook airport expecting a routine pick-up:

We went out and the turmoil was already going on. We knew... something was wrong. I think by that point in time, by the time we got out there, we knew Dr. King had been shot, then when we got to the airport, there was police everywhere, which was very unusual... I heard the conversation start that Dr. King was dead and then I heard the police telling the Kennedy people, the staff people that they didn't want them to go up to the speech. There was an argument, not violent or anything, but there was just a disagreement on whether they should go or not. The police were fairly firm in the conversations I heard. They did not want Robert or anybody up there. By that time, there were already folks there, Councilman Forestal was there and some others, Commissioner Cantwell and so on.¹⁴

Ten minutes after his plane landed, Kennedy emerged and made a brief statement to less than 200 people at Weir Cook Airport.¹⁵ Kennedy's remarks on the airport runway indicate that, in the few minutes since he learned of King's death, he adjusted his rhetoric to fit an urgent situation and addressed the audience:

[Martin Luther King] dedicated himself to justice and love between his fellow human beings. He gave his life for that principle, and I think it's up to those of us who are here – fellow citizens, public officials and those of us in government – to carry out that dream, to try to end the divisions that exist so deeply within our county, to remove the stain of bloodshed from our land.¹⁶

The mood of the newspaper reporters and supporters gathered to welcome Kennedy to the Hoosier capital shifted to one of upset and alarm. Gigerich remembers:

He was walking back towards the plane and this discussion continued... The police were getting fairly firm and somewhat loud about he didn't need to go up there. It was a problem. There were going to be problems if he went up there and Robert said I can go up there with my family and go to sleep in the street and no one would bother me. If they would bother you, then you're the one with the problem. At that point in time, he headed back to the plane and I

believe he went on the plane. Later on, they came out and the motorcade started. We were going to the speech, and we got to the speech. Ethel never got out of the car. As we were pulling in, staff come over and said take Ethel back to the hotel and stay with her until the Senator gets back there, which I did.¹⁷

In difference to Tolan's account, Gigerich's recollection as the driver outside looking in reveals that the decision to continue forward with the rally was not as quickly decided as the campaign advance man's memory lends. Rather, there is a shift in attitude of the campaign staff's willingness to travel to the site and a definite concern for safety of the Senator and his wife. "During this whole period of exchange with everyone, I don't think Mrs. Kennedy said over five words." Gigerich continues,

As Robert put her in the car, she said something to him and I believe she kissed him and then when we got back to the hotel, she was concerned about him and whether he was going to be all right up there. We were all saying he'll be fine, there's people around, he's going to be okay.¹⁸

Ultimately the safety of Kennedy was in the forefront of everyone's minds. The physical fear was real. Kennedy was warned not to go.

Gigerich resumes his account of the situation upon Kennedy's arrival at the airport and reflects on some reasons why Kennedy's safety was of concern. His account acknowledges that Kennedy, even under regular political rallying circumstances, was a human being capable of physical injury and vulnerable to visceral impulse. Crowds often sought to grab at, touch, and pull on Kennedy's body out of the excitement of being in his presence. It was this intimate relationship between crowd and candidate that made Gigerich worry that the excitement could turn to fury and that the physical attraction between Kennedy and his supporters may possibly shift to violence.

Though Gigerich puts forth that his fear was his own, others such as Tolan and the Indianapolis police officials also warned Kennedy not to continue forward with his appearance. Such warnings evidence that the physical fear was real and that Kennedy's body would be at risk in undertaking a decision to go forth into the racialized space of the inner city neighborhood. "I do remember the police feeling very strongly that you shouldn't go down there," Tolan explains:

And they expressed their view and the fact that they felt they were responsible for our safety and having that responsibility, they can't let him go down there. And it became clear in a very short time that he was going and they would nevertheless go with us down there. There wasn't any major confrontation. They were doing their job as they could do best and the candidate just saw it differently.¹⁹

The debate over Kennedy's safety stretched from the airport runway to the Democratic headquarters in downtown Indianapolis. Here several democratic representatives, Kennedy campaign staff members, Indianapolis community members, and families of the representatives were waiting on the east side of Indianapolis where Kennedy was scheduled to stop prior to his rally at 17th & Broadway. The news of King's death was spreading across the Hoosier city.

"I learned of Dr. King's death when I was at the Democratic Headquarters on West Washington Street right off the circle," recalls Lloyd Milliken, the Democratic Precinct Committeeman at the time. "We were all there waiting on Senator Kennedy to come in and speak that evening, and we learned of what had happened...There was of course a great debate."²⁰ Milliken, along with Jerome Forestal, was among the democratic representatives gathering at the Headquarters before traveling to the site. At that time, Indianapolis had a Republican Mayor and a mainly Republican administration.

Forestal was an exception and served as one of the three elected Democrats on the City Council.²¹

Milliken continues his recollection,

[W]e were there waiting on Senator Kennedy to arrive, and that's when we learned of what happened in Memphis when Dr. King was killed. I was not one of the Democratic Party leaders; I was a fairly young lawyer in those days. There was a great debate among the leaders there...Whether or not the speech will go on, whether or not Kennedy should go to 17th & Broadway to give that speech. I wasn't a part of the inner circle that made the decision, but I think the real decision was made by Bobby Kennedy, that he was going to give that speech.²²

Milliken recalls that there was definite contention about whether or not Kennedy should go, but he also remembers that Kennedy was involved in making the final decision. Such acknowledgment previews the ethical implications of Kennedy's response to the immediate situational shift. It is important to realize that Kennedy could have rejected his call to civil service and canceled his trip into the predominantly African American neighborhood as he was advised to do by city officials, law enforcement officers, his campaign staff, and family members. Due to the rise of violent racial outbreaks across the United States – even in the absence of such a tragedy as King's assassination – several indicated that they feared for the safety of Kennedy's life if he were to continue on with his trip.

The Decision

Redirecting focus to Kennedy's role in the decision, Forestal remembers Kennedy's phone call to the Kennedy campaign headquarters. The front man for the Indianapolis campaign office called Forestal and others to the back room of the

Washington Street office, “Hey, come here,” he said, “I want to talk to you.” Forestal remembers, “So, we went in the back room and he told us that Dr. King died, and we said, “Wow! What do we do now?”²³ Such a reaction indicates the suddenness of the news and how the situation of Kennedy’s appearance was changing. The front man continued, “You can continue and go on up there [to 17th & Broadway], or – [pausing] what do you think?”²⁴ Such pause for reflection upon whether or not the other Democratic representatives should continue forward with meeting Kennedy at the pre-planned rally is illustrative of the gravity of the situation. Forestal recalls being asked what he thought about the security and threats received and remembers thinking, “Well, I tell you what, if I were the Senator, I think I would just stay right on the plane and continue on down to Memphis to be at the beside for Coretta.”²⁵ Forestal’s memory aligns with many other accounts in which it was deemed that Kennedy would be safer if he canceled his trip to the inner city neighborhood.

Kennedy, on the phone to the headquarters, responded to the warnings to cancel his appearance with urgent concern for those waiting for him at 17th & Broadway.

Forestal overheard Kennedy’s conversation:

And the Senator shoots back, that’s the worst – that’s the worst thing that he could do. Because he [Kennedy] thought that he wanted to come into this community and he said that “If I didn’t appear tonight or show up at something...They would never forgive me.”²⁶

Such a response indicates that Kennedy stood by his choice to be accountable to those expecting him. In turn, the physical risk remained secondary to the obligatory call, which showcases issues of political answerability, ethical response, and responsibility. Not long after that the Senator announced his decision.

“He says, we’re going. We’re going down there, we’ll cancel the opening of the headquarters,” recalls Tolan. “It was decided that Ethel would go to the hotel directly and that this would be a very low key event.”²⁷ The decision to bypass the headquarters but follow through with his commitment to people gathered at 17th & Broadway is reflective of Kennedy’s concern for the urgent yet decorous situation of King’s assassination. Furthermore, such a move to cancel the political reception but show up to the inner city neighborhood could be viewed as rejection of racialized codes as Kennedy turned away from the powerful, safe space and embraced the negated, marginalized locality. The changing mood that night shifted from one of political excitement to a moment of fear, shock, and sadness.

17th & Broadway: A Dark and Stormy Night

Forestal and some other elected Democratic officials traveled in a motorcade to the site. “I’ll never forget when we turned off of 16th Street, to go down Broadway, the minute we turned the corner, you could see all the – they had these big spotlights up in the air,” recalls Forestal, “you know, and this huge, throng of people. I thought, oh my God, you know.”²⁸ They were directed to go on down to the site and “stall” the audience because “...he [Kennedy] needed time to re-do his speech.”²⁹

As the crowd formed, waiting in anticipation of Kennedy’s arrival, several remember that, “[t]he weather was just gruesome, just cold, and wet, and dark.”³⁰ Billie Breaux, who was an audience member, reports, “...what I remember most about it was the weather. It was rainy and cold and even though it was April it was still too cold to be rainy.”³¹ Forestal contends, “...it was raining. It was drizzling, and we were sitting there.

Everything was just sort of setting back in like a cloud, [with a] darkness around [t]here.”³² The damp, dark rain reveals itself in the foreground of the memory of the actual participants of the event, indicating the physicality of the night. Little did they know that the darkening weather and the chill of the rain only foreshadowed the horrific circumstance to come. The background music of “a little three piece combo” resonated in the drizzly rain as one looked upon the flat bed truck of a podium where Kennedy was to speak.³³

Unlike his previous campaign stops at two established universities that same day, this space was not met with a large stage, podium, lecture, lights, chairs, etc. Rather, the stage was unstable, crowded, dark, and worn down—reflecting the state of the community: poor, classed, and confined with the terms of a racialized space. In reading the platform as material evidence of the physicality of the space, and of what types of bodies are allowed to operate in a raced space, the subjective risk of Kennedy’s appearance is revealed. James Trulock, a local union secretary and audience member waiting for Kennedy’s arrival audience member, narrates:

The podium, the platform from which he spoke was maybe twenty yards from the street, maybe thirty. It was in a field across from the Broadway Christian Center which at that time was certainly not a park; it was just sort of a vacant field. I recall it kind of being two trailers stuck together. There certainly wasn't a permanent kind of stage thing. It may have been a semi truck or trailer rigged to be a stage but it was some kind of platform that was improvised to be a stage. I'm not sure of this but there seems to be those red, white, and blue banners hanging from its skirt.³⁴

Small and rickety, crowded and dark, the stage was full of community, political, and Kennedy representatives. The crowd looked on, and the expectancy grew, as

everyone waited for Kennedy's arrival. Forestal waited too, standing upon the back of the make-shift platform, looking out upon the audience, and wondering how the crowd was going to react to the news of King's death. He was fully aware of the potential rioters that speckled the crowd:

It seemed like a lifetime but no it was quite awhile. I'll say a good half hour to forty-five minutes to maybe even longer because I kept saying I wish the senator would get here because the crowd you know they were getting noisy. Nothing going on, they were just getting anxious. They came to see the senator, he's already two hours late and after they got the word about King that delayed him at least another hour. He was like three or four hours late when he was supposed to be there to meet that group."³⁵

"It began to rain a little, it was turning dusk. I don't remember exactly when Kennedy was scheduled to speak," remembers Trulock. As he continues his recollection, he reveals that some members of the audience, despite urban legend, might have known about King's death prior to Kennedy's arrival and, in turn, before he said a word.

The crowds began to develop and it appeared to be mostly a culmination of neighborhood people and Democratic Party functionaries, precinct committee people, people who worked within the Democratic Party....That crowd began to develop and my impression is that most of them didn't know what had happened. They were still coming to hear a campaign speech by Robert Kennedy and one that we thought was going to be really important because it was one that was going to set down for the people of Indianapolis and for the people of Indiana what he believed about a variety of social justice issues. I think that's what it was going to be about or that's what I had come to hear. I think slowly as the crowd began to get larger and larger, more and more people had heard about what had happened and there was kind of that milling around feeling that you can get in crowds where there's no particular focus to it but we all kind of unspokenly knew the focus. That focus is that Robert Kennedy is coming and Martin Luther King has just been murdered.³⁶

Such tragic news of the death of King undoubtedly stirred a variety of emotions. Those few crowd members, who had heard rumors of King's death while waiting for Kennedy to show up, began to formulate feelings of resentment towards whites. "I do remember that it was a very grave situation," remembers Lloyd Milliken, a Democratic representative who arrived on site prior to the airport crew. "Everyone knew it wasn't a skin wound or a flesh wound or something like that. Everyone knew that it was very serious." Milliken, along with several other Kennedy supporters, had heard the news of King's death at the Indianapolis Democratic Headquarters prior to traveling to the Broadway Christian Center. Milliken remembers, "I know I didn't tell anyone. I may have been too frightened to tell anyone. I don't know."³⁷

Representative John Lewis, and former chairman for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, was one of the audience members that had heard the news of the King's death prior to Kennedy's arrival and remembers that,

There were some people saying that maybe just maybe Robert Kennedy just shouldn't come into town to speak and I took the position that he had to come. That we had organized this meeting, we had organized this rally. He had to come here and speak.³⁸

Lewis establishes the fragile force of the situation but also acknowledges the need for Kennedy to come despite warnings to forego his appearance. Though a majority of the crowd had reportedly been in the park waiting for Kennedy for many hours, the news of King's assault slowly filtered through part of the crowd.

Kennedy Arrives on Site

After his brief remarks on the airport runway, Kennedy and Dutton climbed into the backseat of a waiting car. They headed directly to the site of his scheduled political

rally at the Broadway Christian Center (1654 Broadway Avenue). On the way to the site, Kennedy sat silently for long minutes. “What should I say?” he finally mumbled. Dutton mentioned only the obvious, the need to stress nonviolence and faith in racial reconciliation. Kennedy fell into silence again.³⁹ His question suggests that he was still unsure about what he should do or say, but he remained determined, showing no small degree of courage, to address the mainly African American audience and tell them that their prized civil rights leader had been killed.

“The traveling party broke up in South Bend. The Senator, and I suppose Frank, and of course the press group, went on to Muncie to give a speech there,” recalls Adam Walinsky, Kennedy’s primary speech writer at that time. Walinsky was not traveling with the Senator when he heard of King’s death, suggesting that Kennedy was left to construct a new message. Walinsky continues,

The small staff group, we just went directly to Indianapolis because there was a lot of work to do - preparing for other speeches and appearances and so forth. So, when the word came, and I wasn't going to go, we weren't going to go. He was going to appear in Indianapolis, and I wasn't gonna go near that. That was just another campaign stop that I had absolutely no need to be at. I was supposed to be working back at the hotel. So, when the word came that Martin Luther King had been shot, I was having dinner in the hotel restaurant with John Bartlow Martin [an Indianapolis native and close Kennedy advisor]. I think we may have heard it. I think there was a television personality having dinner in the same restaurant. Might have been Jack Parr. It was Jack Parr. So, Jack Parr is having dinner at another table in the restaurant, and he may have been the person who got the news that Martin Luther King had been shot. That's where we heard it. Right a way, John and I knew, this is really going to be something because... we knew that this was going to have extraordinary consequences for the country. We had already been through three years, three summers of urban riots. Almost every city in the country had some kind of really horrid experience. So, the potential for large scale national violence was clearly there.

Of course, it was there in Indianapolis which had not had its riot yet. So we knew we had to go there, we knew the Senator would go directly there to the place and whatever he had been planning to say before. He might have had some script that we had done before, would have to be drastically redone. So we went out. There was a car the campaign had, and John drove and I was sitting in the passenger seat frantically trying to write some thoughts on yellow pad.⁴⁰

At 17th & Broadway there were plenty of Kennedy banners claiming “Bobby for Prez” and the usual cheerful mood of a political gathering. Individuals gathered in search of an energetic, inspired, and hopeful leader but that quickly turned into a space of mourning. As Rozelle Boyd, former Indianapolis City Councilmen remembers,

I arrived there as nearly hundreds of other people [were arriving]. We were milling about waiting for Kennedy to arrive and certainly it was ballyhoo as quite an appearance and we were all prepped for that in a sense of the word.⁴¹

With a commanding presence Kennedy, arrived quietly. “He arrived with some cars,” remembers Jim Trulock, waiting in the audience. Trulock continues,

There was more than one car and I remember one of them, it looked like a presidential candidate arriving but there didn't seem to be a lot of fanfare, sirens, that sort of thing. Just four or five cars pulled up that sort of thing and they were on the street.⁴²

“I think I was in the lead car,” remembers Jim Tolan. “And we just drove and pulled up. I can see it in my mind's eye right now, we pulled up very quietly. I'm not sure anybody even knew we had arrived,” Tolan explains. “I got out, opened the door, Kennedy got out and there was all of a sudden people were aware of that.”⁴³

The elder Kennedy's, Jack, presence was very clearly felt, as the Senator, grim-faced, stepped out into the chilly night, huddled in a black topcoat. “Bobby Kennedy liked to wear his brother's old clothes, bomber jackets, old overcoats, his old tweed

overcoats,” reports Thomas. Walinsky, Kennedy’s speechwriter remembers, “That night, he was wearing Jack's old tweed overcoat, “Thomas recounts his thoughts of what Robert Kennedy was thinking, “imagine being cloaked in his brother's old coat as he gave this speech.”⁴⁴

Walinsky dashed up to deliver a hastily outlined speech, but Kennedy nodded him off and drew from his pocket some crumpled notes that he had written himself.⁴⁵

Walinsky’s account provides further evidence that supports that Kennedy alone conceptualized his message on his ride to from the airport.

People cheerfully gathered around the candidate as he made his way through the crowd to the make-shift stage where other local democrats, African American leaders, and Kennedy security guards waited. “The crowd was very boisterous, how there was a single person in that crowd that was aware of what had happened [is a wonder to me].”

Walinsky remembers:

So, it was really a happy occasion for these people. They were there to see Robert Kennedy, and he was there. He was closer to being on time than the campaign usually was. There was an enormous amount of hubbub and noise and moving around, but everybody in a very pleasant and happy mood. He waited awhile for that to settle down. Then he started to speak.⁴⁶

Kennedy Takes the Stage

Kennedy, surrounded by audience members, began to walk toward the flatbed truck. “I walked ahead of him and then there was this [platform] with very shaky stairs going to it,” recalls Tolan.

The candidate went up it and the people followed and there was a quietness about it. It wasn't the kind of normal kind of “hip hip

hooray” rally that we liked to put on for public consumption. It was very very quiet.⁴⁷

“I remember there was a kind of entourage on the stage,” recalls audience member, Jim Trulock. “It was really crowded up there. People were very much shoulder to shoulder even standing sideways some of them so they could all get on there.”⁴⁸ The tense mood was surmounting. He asked the local organizer of the rally if they, the audience, had heard the news of King’s death. The local organizer replied, “No, we’ve left that up to you.”⁴⁹ Kennedy turned; standing shoulder to shoulder with others on the tiny cramped stage, and began to speak:

Ladies and gentlemen, [clears throat], I am only going to talk to you just for a minute or so this evening because I have very sad news for all of you. Could you lower those signs please? [There are screams out from individuals in the crowd, still in a political rallying mood]. I have some very sad news for all of you, and I think sad news for all of our fellow citizens, and people who love peace all over the world, and that is that Martin Luther King was shot and was killed tonight in Memphis, Tennessee.⁵⁰

Kennedy’s voice fades as he announces the location of King’s death and cries from the crowd overtake the moment. Cries of “No!” and gasps of disbelief come from several members of the audience. “Much of the crowd had not had a chance to express outwardly their feelings about King’s death, or were unaware that he was actually dead,” reported Anatol and Bittner, which is also evidenced by the collective gasp captured on the audio renditions of this speech. The crowd let out a loud continuous scream. The reaction, in fact, was so loud that “a Negro lady driving her car two blocks away, unaware of King’s death, wondered, “what he [Kennedy] had said.” “I could hear the oooo,” she said, “it just filled the air.”⁵¹

The collective gasp serves as an overall indication that a majority of the audience did not know the news of King's assassination. "I remember when he told us just, it was like a gasp throughout the whole crowd. You could feel the sense of loss that all of us collectively felt," reflects Abie Robinson.⁵² Representative William Crawford, who was also in the crowd, did not know of King's assassination previous to Kennedy's announcement. "No, I was in shock," Crawford recalls. "When you hear those gasps as you recreate the speech, I was one of those that gasped in shock."⁵³ Boyd continues, "As you listened, there was a very audible gasp. So for many, it was first information and their response was as one would expect it to be in that situation."⁵⁴ Vechel Rhodes, Sr., also in the audience, contends, "He's the one I heard it from. Him. He's the one that brought it to us there."⁵⁵

Trulock, who was in the audience, accounts for those who may have, in fact, heard about the assassination before Kennedy's arrival. He states,

There was a big gasp from the audience even though my own perception was that a lot of people knew about it. I think most of the audience knew about it but somehow here was a leader confirming that yes it is true, he had died. He then proceeded to talk about this basic, human need to deal with grief. None of us know how to do that very well. None of us know what we are going to be like at the moment that it strikes us. Nobody knows what they are going to say or do or how they are going to feel, what emotions are going to well up in them. I felt that. I felt that the audience generally felt that too. Tell us what to do Bobby. Tell us what you think. Make this in some measure understandable. I am welling up now because it is still emotional.⁵⁶

After the initial reaction of the announcement quieted, Kennedy looked at his notes for the first and only time saying:

Martin Luther King dedicated his life to love and to justice between fellow human beings. He died in the cause of that effort. In this difficult day, in this difficult time for the United States, it's perhaps well to ask what kind of a nation we are and what direction we want to move in. For those of you who are black -- considering the evidence evidently is that there were white people who were responsible -- you can be filled with bitterness, and with hatred, and a desire for revenge.⁵⁷

“At this point in the speech the crowd became somewhat noisy and isolated shouts were easily distinguishable. Kennedy tried to continue, waited a few moments, then proceeded without referring back to the envelope for the remainder of the speech.”⁵⁸ Audience member, Abie Robinson contends, “As I remember there was no speech that I saw him actually lay out and read. It seemed like everything he said was impromptu.”⁵⁹ When a speaker refers to notes, directness is broken, and the connection with the audience suffers. Audience assurance in the person delivering the message is affected. “...I don't remember him – I can't picture him looking at a note,” recalls Forestal, the person standing to the immediate left of Kennedy, “I just remember him grabbing that microphone [and] stepping up front. And it took a lot of courage to do that.”⁶⁰

As Kennedy announced the fact that King had been shot, “The crowd was still murmuring, and the people at the back of the crowd didn't actually hear it and didn't realize that he had said it,” recalls Walinsky. The news traveled “...as if the knowledge of it moved physically back through the crowd. Which it did,” reports Walinsky. “People started to moan and react to this dreadful news. Then as he spoke, they got extraordinarily quiet.”⁶¹ Kennedy continued his speech:

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization -- black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin

Luther King did, to understand, and to comprehend, and replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion and love.

Kennedy acknowledged that violence was a possible reaction to the news of King's assassination but provided an alternative option by evoking King's nonviolent legacy. Robinson remembers, "He made a special plea that this is not the way we should react about how his lifestyle and what Martin Luther King stood for and I think that made a difference." At least to Robinson, "It made a difference in how I perceived it." Robinson's initial reactions upon hearing the news of King's death dripped of vengeance as he hoped that "...they get whoever this was and something needs to be done." However, Robinson reflects, "When you think out about it, what needs to be done? Justice needs to be done, we need to find who did it, but other than that what we need to do is look at what Martin Luther's life stood for and then carry on that tradition."⁶²

The evocation of King's nonviolent legacy resonates in the memories of a moment that once changed the lives of the individuals who lived it. "MLK Jr. meant everything," remembers Representative Lewis, former chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, "...everything to the African American community and to a very large segment of the non African American community." Lewis, present in the Indianapolis crowd, continues on to say that King "...emerged as a leader, as a fighter, as a warrior for change, to end segregation, to end racial discrimination and to lead America into a different direction to create what he liked to call the beloved community."⁶³ The perseverance and life message of the nonviolent leader of civil

justice was not quickly dismissed by those present in Kennedy's audience. Kennedy continued:

For those of you who are black and are tempted to be filled with hatred and mistrust of the injustice of such an act, against all white people, I would only say that I can also feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man.

Bobby Kennedy rarely spoke publicly about the assassination of his brother, President John F. Kennedy. "I don't know whether or not it was right there or immediately after the, his talk, but I was struck by a couple of things," recalls Tolan. "One was that it was the first time in my memory that I have ever heard of in which he mentions Jack, the president who had been assassinated."⁶⁴ Frank Mankiewicz, a close friend and Kennedy aide agrees with Tolan, "...it was the closest he ever came to talking about President Kennedy." Mankiewicz continues, "He described him, not even as "my brother," he described him as "a member of my family." It was the closest he could come. I never heard him talk about that event ever again."⁶⁵ Such personal loss resonated whole-heartedly in the moment. Evan Thomas, a Kennedy biographer, also reflects on this portion of the Indianapolis speech:

Interestingly, Bobby couldn't quite say his brother's name, or even that it was his brother. He talked about "a member of my family." Bobby Kennedy generally did not talk about his brother's death so saying anything at all was significant. Obviously it was on his mind, it was the right thing to do, people could sense his pain. Bobby was uniquely able to convey the pain he felt as a way of empathizing with the pain that others felt. It was the key of his ability to communicate to the less fortunate.⁶⁶

In order to identify more closely with his audience, Kennedy offered raw sincerity by presenting his own loss. "I thought it was a very clever way of trying to relate not only

himself and his family, but white America to these black people and to black America,” proposes Lloyd Milliken. “I think...it made the audience feel that they were all in the same boat at that particular time.”⁶⁷ Noting that while the syntax of the phrase “I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man,” is “a little bit odd,” Peter Edelman, Professor of Law at Georgetown University and former Kennedy aide, suggests that the underlying message was powerful. “What he is saying is, let’s not think of this in racial terms, let’s think of this as something terrible that happened for all humanity and it doesn’t matter who did it. It’s a loss that we’ve all suffered, and I had a loss also.”⁶⁸

Kennedy channeled the loss of his brother to the more immediate situation and gave the silent crowd a trace of hope:

But we have to make an effort in the United States, we have to make an effort to understand, to get beyond, or go beyond these rather difficult times.

My favorite poem, my favorite poet was Aeschylus. And he once wrote:

Even in our sleep, pain which cannot forget
falls drop by drop upon the heart,
until, in our own despair,
against our will,
comes wisdom
through the awful grace of God.

Considering the makeup of the audience it is not likely that Aeschylus would have found his way in to the speech in normal circumstance. The community that gathered at 17th & Broadway was not highly educated and thus not the typical audience of Greek literature. As noted by Walinsky,

[T]his is, after all, an audience in the Indianapolis ghetto. This is not a college. This is not the downtown association. It is not Harvard

University. It's not even Ball State, or the local teacher's college.
This is just people who live in this neighborhood.⁶⁹

However, “Kennedy quoted Aeschylus to them,” continued Walinsky, “with the sense that not only was poetry important to him, and this great tragic Greek poetry important to him,” but also serving “as a way to deal with his personal tragedy.”⁷⁰

In the years that followed his brother’s death, Bobby sought self-enlightenment and peaceful resolve through Greek philosophy and the writings of the French novelist Albert Camus.⁷¹ According to his aide Richard Goodwin, Kennedy’s encounter with personal tragedy forced him “to explore new worlds of thought and poetry, pleasures and the manifold varieties of human intimacy...almost as if he were deliberately equipping himself for a larger role, laboring to become worthy of succession to his romanticized vision of the fallen leader.”⁷²

Kennedy “...believed that people in that audience would accept this same great tragic poetry and would understand it as a way to deal with their feelings at this time,” offered Walinsky. “So, what that showed and what he proved by doing it, was that there is almost no person, no matter how mean their circumstances, no matter how scant their education, who can not be addressed in the noblest terms of which the human heart is capable.”⁷³ Kennedy (1968) continues his speech as cries of “No!” echo from the audience:

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black.

Claps and cheers of “Yeah!” came from several members of the audience, indicating their understanding and agreement with Kennedy’s message. “He looked like a man who was hurt and didn't want the black community to hurt themselves or other people,” remembers Darlene Howard. It was “...like he felt the compassion for the plight that they felt—like all that they had was lost but at the same time he wanted to remind everybody that this was not who Dr. King was,” says Howard. It was as if Kennedy was telling us, “I know him well. He's not that way. C'mon people, this is not who you are.”⁷⁴ Kennedy goes on to provide the audience a call to action by way of an ethical summons through spiritual provocation. Kennedy beckons for genuine compassion and understanding as he concludes his short speech:

So I ask you tonight to return home, to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King -- yeah, it's true -- but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love -- a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We can do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We've had difficult times in the past. And we will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of violence; it is not the end of lawlessness; and it's not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country [screams echo from the crowd] want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life, [cries of agreement, i.e. “Yeah!” come from members in the audience] and want justice for all human beings that abide in our land. [Audience members continue to cry out in agreement – “Yeah!” – and cheers for Kennedy echo out].

Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world. Let us dedicate ourselves to that, and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

Thank you very much. [Cheers and clapping from the crowd emerge as Kennedy ends his speech].⁷⁵

Kennedy quickly exited the stage, made his way back through the crowd, entered his car, and was taken to the Marott Hotel immediately. The crowd was stunned and silent. “I don't ever recall anyone out in the crowd making any noise or trying to stir up trouble or anything,” says Forestal.

“In fact, I say, after he finished his speech that the thought was that there might be some unhappy people but there wasn't anyone yelling. It seemed like everybody was, they got his message about going home and saying a prayer for the King family and the country and they were going to go home and they quietly disbursed. I don't remember any, as we drove through the crowd, I don't remember any noise or anybody shouting or anything. As I say it was really kind of eerie the way he sort of just dispersed them and everybody just started leaving.”⁷⁶

Crowd Responds Nonviolently

Such tragic news sent an emotional surge throughout the crowd. “It was a situation I felt in one sense a need to be a part of,” remembers Rozelle Boyd, “but then in another sense, it was a situation I was wanting to get out of.”⁷⁷ Boyd's memory points to the strong sense of community that commonly emerges out of moments of loss. Conflicting, however, was Boyd's urge for a solemn space. “That's the kind of thing that happens,” Boyd continues, “you want to spend just a little time with yourself so that you can do your personal adjusting to what that situation was and handle your anger and handle your grief.” So Boyd, along with many other individuals gathered at 17th & Broadway, did not stay in the area for long.⁷⁸

According to news reports, the crowd left quickly and in an orderly manner.⁷⁹ Rather than reactions steeped in violence like so many other communities across the U.S.,

the people of Indianapolis, did, in fact, maintain a peaceful composure that illuminated Kennedy's plea for "...understanding and compassion towards one another."⁸⁰ On April 4, 1968, there was no quick desolation of Indianapolis African American communities; and relations between races did not fall to an even lower level, as happened elsewhere. Something was different in Indianapolis.

The Power of Kennedy's Appearance: What the Crowd Remembers

Moments of anguish and agony on the national scale have generally, I'm referring to the past, called for the person with the booming rhetoric, the thunder of delivery, but that's not what happened that day. You could not find a more understated and understated man than Robert Kennedy. By all prescription, he was not the man for the moment, except, he took into that situation, which very few people take and that is ethos that was beyond all definition and beyond all measure. Here was a man who, and again with a lot of understatement, blazes a trail as attorney general of the United States. Here was a man, with understatement again, who went through the grief of a brother assassinated. Here was a man, on that day, when emotions were raw and so badly bruised, comes in and saves a city, because while there was calming there, there was calamity everywhere. To what do we attribute that? One person. The reasoning man constructing the reasonable audience.⁸¹

Karl Anatol, then a young graduate student who visited the urban community to conduct interviews in the days that immediately followed Kennedy's appearance, more recently suggested that Kennedy alone was a reason for the extraordinary response in the Hoosier city. Anatol is not alone in placing Kennedy at the center of the story. Bearing in mind the context and location of the event, Lloyd Milliken opines, "I don't think too many politicians would either have the courage or the ability to do what Bobby did that night... This was not a campaign speech."⁸² Urban legend, strengthened by the various collected oral histories about that night, suggests that the man behind the speech worked

to halt violence in Indianapolis after King's assassination. Therefore, a thoughtful exploration of what the crowd remembers about that night is needed to underpin the power of Kennedy's appearance.⁸³

Fronting Kennedy's character while crediting his carefully spoken words continues with Robert H. Jackson, also in the audience that night, who remembers Kennedy's prudent authenticity when he says, "That was a time that the true man spoke his piece, said his words, chose them carefully..."⁸⁴ And we know Kennedy was not alone that night—he spoke to a collection of individuals. His call to action put the audience in the lead role. They were the ones who held the ultimate choice in how to respond to the news of King's death. "I think he took some strength from the crowd, from the fact that they were orderly and peaceful at least through the speech and so far as he knew, after," says Frank Mankiewicz. "Notice he said he wanted them to go home. I thought that was an important element of that...Don't go out in the streets, don't do that. Go home, go say a prayer."⁸⁵ Herein lays a reason why the memories captured of this historical night need to be preserved for all its multi-dimensional merit. The descriptions taken from the oral histories indicate that Kennedy's speech was moving and perhaps the main reason why there were no riots in Indianapolis while the rest of the country was in total disarray. However, there is more to be gained from these individual memories of the speech in Indianapolis.

As evidenced in the memories put forth in collected interviews, those present in the audience also remembered the visceral feelings associated with that moment which resonated in the gasps and groans. William Crawford, now a 70-year-old Indiana state

representative, was a young and impatient member of the Black Radical Action Program in 1968. “He was in the audience that night, and he and his friends might have ‘struck the match’ over King’s slaying,” reported Higgins.⁸⁶ Recalling the visceral and emotional elements of the reaction of the audience, Crawford remembers:

...as the sky darkened and a light rain fell, the crowd shook with sorrow and anger when Kennedy told them King had been shot. But after hearing Kennedy’s words of peace and nonviolence, ‘our reaction was one of prayer...Unlike other communities; we did not strike a match. We did not pick up a gun.’⁸⁷

In similar form, Representative John Lewis, civil rights activist, recalls: “The words...they just ring...they’ll just chill your body. And he [Kennedy] did, not in a...loud...but almost in a prayerful manner [delivered the news of King’s death].”⁸⁸ In these remembrances it becomes apparent that the rhetorical effect of Kennedy’s address is a combination of bodily experience, Kennedy’s words, and his tone. The situational context and Kennedy’s gesture (of speaking) and delivery play a role in the once-occurrent experience alongside the memories of the actual audience participants. “I was so intrigued by the calmness of the crowd,” remembers the late Representative Julia Carson. “They listened and they went away with not hate but with compassion in their hearts. I mean you could just feel it over the crowd.”⁸⁹

The way Kennedy delivered the news mattered just as much as the words he carefully selected. Representative John Lewis asserts that “...because of what Robert Kennedy said, the way he said it, there was not any violence in Indianapolis. It was order. It was peace.”⁹⁰ Lewis continues, “After seeing him and after hearing him gave me an even greater sense of profound respect for him is because he was the kind of

person who carried something of a presence around him.” Within Lewis’ overall memory of the event lies a forgotten feature of political oratory: presence. “He was believable...His, for lack of better words, aura. There was believability about him, sincerity in his tone, in his speaking that made him believable.”⁹¹

The sincere presence evidenced in Lewis’ memory aligns with Abie Robinson’s notion of calm awareness. “He seemed very calm knowing, knowing what he knew,” offers Robinson. Remembering that Kennedy advisors didn’t want him to go, Robinson reflects, “It seemed to be that he was calmer than anyone who was around him...that was very apparent. I don't know why that would be other than simple awareness.”⁹² Here Kennedy’s physical language lies in the foreground of the memory, emphasizing the heightened awareness of scene and situational circumstance.

Beyond the recollections of visceral feelings, and closer to the memory of Kennedy’s aura, is Anatol’s reflection that represents those who resolved to remember the unexplainable. “[A]s far as I'm concerned it was pure magic happening in Indianapolis,” says Anatol.⁹³ Similar to other memories from that night, this rendering puts the force of the experience in the realm of the supernatural, not unlike the experience of religion, tragedy, fate, and philosophy. The relevance of such memories (and talk of magic) is to illustrate that context, sincerity, presence, awareness, and physical sensations are absolute components of Kennedy’s overall message. Such rhetorical essentials are emblematic of an honestly enriching story – one that is worthy of unrestricted exploration.

Conclusion

A reading of Robert Kennedy's announcement of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. is better done if explored through various angles and mixed perspectives. Such variation gives us capabilities to better understand the multiple facets of this momentous event. In other terms, Kennedy's April 4, 1968 address is only read half way if only read for its words. The work to follow is an effort to expose a true dialogic moment that carries with it historical, political, social, and cultural significance. By exposing communicative instances in which dialogic moments present themselves in human interaction, the ethical dimension of communications is exposed as well.

Cities all over the United States were at the mercy of violent rage following the assassination of Dr. King. Indianapolis, unlike these hundreds of other cities, remained calm. Kennedy's appearance, in a predominately African American neighborhood, to relay the news of King's death, is credited as a main reason for this peaceful effect. Through an approach of digging through multiple layers, this real-life tale will expose the power of the presence among audience and speaker, emotive argument, as well as the magical turn of fate which all contributes to the possibility of a dialogic rhetoric.

Though this is one of the all time greatest speeches in our national history and is remembered alongside the inaugural addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, King's own "I Have a Dream" speech, as well as other famous orators including Malcolm X, Ronald Reagan, General Douglas MacArthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Barbara Charline Jordan, and Mario Matthew Cuomo, this event is more than just a great speech.⁹⁴ The apparent simplicity of Kennedy's words is deceptive –its

fusion of tragedy and response, along with its wealth of courage and emotion, marks this historical moment with despair and hope.

This speech is not only historically and politically significant, but it is also important to rhetoricians, communication ethicists, and those interested in argument and critical cultural studies. Rhetorically, how we measure effects is of interest. Expanding theoretical insight to constitute criticism as it resides in world disclosure offers a new way of looking at rhetoric. The communication ethicist, or anyone interested in the philosophical work on dialogue, will appreciate this work as concepts - like answerability, emotional-volitional tone, and care for the other - come to life via application and consideration of Kennedy's appearance. Whether or not rhetoric can converge with philosophical insight to create opportunities for one-time, unique (and other-worldly) moments in and through communication interaction will be considered.

For argumentation scholars, the interest comes forth in a re-thinking of how we do argumentation. Realizing that it is not enough to only consider the text of Kennedy's announcement, an attempt is made to make the peripheral or outlying features (beyond Kennedy's words) of the argument central and significant in the overall effect. Working to overcome the politics of difference in order to get at and reveal moments of authentic connection between individuals (or groups of individuals) remains at the heart of this project. Such politics - of race, class, and/or gender - resonate in the situational context of communication interaction and, in turn, create *real* social, political, cultural, and historical problems. Thus, the critical cultural scholar will find this study ripe with

opportunities to uncover the politics of representation, racialized discourse, privilege, power, ideological hegemony, and reconciliation.

The story of April 4, 1968 brings to light issues of race, rage, shock, understanding, authenticity, mourning, presence, and ethics, to name a few. Such an event, one that carries with it great historical, civil, political, and ethical implications, ought to be embraced for all the lessons it provides. Instead of retelling the story within the confines of theoretical classifications, this version of the story embraces the multivocality of the many participants and reflects critically upon the world disclosure of the event as it emerges from those remembrances. As we will see, this occasion is more than Kennedy announcing the assassination of King.

Chapter Two: The Problem Multifaceted Accountability and Contribution toward Rhetorical Effectivity

Robert F. Kennedy's announcement of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination remains one of the most significant moments of U.S. history. Not only did he deliver eloquent words in light of such a national tragedy, he also presented a message that helped quell violence in the city of Indianapolis as race riots erupted across the rest of the country. Urban legend has long endorsed the argument that the absence of race riots in Indianapolis on April 4, 1968, resulted from the power of the speech that Kennedy gave that night. Scholars, too, have made passing references to Kennedy's role in keeping the peace in Indianapolis. But surprisingly few academics have examined at length the significance and importance of Kennedy's Indianapolis speech and the power of rhetorical effectivity.

An evaluation of whether or not a traditional disposition, with focus directed toward logic and language, will be used to determine whether isolated rhetorical effect is suitable in explaining the power of speech or if a constitutive turn in the research of Kennedy's address will be more productive. This will be done through a review of literature that will solidify the problem as well as illustrate how others have reported on Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination. After reviewing the historical approach of biography and rhetorical critical focus on words and arguments, the limitations to these approaches will be addressed and the problem of isolated effect will

be revisited. This chapter will conclude by offering a new approach, one that seeks a more encompassing analysis of rhetorical effectivity, as well as foregrounds the importance of real situational experience.

The Problem: Accounting for the Multifaceted Effects of Kennedy's Rhetoric

It is necessary to consider why this speech carries power and to determine how this study will contribute to understanding the strength and influence of rhetorical effects. Traditional criticism assumes that rhetoric is an instrumental method and involves a series of choices, and the ability to discover the available means of persuasion resides in those choices. Realizing that the realm of rhetoric is concerned with effect as much as it is concerned with magnetism or durability is to understand that rhetorical inquiry is not one-dimensional. Rather, there are several ways in which we can account for the power of rhetorical discourse.

Since Aristotle we have considered the power of speech and its available means to influence action. Traditionally this has been attributed to reasoned appeals or the production of judgments concerning the pressing reasons, situational factors, and issues at hand (or exigencies); both the materiality and aesthetic features of the words used to mark style and artistry of the message; and the strategic expertise of the speaker to make choices and adapt to the occasion and/or audience. All of these elements play a role in the multifaceted effects of Kennedy's rhetoric. However, these are not the only elements and thus should not be the only way we look at this speech or others. For if we only encounter this night through Kennedy's words alone we would miss what is most important: the presentation of the speaker's body as a site of reflection and embedded

circumstance; the emotional tone of the message that comes forth through feelings as outbursts of emotion marking the climatic peak of a rhetorical condition; and the unique connective energy, which pulls in all participants to the rhetorical act and transcends the rational yet resides entirely in the overall outcome. We become more aware of these features when we expand our ideas of argument, style, and delivery. Such features will emerge in a phenomenological approach.

This kind of an approach requires that we see speech as more than a tool of persuasion, and instead as “world-disclosure”—constituting a meaningful order of persons and things.¹ This disclosure, sometimes unintentionally derived from instrumental features of the rhetorical act, reconstitutes social values, beliefs, memories, norms, languages, etc. Thus, rhetorical critics should not only concern themselves with how persuasive a message is (an instrumental/influence model) or if the message met its persuasive ends. Rather, critics should realize that the instrumental really relies, and lives within, the constitutive account otherwise we can not truly account for what makes a message persuasive. A move to make observations about how participants use things like context and “stylistic tokens”² to activate a moral consciousness is needed. As Ronald Walter Greene suggests in his article, “Constitutive Rhetoric and the Idea of Performance”, this aesthetic turn relies on a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity “...which focuses on the process of identification made possible by the political and aesthetic nature of the rhetorical dynamics of language.”³

There are two base assumptions that are challenged by a constitutive view: the focus on words, both in terms of argument and style and the focus on persuasion rather

than identification. Theories of classical Aristotelian persuasion are limited to a causal model (the speaker sends a message which causes the audience to react in a certain way). This does not account for circumstances prior to or following the sending of the message.

Ideologies, personal experiences, beliefs, traditions, histories, and identities can also be attributed to creating an image of an audience that generates conditions of possibility beyond that of persuasive techniques. Not failing to recognize the importance of the traditional perspective, Maurice Charland (1987), like Greene (1996), offers a constitutive rhetoric which helps explain how discourse works independently of having caused effects. Offering the idea of a “double constitution” of rhetoric that is open to amendment throughout the ongoing narrative, Charland explains that, “[w]riting rhetorical theory should be considered, not as an element in the transmission of a fixed body of knowledge, but as a performance that tells both of rhetorical practice and of itself being told.”⁴

To account for the process inherent in the notion that “persuasive discourse requires a subject-as-audience who is already constituted with an identity and within an ideology,” an examination of discursive practice as constitutive rhetoric begins. To further explain, Charland (1987) turns to Althusser’s production of ideology and interpellation:

An interpellated subject participates in the discourse that addresses him...Note, however, that interpellation does not occur through persuasion in the usual sense, for the very act of *addressing* is rhetorical...In addition, this rhetoric of identification is ongoing, not restricted to one hailing, but usually part of a rhetoric of socialization. Thus, one must already be an interpellated subject and exist as a discursive position in order to be part of the audience of a rhetorical situation in which persuasion could occur.⁵

How to account for rhetorical effects is difficult as the constitutive model urges critics to “...understand judgment as an aesthetic-ethical process made possible by how arguments speak for and speak about persons, places, and events.”⁶ This is a dilemma because using a constitutive model to assess the effects of rhetorical acts renders ethical judgments based on the content of discourse alone. As Hicks (2009) points out, a more traditional, instrumentalist account of effect is often privileged because it relies on “...causal evidence that the singular act of expression in question was the material cause of the effects.”⁷ However, as previously noted, to read the rhetorical effects of a communication interaction only in terms of its success and/or failure of verbal persuasion would be limiting. This dilemma illustrates that there is a definite lack of and a need for a more encompassing analysis of rhetorical effectivity.

Not unlike previous scholarship, this project, in pursuing a notion of dialogic rhetoric, allows for “rethinking of judgment and the working of the rhetorical effect.”⁸ Considering how language can maintain order as it allows close investigation of the means, methods, and techniques utilized, is provocative. However, to focus only on the verbal message would dismiss the role of the rhetorical situation as well as the integral role of the audience members in maintaining peace in Indianapolis rather than rioting. Though important to consider, its rhetorical effect should not be limited to Kennedy’s words and persuasive maneuvers alone as this would deliver limited results. We must instead look closely at the outcome available through the constitution of world-disclosure which resides in emotive moments of ethical performance.

The assassination of King and the various reactions thereafter offer opportunity to investigate the power of rhetorical effects. It is the goal of this work to take on a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity that embraces situational experience as well as provides analysis that reaches beyond words and arguments and historical biography. It is not enough to tell the story of Kennedy's appearance in Indianapolis. Nor is it enough to read Kennedy's speech on the page and examine the eloquent words for argumentative strategies. One must embrace the actual lived experience of the moment (and the multilayered argumentation at work) if there is real interest to uncover the true power of rhetorical effectivity. Thus, considering the complexities of its rhetorical effectivity is necessary. The unique situational context, all participants (both Kennedy and his audience) of the speech act, aesthetic argument, and ethical implications all become fundamental components of a successful evaluation. Just as historians need to embrace the rhetorical effects of particularities of larger narratives, rhetoricians need to embrace a phenomenological approach—one that foregrounds the reality of the event itself.

The approach taken here, in difference to previous research about Kennedy's address, argues that it is problematic to only consider the rhetorical effect of words alone. Taking a phenomenological path is the only way to achieve a more encompassing analysis. Thus, consideration of outlying elements, such as the emotional, visceral, and kisceral modes of argument⁹ is needed alongside the more traditional logical and verbal analyses. In large part, the "peripheral modes of argument"¹⁰ embedded in Kennedy's address are what accounts for its effectivity. Further, this research project extends the

work of Gilbert (1997) to explore how this research supports a dialogic rhetoric, one that fully integrates the logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral modes of reasoning.

Phenomenology, with its emphasis on the actual processes, calls critics to attend to a more complete interpretation of the communicative act. Gilbert provides an excellent framework with which rhetorical critics can begin because he offers three other peripheral modes of reasoning (beyond the logical) to consider (i.e., the emotional, visceral, and kisceral). However, this is not to imply that Gilbert's model stands alone without the need of certain adjustments from other theories, models, etc., in order to adequately grasp what is really going on in situational experiences. Rather, each experience/moment/event/communication interaction under examination has a multiplicity of reasons why its rhetorical effect comes out the way it does. Thus, rhetorical critics should be open to a wealth of theories and interdisciplinary work if interested in understanding the complexity of the overall experience.

Kennedy's Announcement of the Assassination of King: A Review of Literature

The headlining article that appeared in *The Indianapolis Star* the morning following King's assassination began with two paragraphs on the status of the previously favored candidate, Roger Branigin. The remaining four columns of the article provided a play-by-play report of Kennedy's campaign schedule for the day, briefly mentioning the speech towards the end, noting how quickly the crowd left after Kennedy's announcement.¹¹ News reports of the Kennedy speech are scarce, and, in some places, overshadowed by King's assassination. One article, published in the Indianapolis evening newspaper the day following the King assassination, recognizes the effectiveness of

Kennedy's discourse. The article states that the crowd was offered juxtaposing alternatives—an ideology of polarization (and “lawlessness”) or a move to carry out the dream of the beloved Dr. King (and remain non-violent). The article also explained that Kennedy “looking pale and shaken, disregarded his prepared speech and spoke briefly to a predominantly Negro crowd....urging them not to meet violence with violence.”¹²

Newspaper reports generally focus on what happened rather than reflect on the impact of the moment. Thus, if even mentioned, Kennedy's speech stands far away from center stage in the newspapers. The emotions and other significant rhetorical features that were demonstrated by the nonviolent crowd are left outside the reported narrative. Just as citizens and social commentators have paid particular attention to Kennedy's words, rhetorical critics and other various researchers have also emphasized words as the only effect of Kennedy's appearance.

To date, few social commentators, rhetorical critics, historical biographers, citizens, and other various researchers have considered Kennedy's April 4th speech as an act with profound effects. A review of literature suggests that historians have approached this speech from the larger perspective of Robert Kennedy's life narrative. Rhetorical critics and other researchers provide a critical overview of Kennedy's Indianapolis speech act and/or focus on how Kennedy's words evoked particular argumentative strategies. Social commentators and citizens have also embraced Kennedy's address and the power of his words as the reason why Indianapolis maintained peace over violence following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. Further explication of this project

will be made after an examination of the previous studies that focus on Kennedy's April 4, 1968 address.

Biography

Robert F. Kennedy's life has been chronicled in various ways, with historians focusing on his private life, his public life, or his 1968 presidential campaign. From an assortment of historical works, a portrait of Robert Kennedy as a man with many faces becomes apparent. References made by historical biographers of the Indianapolis speech are minimal in comparison to the various reports of Kennedy's life experiences. For this project, understanding the man behind the Indianapolis speech becomes the significance of the historical research. Following is a brief survey of historical works that chronicle Kennedy's life, as well as reference his April 4, 1968 appearance in Indianapolis.

In a thorough biography of Robert Kennedy, Arthur M. Schlesinger (1978), a Kennedy advisor for many years and devoted friend, creates a compelling account of the public and private years of Kennedy's short life. Having an insider's perspective via Kennedy's diaries, private papers, letters, and oral history interviews, Schlesinger works to reveal new information about the "representative man" while also reflecting on the turbulent tensions of the 1960s.¹³ This biography examines the multiple forces, such as family, religion, and politics, which helped shape this leader and his concern for social justice. A common portrait of Kennedy takes form here with strokes of tragedy, influence, courage, wealth, and family exuding dominance over the historical narrative.

In similar form, Kennedy biographer Evan Thomas (2000) turns to oral histories, family papers, and government documents to add important details to the once-shaded

aspects of Kennedy's life. Marking him as "...the most fierce and the most vulnerable, the Kennedy who most intensely experienced the range of human emotions," Thomas looks closely at the multiple layers of character that make up the extraordinary man.¹⁴ This account, like Schlesinger's (1978), is at the forefront of the common portrait of Kennedy's life that has come to be represented in biographical renditions. Juxtaposing the "Good Bobby" or the gentle, idealistic family man who held a sense of moral obligation against the ruthless Attorney General, or the "Bad Bobby," the political character known for vindictively protecting the family's name, Thomas describes Kennedy's life through themes of morality, intrigue, crisis, conscience, and courage.

Narrowing the scope of the Kennedy narrative but still providing insight into the character of the democratic leader, David Halberstam (1968) follows Robert Kennedy during his 1968 presidential campaign. The reader travels with the Senator from state to state, immersed in the issues that were the cornerstone of RFK's campaign, social justice, civil rights, and non-aggressive foreign policy. Where the other historical narratives account for his upbringing, family influences, and the early stages of his political career, Halberstam remains committed to the closing years of his life, beginning his biography in the fall of 1967. This narrative carries the reader through Indiana, the first stop on Kennedy's campaign trail, pointing out the political challenges of visiting a conservative state. Halberstam stops one step short of Kennedy's final campaign run on June 4, 1968, the night Robert Kennedy was assassinated.¹⁵

Also focusing on the final years of Kennedy's life, Jules Witcover (1969) offers a complete and comprehensive account of the 1968 presidential campaign.¹⁶ In detail,

Witcover discusses the speeches, campaign stops, and strategy meetings as well as provides an analysis of Kennedy's platform.¹⁷ Most historical accounts of the 1968 campaign only cover the elements of the campaign and/or Kennedy's assassination and rarely cover the details of individual events. Because Witcover's detailed account of the 1968 campaign pays careful attention to specific events, it is essential in understanding Kennedy's transformation from one who was ruthless and unforgiving to the caring candidate who quite possibly could have gone on to become President.¹⁸

In a more recent volume celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Indianapolis speech, Ray E. Boomhower (2008) delivers a detailed account of the 1968 Indiana primary campaign in his own historical narrative. Similar to those of Halberstam (1968) and Witcover (1969), this biography carefully traces the few weeks in Indiana that turned out to be one of the more significant political moments with regard to race relations. Unlike those of Halberstam and Witcover, this historical narrative is built around Kennedy's Indianapolis announcement rather than following the traditional timeline of the campaign schedule. Beginning and ending in the present at the 2008 memorial, *A Landmark for Peace*, which stands at the location of Kennedy's 1968 speech at 17th & Broadway, Boomhower establishes the sustaining gap in race relations as it is sculpted in the outreaching arms of Kennedy and King.¹⁹

Boomhower begins with providing a more detailed account of the events that led up to Kennedy's renowned Indianapolis speech and argues that it was this speech that made obvious that the times were changing in Indiana politics. In this way, he presents a return to the political story. Using more first hand accounts from actual participants in the

Indiana primary, Boomhower traces Kennedy's decision to enter the race, revisits his biggest opponents, covers inside details on campaign strategies, and reflects on voters' reactions. While Kennedy's Indianapolis speech receives more attention here than in other historical biographies, Boomhower's narrative still maintains an avid interest in "Kennedy's ability to bring people together" as "one of the reasons his words of calm had struck such a chord with the crowd that heard him speak in Indianapolis following the death of Martin Luther King, Jr."²⁰ Here, the familiar representation of Kennedy's heartening character emerges again along with the words of his celebrated address.

The work put forth by Schlesinger (1978), Thomas (2000), Halberstam (1968), Witcover (1969), and Boomhower (2008) provide a variety of biographical approaches that capture the common portrait of Robert Kennedy. Spanning forty years, this collection of perspectives put forth by close friends, aides, writers, and researchers, provides only a sample of the work done on the charismatic leader who was an emblem of hope during tragic times. For instance, other accounts delivered by Plimpton, ed. (1970), David & David (1986), Heymann (1998), and Steel (2000) provide similar readings of Kennedy's life story – one that was motivated by family, touched by tragedy, and resolved to be legendary.²¹ While providing glimpses of the composite picture – as father, brother, political candidate, American citizen, etc. – the historical approach to the life and message of Robert Kennedy covers broader timelines and paints the composite in broader strokes. As a result, however, the attention to critical details of specific events is lost. A closer look at how these historical biographers frame the event of Kennedy's announcement of King's death will further illustrate how their research is shaped by a

method that does not pay sufficient attention to the rhetorical innovations used that notable night.

Schlesinger (1978) includes only a brief reference to Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination among his descriptions of the campaign events of that day. Noting that Kennedy had race relations on his mind earlier in the afternoon at the university talk in Muncie, Indiana, the narrative moves to how Kennedy received the news, was warned not to go, but decided to continue forward with the pre-planned rally in the heart of the Indianapolis "ghetto."²² Schlesinger's account of what happens next is limited to a brief description of the weather, Kennedy's appearance of "anguish," and the indication that the announcement of King's death was interrupted by the reactive gasps from the crowd. In his account, the speech is presented merely as Kennedy's spoken words. The historical narrative quickly resumes at the Marott Hotel where Kennedy rejoined his campaign staff to prepare for the next political move amidst the fury that swept across the rest of the country.²³ Diligently focused on the biography of the political leader, Schlesinger does not pause to reflect on the rhetorical invention used by Kennedy that night. While noting that cities across the country erupted in violence, this version does not account for its rhetorical effect of nonviolence in Indianapolis. Rather, Schlesinger carries the story forward by noting that Kennedy reflected on the violence in his campaign speech at the City Club in Cleveland the next morning.²⁴

Thomas' (2000) biography also mentions Kennedy's Indianapolis address while recounting the opening of his presidential primary campaign. Quickly jumping from Kennedy's announcement to enter the primary race to his pre-planned rally in the urban

“ghetto,” he replays Kennedy’s reception of the news of King’s death, the warnings to cancel the trip, and gives a brief description of the crowd milling about awaiting Kennedy’s arrival. Thomas marks Kennedy’s announcement of King’s death by the collective gasp of the crowd and then includes small sections of his speech without any reflection of Kennedy’s rhetorical influence. The historical narrative rejoins at the hotel where “More than sadness,” reports Thomas, “King’s death seemed to have aroused old fears in Kennedy.”²⁵ Rather than reflecting on the lack of violence that emerged from the situation in Indianapolis that night, Thomas links King’s assassination to Kennedy’s response to threats upon his own life before returning the story of one man’s quest to find his voice amidst campaign themes of “unity and reconciliation.”²⁶

Halberstam (1968) precludes the events of April 4th by noting the tensions of race relations that were polarizing communities across the country. Kennedy “spoke of a hope for a generous America” immediately before he received the news of King’s death which marked his awareness of hate and division as well as his quest to reconcile the races. In his telling of Kennedy’s life, Halberstam, unlike other biographers, indicates that upon receiving warnings not to go forward into the urban community, Kennedy “...had not wanted to go, but others convinced him he must honor his obligation.”²⁷ Halberstam goes on to reprint the majority of what he claims is “...perhaps the best speech of the campaign, perhaps the best speech of his life.”²⁸ After Kennedy’s words are revisited, Halberstam points out that Kennedy’s very appearance in the city’s “ghetto” was considered more important by the press than his speech. He was “one of the rare American political figures who could, on a night of such anger and vengeance, go safely

into the black quarters of the cities,” writes Halberstam. “Others would go that night, and in the nights to follow, in unmarked cars or fly quickly over in helicopters as city after city burned.”²⁹ Acknowledgement of Kennedy’s physical action stands out in difference to other historical accounts because here something other than his spoken words gains a line in the story. However, the rhetorical power of such action remains undervalued. Halberstam fails to reflect further on the events in Indianapolis and instead turns to a summative review of the relational history between the Kennedys and the Kings.³⁰

Placing the reader in the midst of the campaign, Boomhower (2008), like Witcover (1969), recounts how Kennedy found out Martin Luther King, Jr. had been shot. Boomhower, however, centers his historical narrative from Kennedy’s announcement of King’s assassination and suggests that this particular speech calls attention to Indiana politics in 1968. This version takes a closer look at Kennedy’s decision to enter the primary in the Hoosier stat where his biggest opponents were, and how to best improve voter participation. April 4, 1968 remains at the center of the story. Providing the most detailed account of Kennedy’s appearance on 17th & Broadway, Boomhower begins by acknowledging the antagonistic press and anti-Kennedy sentiment that was already circulating before he arrived at the two colleges that marked the kick-off to the Indiana campaign.³¹

With focus on the speech, tracing Kennedy’s arrival into the urban neighborhood, and submerging the reader into the event, Boomhower integrates Kennedy’s speech with brief reflection, mainly provided from interviews, on how he spoke of the Greeks and his own assassinated brother. He concludes by reporting that, “As Kennedy climbed off the

flatbed truck on which had had been speaking, people close to him stretched out their arms to try and touch him.”³² Beyond acknowledging the visceral attraction between Kennedy and his audience, Boomhower quotes James Tolan, an advance man for the campaign, who recalled, “...you could see the awful magnetic power that he had – the charismatic quality that he had,” which indicates that more than verbal persuasion was operating between the speaker and audience.³³ Briefly alluding to the dynamic power of Kennedy’s speech, Boomhower reports, “Both whites and blacks who have witnessed the speech described what they experienced in religious terms.”³⁴

Providing more contextual details than ever before, this version mentions specific members of the community who were present that night in Indianapolis as well as offers more details into how Kennedy first received the news of King’s death. Unlike the other historical narratives, Boomhower carefully recounts the events of the day by using a variety of sources, including personal memories of Kennedy staff members, speechwriters, and those present in the audience. Such attention to detail provides opportunity to reveal the multiple forces at work as Kennedy announced the death of King. Just as in Boomhower’s work, this project captures revealing testimony that points to the multiple effects that arose from Kennedy’s appearance. However, Boomhower’s work is still committed to the historical narrative and, while offering glimpses of the diverse rhetorical effectivity embedded in the memories captured in oral history, he returns to the overall story of Kennedy’s primary campaign. Rather than reflecting carefully on Kennedy’s rhetorical innovations, Boomhower traces the influences of

Kennedy's time in Indiana to California and beyond, ending with a trip on the funeral train and resonating in meaning evoked by the memorial on 17th & Broadway.

The historical information about Robert Kennedy is beneficial because it helps provide an overall understanding of the multilayered person responsible for the Indianapolis speech. Through the use of narrative, Kennedy's public and personal life are reported and composed by various historians as they account for his life experiences. While not dismissing the need for the historical perspective to understand the man behind the speech, this work accepts the legacy of Kennedy outright but instead turns attention towards rhetorical innovation. Historians need to engage with an approach that provides a means of investigating the symbolic action of Kennedy's speech. A turn toward rhetoric would allow for a better understanding of how language, in its many diverse forms, can gain and maintain order, construct identity, and articulate a world view of hope in a time of tragedy.

Words/Arguments

Just as historians have taken interest in Robert Kennedy, rhetorical critics and other researchers have developed a curiosity about this man and his dream. In contrast to the historical approach, these researchers pose critical questions and/or focus on how Kennedy's words evoked particular argumentative strategies in his Indianapolis address. Themes of political courage, racial reconciliation, the power of words, and rhetorical invention are a few of the ideas to emerge from this body of literature. Anatol & Bittner (1968), Levy (1994) and Murphy (1990) are just some of the researchers who have written specifically on Kennedy's Indianapolis appearance.

Karl W. E. Anatol and John R. Bittner (1968) were the first scholars to be interested in the communication phenomena that occurred “In the heart of the Indianapolis Negro ghetto...” that fateful April night.³⁵ Graduate students at the time, their project “...was in pursuit of a classroom assignment that escalated...in to something publishable,” reports Anatol (2008) years later.³⁶ Similar to this project, Anatol & Bittner (1968) sought to understand the effects of Kennedy’s speech from the point of view of the audience. “John Bittner was white,” reflects Anatol (2008), and “I am black and going there and trying to probe into these rather raw and not yet healed feelings,” proved to be a difficult feat. “[W]e wanted to be very careful about it and so with [some] background checking and reflecting we drove the 55 miles for the purpose of meeting with folks at something called the Christian Brotherhood Center, I believe it was.”³⁷ At the site, about one month following the event, Anatol & Bittner met with a small audience to get a “sense of their recollections of the situation.”³⁸

Although they had the benefit of collecting immediate feelings and reactions from audience members and neighborhood residents, Anatol & Bittner remained ultimately quite selective in what responses actually made it into the published article. A majority of this scholarship provides details of the scene, situation, and conditions to which Kennedy spoke while attempting to “...ascertain the effects of the speech on the Indianapolis Black community.”³⁹ Anatol (2008) later explains that, “We were just taking with us snapshots of an event and trying to put it on a page and what we came up with is these little threads that convince one that the situation in Indianapolis was one that was

tremendously volatile.”⁴⁰ Unlike this project, Anatol & Bittner (1968) provide little analysis of the audience reactions collected in their interviews.

The importance of such research, however, is not undermined nor quickly dismissed. It is inevitable that such record of first-hand reactions from those immediately affected by the Kennedy speech, is priceless. In fact, some of those memories are also used in this work. Anatol & Bittner (1968) point to the immediate and nonviolent “dispersal” of the crowd as the place “...to constitute a major factor in determining the effectiveness of the Kennedy speech.”⁴¹ They remind us that the conditions of the speech were “vital” and that “involvement was Kennedy’s choice”.⁴² They go on to express that Kennedy’s method was “confrontation” and the “pay-off” was “pacification.”⁴³ The interviews collected were then used to demonstrate how such pacification took place. Themes, found among the audience testimonials, point to the overall effectivity of Kennedy’s speech, and included the politician’s “...already existing ‘image’ that appealed to the Black community” as well as his use of “pathos” and “identification” with the audience.⁴⁴ Ultimately, Anatol & Bittner’s findings return to emphasize the role of Kennedy’s “counter-persuasion” as they momentarily reflected “about what could have happened if Kennedy had not appeared in the ghetto.”⁴⁵ The authors speculate, albeit briefly, on Kennedy’s intentions and conclude by writing:

The greatest lesson learned is that violence and riots can be averted and that cross-cultural communication is a necessary step. In the ghetto it seemed to matter that verbal discourse took place in a critical moment. It is customary that the task of “preachment midst crisis” be assigned to countless editorials; the irony is that the illiterate cannot read.⁴⁶

Anatol & Bittner's work contributes to the literature concerned with the rhetorical effect of Kennedy's words and arguments. They conclude by acknowledging the need for intercultural communication and highlight the impact of Kennedy's "verbal discourse" which is in line with the majority of research done on this speech.⁴⁷ However, also acknowledged in this piece of scholarship is the important contribution of audience reflections, immediate circumstance and conditions of the rhetorical act, and points of identification between the speaker and crowd. This work will extend Anatol and Bittner's efforts to understand the powerful effect of the Kennedy event by also turning to the remembrances of actual audience participants. This research, though, works to extend the analysis of the speech beyond notions of "counter-persuasion" and "verbal discourse" and also considers the visceral, emotional, and kisceral reasoning involved in its overall effect of nonviolence. This approach will work to highlight dialogue and connectivity over "rhetoric of control"⁴⁸ as well as work to eliminate dated judgments based on race and class.

Another scholar interested in the argument presented in Kennedy's speech is Andrew Levy (1994) who investigates how our society defines an act of political courage. In comparing Kennedy's rhetorical act to the lack thereof following the 1994 race riots, this work questions the mythological nature of the premise that the April 4, 1968 speech forestalled violence in Indianapolis. Rather, Levy suggests that Indianapolis probably remained calm because it possessed "a strong and complacent black middle class." Continuing with a brief history of Indianapolis, Levy also notes that the city does not offer significant evidence in the area of progressive race relations.⁴⁹ Taking a critical

approach, Levy uses Kennedy's speech to raise questions of political courage, race relations, exploration of the welfare state in America, and the role of commemorative sites as "immemorial." Here we begin to see Kennedy's Indianapolis act as more than one instance in a narrative series of his life's work. Focus is placed instead on critical issues such as race and class and how political figures interact with such matters.

Aligning with Levy's goal to unveil critical questions raised by Kennedy's speech, this project will also offer insight on political, cultural, social, and ethical implications of this speech act. Rather than focusing on how the efforts of Kennedy's speech connect to political issues of today via themes of racial progress (or lack thereof), this project will seek to illuminate the lived-experience of that particular event and suggest that other elements, beyond Kennedy's words, contribute to its overall rhetorical effectivity. By considering other elements, such as emotional argumentation and role of the audience in the overall experience, the critical concepts presented in the work of Levy can be extended.

Unlike Levy, John M. Murphy (1985, 1990) takes a rhetorical approach to Kennedy's April 4, 1968 speech act. Murphy, one of the few communication scholars to work on Kennedy's April 4, 1968 Indianapolis address, began his investigation of Kennedy's rhetoric with his dissertation that focused on the obstacles faced during Kennedy's 1968 campaign race, as well as the rhetorical strategies used to overcome those difficulties. Devoting entire chapters on Kennedy's speeches given in the Indiana primary, the Nebraska and Oregon primaries, and California primary, Murphy (1985) concludes that the rhetorical form of the jeremiad characterizes Kennedy's rhetoric. This

choice of rhetoric, he finds, is beneficial in that it allows the speaker to bring moral concerns into the political arena while affirming the existing social structure. When speaking of Kennedy's Indianapolis address in particular, Murphy proposes that Kennedy's words presented the need for reconciliation and compassion. He claims that Kennedy's use of identification with the audience guided them to honor King's message of non-violence in Indianapolis.⁵⁰

In a later work, Murphy (1990) looks at the two speeches Kennedy gave after the assassination of King. His work here resembles a more traditional rhetorical analysis, and he states that Kennedy's eulogy worked as an epideictic address "by explaining a disturbing event within the frame of values and beliefs accepted by the audience."⁵¹ Utilizing the Cleveland speech (which immediately followed the Indianapolis speech) as an example of the jeremiad tradition, Murphy focuses on Kennedy's rhetorical moves, which place responsibility for the rising disorders on the individual and remove the problem away from the American system in general. Murphy illustrates that while epideictic address is helpful in regaining order in times of crises, he also suggests that the jeremiad also limits social criticism. Though important, Murphy's work (1985, 1990) privileges the power of verbal communication and focuses on traditional rhetorical analysis of such. While in agreement with Murphy's work to recognize the power of Kennedy's words in offering racial reconciliation, this project, suggests that Kennedy's speech is only read half way if it is read only for the words delivered. Although a plethora of works exist from scholars interested in Kennedy's announcement of King's

assassination, none yet has attempted to explain or account for the often overlooked effects that arose from his spoken discourse.⁵²

What cannot be captured in any of the aforementioned treatments of Kennedy's speech is the rhetorical power of situational risk. As Maurice Natanson (1965) puts it, "Argument and counterargument...are bound within the frame of the established situation, which in turn might be analyzed into certain role structures and societal functions."⁵³ The situational context defines the possibility of argument and is not merely "open" to the speaker to do what he or she will. Though it is possible "...that one might convince the other of some limited aspect of the total problem...such convincing would be limited precisely because the basic self, the person involved, would be really not at issue."⁵⁴ Rather, the situational context foregrounds the issues of the moment and in order for the speaker to persuade the other(s) in this case "...would mean to force the presence of the self, the risking of the self," as Natanson terms it.⁵⁵ This claim highlights the importance of authenticity, by way of speaker, in its overall rhetorical effectivity. One way to go about assessing such authenticity is by considering the risk element embedded in the rhetoric. However, it is to be noted that, "The risking of the self, even in genuine cases of willingness to risk, by no means assures the liberation of the self. What is constitutive of liberation derives from a much more primordial stratum of argumentation."⁵⁶ This last ascertainment by Natanson redirects attention toward often obsolete elements of argumentation that tend to be left out of consideration when assessing rhetorical effectivity. Capturing the authenticity or "primordial stratum" of

Kennedy's announcement needs to be done by looking at the speech from multiple perspectives and through a careful unveiling of feelings involved.

In sum, Natanson writes,

...that arguments, however seriously pursued or sincerely projected, are not in themselves constitutive of the self, that they do not in themselves assure the true risking of subjectivity. Rather, [Natanson puts forth] that argument must be transcended by argumentation in order for the self to be located and its world brought to life. Risk is established when the affective world of the person is existentially disrupted, and this disruption means that his immediate life of feeling and sensibility is challenged and made open to challenge. Argumentation involves the constitution of that total world of which the formation of arguments is but a surface part. To transcend arguments in order to locate the person is to recognize the claims of immediacy and respond to them in dialectical reciprocity. The philosophical act which liberates the self is the same act which acknowledges the mystery of dialogue by engaging in the rhetoric of risk. [Natanson] concludes that philosophical argumentation is the counter examination of the claims of immediacy.⁵⁷

The importance of Natanson's work resides in the attention paid to the immediate situational context by way of the occasion and the participants in the communication exchange. Also of importance is his insight regarding the risking of self within that moment. The real problem is that the historical and rhetorical treatments of Kennedy's April 4th announcement cannot account for the degree of risk that audience members see as the real force of the speech.

Conclusion

The relentless focus on Kennedy's spoken words presents a problem because of the power that comes from elements outside the speech act. Thus, a turn to embrace the complexities of rhetorical effectivity, which involve such elements as the unique situational context, all participants (both Kennedy and his audience) of the speech act,

aesthetic argument, and ethical implications become fundamental components of a successful evaluation. Just as historians need to embrace rhetorical effects of particular moments in larger narratives, rhetoricians need to embrace a phenomenological approach, one that foregrounds the reality of the event itself. A review of literature specific to Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination provides evidence of the problem of isolated rhetorical effect, because, to date, all of these inquiries have focused only on Kennedy's verbal message. Historians, rhetorical critics, and other researchers are missing the overall nature of the event and the sense (or "feel") of the actual lived experience.

Abie Robinson (2008), Indianapolis resident, remembers what it was like to be in the audience that fateful April night in 1968:

I was in that astonished crowd the night we learned of the assassination of Martin Luther King from the Senator Robert Kennedy. I remember the intense emotion that enveloped everyone present, the profound grief, the disbelief, the despair followed by anger and a desire to retaliate, but the inspiring impromptu speech given by Senator Robert Kennedy that tragic night caused us to reflect on the life of Martin Luther King and what he proclaimed to be the right response to violence. I believe it was a super-natural power, which caused us not to respond in lawlessness, but to hold on to the principles and ideas of non-violence that were the bench mark of Martin Luther Kings' legacy.⁵⁸

Robinson's memory of April 4, 1968 as a participating audience member, illustrates that there are multiple layers of rhetorical effectivity operating in the experience of Kennedy's announcement. King's legacy of non-violence is absolutely present in Robinson's memory and he accredits this to "...the inspiring impromptu speech given by Senator Robert Kennedy..." Thus, in support of the majority of the research

done on the April 4th address, Robinson's memory points to Kennedy's inspirational words and how they worked to maintain peace and seek out reconciliation.

However, and more importantly for the nature of this project, Robinson remembers "...the intense emotion that enveloped everyone present..." which moves its rhetorical effect beyond Kennedy's words. Robinson remembers feelings of "profound... grief... disbelief... despair." He felt angry, he desired retaliation. Robinson remembers a turning point, a moment of reflection upon these feelings. He rejected the anger and urge to retaliate, and "...believes it was a super-natural power..." that quelled violence in Indianapolis. This recollection illustrates that both verbal and nonverbal features, such as emotion and feelings, contributed to the overall experience of the Kennedy announcement. Robinson is not alone in his memory of that fateful night. Several others, ranging from Kennedy aides to community members, who were present in Indianapolis that night, also remember more than Kennedy's speech alone. As the details are recounted through the memories of the participants, other elements, such as the visceral experience, emotional connections, and authentic feelings, will emerge as a fundamental force of the rhetorical effect of nonviolence in Indianapolis. How we account for these effects, when they are result of a moment of radical openness and risk, becomes the fundamental research question at hand. Immediacy, a heightened sense of emotive perception embedded in the physicality of the communication interaction, becomes an essential feature in explaining rhetorical effectivity.

Phenomenology provides one answer to the constitutive dilemma of rhetorical effectivity that stems from a lack of a framework that gets at questions of ethics,

aesthetics, feelings, energy, etc. This dilemma illustrates that there is a definite lack of and need for a more encompassing methodology to uncover the true power of rhetorical effects. Thus, we need a pedagogical shift away from discourse (verbal/written) as the primary place to render judgments about the effects of communication interaction. Instead, research should work to foreground the often outlying or peripheral features of argument such as feelings, authenticity, timing, and occasion. When we recognize that context is always operating in and through discourse, a problem arises because, more often than not, context is neglected by argumentation scholars as a fundamental component of the communicative interaction. This is because context, along with other peripheral or outlying features, is rejected in favor of more rational and/ or logical components of the argument. Thus, the next chapter offers that a rhetorical perspective of argumentation— one that embraces a phenomenological methodology, can account for the contextual force of communication interaction.

Chapter Three: The Method

Phenomenology as Method: Accounting for Context in Argumentation

Context raises fundamental issues for anyone interested in the role of situational relevance in rhetorical argument and effects. However, context is often unrecognized as its own contributing feature of rhetorical effectivity. As it is always operating in the communicative interaction, it deserves more attention from communication scholars. Context surrounds the words, envelopes the participants, and contributes to the formation, deliverance, and acceptance of an argument. Functioning in tandem with traditional features, such as logistic reasoning, word structures, and procedures, are contextual components that account for the aesthetics, feelings, and eventfulness of the communicative interaction. This project addresses the importance of context in argumentation by offering phenomenology as a method to account for rhetorical effectivity.

This chapter begins by examining Maurice Natanson's (1965) account of argumentation that vindicates the immediate contextual moment. A reflection back on Hans-Georg Gadamer's (1979) work reinforces that both human and environment, through language, create the world in that moment. A review of how context has been traditionally overlooked for more rational and logical components of an argument will be done through the work of Darrin Hicks (2005) and Ron Greene (1998). Foregrounding context presents a need for a more constitutive model of rhetorical effect, one that

foregrounds situational context along with other non-traditional components of the argument. Placing context into the discursive tradition will be done by focusing on two fundamental features of the traditional view of argument, found operating in the work of Michael A. Gilbert (1997, 2001, 2002) and Lenore Langsdorf (1997, 1994, 1990).¹ In closing, a phenomenological method will be offered as one way to account for the contextual residue of communication interaction.

Immediacy, Risk, and Fusion Found in the Rhetorical Situational Context

Natanson's (1965) "claims of immediacy" is inherent and vital to analyzing argumentation via the phenomenological approach. His account of argument is arrived at by examining all components of said event: arguer, argument, and audience in a combined state. Applying such a perspective helps us to underpin the subjective immediate embodied response. In a directive push to view argument in a new way, Natanson urges that "...we must look to the relationship between the subjectivity which argues and the claims of argument."² Unlike the traditional sense of arguments, which consist of "declarative sentences, propositions interrelated in cunning ways and arranged to show, demonstrate, establish some cognitive rather than affective truth," Natanson goes on to explain the embodied risk of the argument.³ The limited and more traditional definition of argument accounts merely for fact and façade and abandons emotional states, visceral content, as well as leaves immediacy unaccounted for.

Natanson's overall value to argument is based on its subjective risk. "I risk myself," he writes, "in an argument when I know or sense that the very nature of the activity I'm engaging in had its own rationale within which what I am and who I am must

be determined.”⁴ Thus, the risk is not only confined to the content of the argument but in the arguer’s intent in engaging in the argument at that moment. Moreover, Natanson says,

...when I truly risk myself in arguing I open myself to the viable possibility that the consequence of an argument may be to make me *see* something of the structure of my immediate world. To say that argument is constitutive of a world is right, but it is precisely the meaning of “world” that such an assertion calls into questions.⁵

The world to which Natanson refers is “the first place the personal and immediate domain of individual experience.”⁶ The risk of the argument is not that the logic is challenged but that the arguer him/herself is challenged. Each risk is unique and personal because of the speaker’s/arguer’s individual immediacy. In Natanson’s words, “feelings, pride, love, and sullenness, the world of my actuality as I live it” is what makes up that individual or “existential immediacy”.⁷

The subjective risk of the argument is not always present, and, often times, is not easy to point out. “The self is not risked through arguments or even through willingness to argue seriously; only when the full range of depth of the affective life is shocked into openness is a true risk attempted.”⁸ To account for “existential immediacy” we must look at not only the speaker and the audience’s immediacy but also our own critical interpretations. A closer look at Hans-Georg Gadamer’s (2004) “fusion of horizons” is a good place to begin the process of acknowledging that, in the argument, individuals seek for intelligible knowledge of the issue at hand, as well as worldly knowledge overall.

Hans-Georg Gadamer, the German philosopher who uses the metaphor of conversation throughout his work, brings dialogue to the forefront in thinking about how

we may come to understand argumentation. Conversation can be understood as an aspect of process where knowledge is not a fixed thing. Gadamer argues that each individual brings prejudices or prejudgments to conversations and that by opening oneself to other standpoints and observations we participate in the act of dialogue in which ideas become intelligible. Herein also lies the risk of exchange. For Gadamer, it is a matter of interpreting and carrying on a dialogue with texts, the conscious exchange of ideas between reader and work, in which every individual carries the duty of interpretation.

Gadamer, one of the first to present a view of hermeneutical linguistics, argues that there is no thought prior to language and that it is language that both makes possible and limits our understanding. Gadamer (1979) describes conversations as:

A process of two people understanding each other. Thus it is a characteristic of every true conversation that each opens himself to the other person, truly accepts his point of view as worthy of consideration and gets inside the other to such an extent that he understands not a particular individual, but what he says. The thing that has to be grasped is the objective rightness or otherwise of his opinion, so that they can agree with each other on a subject.⁹

The concern is not to win the argument per se; rather, Gadamer sees dialogue as an advancement of knowledge, understanding, and human interests.

Gadamer suggests that the world and language are not two separate entities working independently of each other, and as a result, each side is able to make a significant exchange without either side giving up total independence.¹⁰ “Gadamer claims that we must not think of the intelligibility of language and the intelligibility of the world as completely autonomous domains separated by a chasm of unbridgeable ignorance,” argues Wachterhauser (2002), “but, instead, we should think of both

intelligible realities as belonging together.”¹¹ In other words, language and the world form spaces, having common characteristics that overlap each other to create meaning. Wachterhauser reminds us that, “The world or the object has its own intelligibility that can resist or confirm our ways of thinking and speaking about it, but language has a creative power to elicit or evoke the intelligibility of the object.”¹² Our choice of words has to do with the way the world shows itself to us, but it is also how the world relates to us. This type of dialogue is possible because both the world and the languages we use to understand it share a common natural meaning.¹³

One objection to Gadamer’s work is “that not everything that I understand can be put into words.”¹⁴ For example, a piece of art or music can be understood symbolically but may not be able to be captured meaningfully through words. Gadamer addresses this objection with example of the painter, the sculptor, or the musician in his work *Truth and Method*. “The important idea for Gadamer’s notion of interpretation and its inherent linguisticity,” according to Grondin (2003), “is that the listener be taken up by what he seeks to understand, that he responds, interprets, searches for words or articulation and thus understands.”¹⁵ Being unable to find words, argues Gadamer, can only be considered by what one fails to say. “The unsayable is only the unsayable in light of what one would like to say, but cannot,” writes Grondin. The limitations of language, then confirms, as Gadamer sees it, “the universality of language as the medium of understanding.”¹⁶

Natanson (1965) refers to traditional means of argument as the viewing of “the naïve content of daily life” which accepts the terms of the argument in the terms of the

logical, common-sensical, world.¹⁷ In sharp contrast to this view is the assertion that it is precisely such discourse that constitutes that world. The contextual pre-discourse becomes just as vital to the logical gravity of the argument, if not more so. There is internal thought and discourse prior to externalized discourse through language which makes possible and also limits our understanding. It is Gadamer's assertion that in trying to understand discourse, we must bridge the event with common and uncommon terms of our own world, thus revealing new meanings otherwise hidden in the plain text of the event. "To understand it does not mean primarily to reason one's way back in to the past, but to have a present involvement in what is said."¹⁸ This bridging appears in the immediate moment which pointedly acknowledges claims of the then-and-there situational context. It is in forming "fusion of horizons" that the most cryptic and sometimes important meanings in that immediate moment can be revealed and thus analyzed. "What is at issue, really, in the risking of the self in genuine argument is the immediacy of the self's world of feeling, attitude, and the total subtle range of its affective and conative sensibility."¹⁹

Gadamer (1979) and Natanson (1965), acknowledging the subjective/objective stand on worldly consciousness, direct us to a phenomenological methodology which uniquely explains the moment of Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination. Gadamer argues that experience, culture, and prior understanding render the scientific ideal of objectivity impossible. The meaningful understanding takes the form of a "fusion" of worldviews between the interpreter and his object. Gadamer sought to highlight the importance of dialogue for the purpose of finding meaning as a process

where knowledge is not a fixed thing. Noting that each individual brings prejudices, ideas, and beliefs to conversations Gadamer asserts that the willingness of one to be open to different standpoints and observations will allow one to become more enlightened. This process of conversation, in Gadamer's view, is the act of dialogue in which ideas become intelligible. In this conversation, opportunities for the subjective risk embedded in Natanson's "claims of immediacy" are presented.

Gadamer's conception of the "fusion of horizons" and its importance in hermeneutical scholarship allows only for a self-subjective understanding of a situational or argumentative force. In combining such aspects of discourse, context, and a critic's personal understanding and inherent biases, one has difficulty reconciling the many facets of the situation as a whole. Not unlike Gadamer's interpretative approach, the work done on the rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968; Vatz, 1973; and Biesecker, 1989) allows for further consideration of the conglomeration of tools needed to understand the immediate situational context of argument.

Lloyd F. Bitzer (1968) claims that the rhetorical situation is born when context calls for discourse that could prove to be meaningful and altering and thus the situation gives way to the discourse through exigence, audience, and constraints.²⁰ In contrast, Richard E. Vatz (1973) argues that discourse is the catalyst of the rhetorical situation and that the words and utterances are to be examined in the attempt to grasp the rhetorical situation and understand the varying messages (and roles) between rhetor and audience.²¹ The components of exigence, audience, and constraints are therefore dependent on speech itself. It is by abandoning attempts to view a rhetorical situation based on any

moment, message, audience, or instant, and accepting those components' ever increasing variance that the reader/analyst is exposed to risk.

Barbara A. Biesecker (1989), in her more recent contribution to rhetorical situation scholarship, rejects Bitzer's (1968) claims that historicism and exigence create the discourse. Biesecker also declares that to view the rhetorical situation as merely the after-effect of the rhetorical artifact or discourse, "severely limits what we can say about discourse which seeks to persuade."²² Biesecker works to uphold each theory's stance of importance of situation versus discourse while demonstrating the shortcomings of both scholars' theories. She states that the rhetorical situation can be found through deconstructing all components in a Derridaen fashion while keeping in mind that the situational rhetorical truth is in a constant variance, reliant on the ever-changing definition of rhetor and audience and the subsequent messages put forth from that audience. To that end, it must be noted that the rhetor is also in a state of reception as s/he has to play the part of audience to those messages. Herein lie the claims of immediacy and at root, Natanson's (1965) arrival at argument and risk.

What is needed to explain immediacy (which is embedded in subjective risk and found in the rhetorical situational context) is a phenomenological account of argumentation. Two scholars who give thought to such methodology are Langsdorf (1997, 1994, 1990) and Gilbert (1997, 2001, 2002). In particular, Gilbert's (1997) modes of multi-modal argumentation provide a framework open to the possibilities of exposing risk in the immediate claims of the subjective communication interaction. The 1968 Indianapolis audience was calling for a claim of immediacy and that is what Kennedy

could give them. In that moment in 1968, immediacy worked because the audiences' world had been shattered—what Natanson (1965) would say was a subjective embodied response.

Traditional Views of Argument and the Repression of Multimodality

In an effort to expand the traditional philosophical enterprise in which rational or “logical” elements of communication are privileged to non-rational essentials, this project will first consider the traditional view of argumentation. As with Gilbert (1997, 2001, 2002) and Langsdorf (1997, 1994, 1990), an acknowledgement of the need for a more encompassing account of argumentation is included. To begin, the traditional view emphasizes the role of rational/logical/reasoned forms of evidence and, therefore, presents (and limits) discursive/verbal communication as the sole element of the argument. Secondly, more often than not, nondiscursive forms of communication are seen as interruptions to the rational/logical/reasoned argument. In a significant number of communication interactions, the real issues are not the original discursive declarations. Rather, the feelings attached to the declarations, the integration between the logical and emotional, become just as important. If emotional argumentation is to be taken seriously, Gilbert (2001) posits, “. . .there need to be rules and guidelines for the emotional mode just as there is for the logical. That is, regardless of the theory of emotion one subscribes to, acknowledging its pervasiveness means that its role in social interaction must be examined philosophically.”²³ The often repressed or masked over, modes of argumentation are “more meaningful, more contextual, and more realistic models.”²⁴ Gilbert (1997), through a critique of logic, and Langsdorf, through a critique of

traditional communicative action, support the move toward incorporating restrained features of argumentation. Context is produced in and through action making and context is everything and words. Such understanding highlights that context cannot exist prior to the event.

According to Gilbert (1997), there are two core assumptions of traditional approaches to argument and reasoning that are still found operating determinedly in argumentation studies. The first is concerned with rationality, "...where the sense of the 'rational' is taken as "reasoned" in the Critical-Logical (C-L) sense."²⁵ It is generally assumed that, in the Critical-Logical tradition, the best forms of reasoning are linear and cautious and that an argument consists of a verbalized conclusion along with one or more premises. The Critical-Logical/discursive model situates communicative interaction into universal patterns too linearly and narrowly, however. When this mode is considered as the only rational form of argumentation, unreasonable limitations regarding how real arguments occur as well as limitations to the standards of methods favored by certain groups are extended.

Gilbert (2002) introduces the concept of "logocentric fallacy" which is "...the assumption that verbal pronouncements take precedence over other forms and modes of communication, and it is a fallacy because relying on it can often lead us to accept falsehoods rather than truth."²⁶ If one considers verbalized discourse as the only form of rational communication, then one excludes important cues that contribute to the overall formation of a message. "These cues range from the very words being uttered, to the context in which the communication is taking place, to the emotional and intuitive feel of

the message.”²⁷ Put another way, there is no meaning without a context, and the context is created through multiple sources. Gilbert contends that emotional messages more often have greater influence “than the words used to belie them.”²⁸

The second assumption of the traditional approach to argument and reasoning is concerned with how context, both social (and in this case, historical) as well as other repressed features, such as psychological motivations, body language, and intuitiveness, interfere with or interrupt the argument, mainly due to their outlying nature.²⁹ The indescribable or “ineffable,” as Gilbert (1997) terms it; aspect of nondiscursive arguments often inhibits their use in argumentation. “We frequently fail because language is often not up to the task of describing and communicating the details of non-logical modes. But the error is in supposing that we only understand something when we can put it into words; that being able to ‘say’ it makes it real.”³⁰ Until we learn how to describe the nondiscursive aspects of communication, Gilbert (2002) claims, that, at best, there is a need to recognize the “logocentric fallacy” in modes of communication.

Aligning with Gilbert’s two core assumptions of the traditional perspective of argumentation, Langsdorf (1997) highlights how communication presumes that the individual’s speech act will conform to three modes of argumentation – cognitive/theoretical/instrumental, practical/moral/legal, and aesthetic/expressive/evaluative.³¹ As described by Langsdorf, the cognitive/theoretical/instrumental argument is “...warranted by correlation with empirically accessible consequences of claims or by coherence with already accepted claims.”³² The practical/moral/legal is concerned with rightness or truth in regard to

interactions with other people. And, finally, the aesthetic/expressive/evaluative reasoning “...is oriented toward a “subjective world” and seeks truthful self-knowledge, as warranted by patterns of conduct that are consistent with a speaker’s linguistic behavior.”³³ When considering communication activity within these modes, the traditional assumption remains committed to investigating discursive features. Thus, traditional argumentation theory leaves out other nondiscursive communication forms that appear in real interaction. The traditional view of argument enacts a “...restricted focus on one mode of communicative activity – the linguistic – [which] abstracts and valorizes that mode in contrast to others, such as tactile-kinesthetic (nonverbal) and pictorial or imagistic (unworded) communicative activity.”³⁴ Similar to Gilbert (1997, 2001, 2002), Langsdorf questions if this idealistic theory of communication action is true to real communication activities. Both of these scholars claim that an embodied sense of argument is not one necessarily concerned with the discursive rationality that functions through persuasive rhetoric, *per se*. Rather it is an actual rhetorical moment between speaker and audience.

Operating restrictively within a theory of traditional form fosters an environment in which structure, form, procedure, or ideal conditions take priority over the space, authenticity, and time (all features of context) of the communication interaction. Though important to consider, the verbal/written discourse does not stand alone in the creation of its rhetorical effect. Moving research beyond logic allows for a more real account of what happens in communicative interaction. This is not to suggest that the logical mode does not contribute—but relying *solely* on the traditional study of rhetoric drastically ruptures

an encompassing view of rhetorical effectivity. Instead, an encompassing investigation of rhetorical effectivity that accounts for both the discursive and the often “peripheral” or nondiscursive (nonverbal/unwritten) communication elements is necessary to examine what drives the persuasive appeal of communication exchange.

Context and Constitutive Effects

We must recognize that context is always operating in and contributing to the overall rhetorical effect. Hicks (2005) argues that context is “...more than the extra-textual phenomena, such as setting, situation, prior knowledge, or identity that sets parameters on possible interpretations of meaning.”³⁵ Rather, context should be considered an “analytic category” that is called upon by individuals who are actively experiencing the communication interaction.³⁶ This category establishes and delineates limitations on what can be said, by whom, and in what situational contexts. Thus, context is a regulatory system that is also inherently political because it helps participants shape “...the means and opportunities for struggle.”³⁷ Such an understanding of context exposes the neglect by communication scholars to conceive of context as its own stand-alone category.

Context provides the requirements for determining if an utterance is “real, authentic, and true” as well as resolves what utterances are appropriate for certain situations.³⁸ Similar to Hicks’ concern with the role of context, Greene (1998) posits that “...rhetoric has the ability to create situational truths which give meaning to collective human behaviors.”³⁹ Thus, rhetoric, implicated by human action, is steeped in ethical consequences. If context can be strategically used by participants “...to assign meaning

and value to each other's conduct...⁴⁰ as well as measure the authenticity and ethical implications of the communication interaction, the contextual component becomes an essential concern for argumentation scholars.

Hicks & Langsdorf (1999) state that,

A rhetorical perspective understands argumentation as relativistic in the sense of being attuned to the interests and needs of particular audiences (conditions) seeking to make wise decisions in their situations (context and content).⁴¹

Thus, accepting that the situational context is always operating in and through communication drives the understanding that rhetorical strategies are uniquely designed for specific situations. Rhetorical strategies should then be considered "...constitutive of the agents who use them, the contexts of that use, and the content to which they're applied."⁴² A constitutive model of effect posits a new rhetorical perspective on argumentation. There is space within the rhetorical form of argument for multimodal reasoning.

Accounting for Multimodal Contexts

By considering the often-unrecognized elements of the rhetorical act, a critical movement towards assessing how communication activity *really* happens begins to emerge. This phenomenological approach embraces the descriptive rather than relying solely on critique, and allows the focus to be redirected from "results or products" or "ideal conditions" of the interaction to the entire process and impact of the rhetorical event.⁴³ The only way to accomplish this is to look at argument through phenomenology;⁴⁴ however, more exploration of a phenomenology as method is needed.

Phenomenology is a way to study real life experience. Tracing the implications of phenomenology as a way to study situated human activity, Langsdorf (1994) proposes that communication studies can be expanded to consider the meaningfulness of acts, events, and situations. Highlighting the fundamental role of context in communication illuminates the role of a socially constructed reality.⁴⁵ Investigating spoken discourse (or conversation) in contrast to written text, Langsdorf (1990) claims that in spoken discourse, "...we're automatically *present* in the *context* that's producing the ideas at issue."⁴⁶ In difference to written text, which is a distant object and not an event but a perceived finished product, the spoken word (or discourse) allows for nondiscursive communication to appear.⁴⁷ In sum, Langsdorf highlights the need for a methodological shift from "process to purpose" and acknowledges the dialogical nature of real life argumentation. Thus, similar to this project, Langsdorf indicates the need for diverse interpretative strategies for the various types of argumentative discourse in order to truly analyze the actual lived situational experience of communication events.

When considering a communication interaction, reflection upon the entire context brings critics closer to the truth of the actual situational experience. Gilbert's (1997) multi-modal model is a wonderful beginning framework but one needs to turn to supporting (or extending) theories to really explain what the emotional, visceral, and kisceral experience is for the people experiencing it.⁴⁸ Because there are multiple sides to a communication act, and which hold individualistic differences, it is important to recognize that the points of convergence in which individuals open up to one another in an effort of unity are exceptional.

To unveil such hidden elements of the communication interaction, a multifaceted approach that draws upon rhetorical studies, philosophical insight, aesthetic argumentation, historiographical research, and personal insight is needed. Historiographical research helps to situate the communication exchange and elevate the contextual features of rhetorical effect. Aesthetic argumentation illuminates peripheral modes of communicative interaction which provides a structure to underpin the logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral. In addition to relying on the rationality of procedures, patterns, structures, and conditions, it is also necessary to draw upon a variety of theoretical perspectives, thereby enabling the rhetorical effectivity to emerge descriptively and intuitively.

The Multiple Modes of Reasoning: Conceptualizing the Tasks at Hand

Though it contributes to communication theory, the work of Gilbert (1997) and Langsdorf (1997, 1994, 1990), is restricted to the hypothetical. They provide the theoretical basis for conceptualizing non-traditional modes of argumentation but do not provide any focus on a sustained case with real political import. This project, moving beyond a test of theory to a full body account, leads to a normative account of what dialogic rhetoric is and what it entails.

By expanding the conceptualization of the modes of argument, it is important to note the problems and difficulties inherent in attempting to translate nondiscursive forms of argument into discursive language. However, as Gilbert (1997) posits, “The kind of information presented may defy direct translation, but that does not mean it is not an argumentative move.”⁴⁹ Because of the difficulty of this translation, the contextual

implications of the argument “...and, perhaps, the personal and social histories of the arguers” needs to be considered.⁵⁰

Therefore, the timing and announcement of King’s death as well as the social history of Kennedy himself is fundamental in evaluating the emotional appeal of the April 4, 1968 address. However, as aptly noted by Gilbert (1997):

But this is exactly the point – we understand the communication as a part of an interactive argument, as a component argument of a larger argumentative context. Any translation we might make for descriptive or discursive purposes will rely on our understanding of the entire argumentative context, and not just on the simple analysis of an individual item.⁵¹

Despite its limitations, exploration of the multiple modes of reasoning gives us a clearer picture of what actually occurred when Kennedy announced the assassination of King.

The Logical Mode of Reasoning

The first of the four modes of argument presented in the work of Gilbert (1997) is the logical. This mode can be understood as “...arguments [that] are based on an appeal to the linear patterns that lead us from one statement or set of statements to a claim. These arguments are linguistic, dialectical and classically identified as serial predictions.”⁵² For example, consider a short example of Kennedy’s address through the lens of the logical mode. Such an analysis approaches Kennedy’s argument in terms of a basic premise, conclusion, and inference model. The message can be distilled in the accuracy of the inferences linking premises (and evidence) to the claims they support. For example, consider a few excerpts from Kennedy’s speech:

Martin Luther King dedicated his life to love and to justice for between fellow human beings, he died in the cause of that effort.

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization -- black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and to comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread out across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion and love.

So I ask you tonight to return home, to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King -- yeah, it's true -- but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love -- a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.⁵³

By acknowledging King's legacy of nonviolence and compassion, Kennedy provides his Indianapolis audience with a powerful truth to warrant his claim toward racial reconciliation. Kennedy was announcing the assassination and death of Dr. King which foregrounds the situational context as the initial trigger in the production of Kennedy's Indianapolis message. King's death immediately ignites a legacy that privileges peace over violence. The Indianapolis audience aligned with Kennedy's evocation of King's *being* as promoting nonviolence, which explicates the inference linking the premises (and evidence) to Kennedy's claim for reconciliation. The irony of rejecting King's legacy is wrong thus the evidence put forth by calling out Dr. King's legacy warrants the crowd not to riot.

Utilizing a Critical-Logical model, this example illustrates how Kennedy's message can be viewed in a categorical linear manner of A, B, therefore C. However, to merely reduce Kennedy's message to its linguistic terms "...is to negate both the method and purpose (conscious or not) of the move."⁵⁴ While illustrative of the discursive force of Kennedy's speech, this analysis does not account for the radical shift in context that occurred in a moment when the Kennedy campaign, planning for a political rally, was

notified of King's death, nor does it account for the emotional components found in the overall experience of the speech event. If one is interested in exposing true dialogic moments in argumentation, its effect cannot be accounted for in strict instrumental terms.⁵⁵ The basic premise, conclusion, inference categorization does not consider the emotions apparent in Kennedy's delivery of the message (tone, vocal pauses, hand gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, etc.) nor does it consider the feelings of the audience in the act of experiencing the announcement of King's assassination. Thus, the often-masked modes of argument – the visceral, emotional, and kisceral – must be considered to incorporate the nondiscursive elements that occur in actual communication interaction.

The Visceral Mode of Reasoning

The visceral mode of argumentation "...stems from the area of the physical."⁵⁶ This mode can be displayed through the body, through nondiscursive means, as well as, can exist prior to the linguistic, logical model. To consider the visceral mode of argument apparent in Kennedy's address is to consider that it was Kennedy's physical actions that made his argument persuasive and effective. His behavior, along with his physical embodiment of the announcement, is a significant contributor to its overall rhetorical effect of the April 4, 1968 speech act. Kennedy acknowledged:

For those of you who are black -- considering the evidence evidently is that there were white people who were responsible -- you can be filled with bitterness, and with hatred, and a desire for revenge.

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization -- black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand, and to comprehend, and replace that

violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion and love.

For those of you who are black and are tempted to be filled with hatred and mistrust of the injustice of such an act, against all white people, I would only say that I can also feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man.⁵⁷

Kennedy's words directly illustrate that the situation that fateful night fronted concerns of racial significance. Noting the repetition of Kennedy's recognition of blackness and whiteness, among other themes of compassion and understanding, directs attention to the racial implications that saturate the visceral occurrence.

This particular speech has been acknowledged for Kennedy's rhetorical invention and persuasiveness to maintain social order. An examination of the visceral component applies a critical cultural framework to a historical moment in order to explore the significance of race and discourse in public speech acts. More specifically, a critical cultural framework expands the opportunities for analysis beyond that of Kennedy's words. The context, then, is expanded to include such things as Kennedy's whiteness in a racialized space. These new areas of investigation in regard to this speech contribute to the understanding of race relations in the late 1960s, and, more specifically, race relations in Indianapolis. By utilizing such theories as Mills' *Racial Contract*, Perkinson's work on whiteness as a cultural construct, and investigating more fully the implications of bodily gestures in racialized spaces, a contribution to the study of public address is made.

The Emotional Mode of Reasoning

The emotional argument of April 4, 1968 can be found in Kennedy's sincerity, which is illustrated through his delivery as well as through the "emotional-volitional"

tone of the overall event.⁵⁸ Beyond Kennedy's words, the tone of the speech act is just as important in creating the emotional argument. As Adam Walinsky, Kennedy's speech writer, posits, "This was a speech directly from his heart and from his head."⁵⁹ Audience member, Abie Robinson, confirms, "There was believability about him, sincerity in his tone, in his speaking that made him believable."⁶⁰

The seriousness of the situation is relevant in considering that Kennedy's initial appearance to this audience was scheduled as a political rally. Thus, when Kennedy says, "*Could you lower those signs please?*" and repeats "*I have some very sad news for all of you...*"⁶¹ it is evident that he is changing the overall emotional tone of the entire event. Further, the slow pace of Kennedy's voice and how it fades immediately following his announcement of the location of King's death illustrates the grief, along with shock and disbelief, that Kennedy felt about King's death as he was actively announcing it.

Emotional arguments are fundamental to human argumentation. They communicate to us elements that logical arguments do not.⁶² The emotional feelings attached to the words become just as important when considering the audience's reactions to a particular event. For example, the crowd appeared to sense the commitment of Kennedy which is evident in his vocal and physical delivery. In support of this claim,

Time reporter Joe Klein, has more recently contended:

One senses, listening to tape years later, the audience's trust in the man on the podium, a man who didn't merely feel the crowd's pain but shared it. And Kennedy reciprocated: he laid himself bare for them, speaking of the death of his brother – something he'd never done publicly and rarely privately....The silence had deepened, somehow; the moment was stunning.⁶³

As aptly noted by Gilbert (1997), “Emotion often tells us what people believe, and more significantly, that there is more going on behind their words.”⁶⁴

In light of such a tragic announcement, it is not what was said but how Kennedy chose to say it that is significant. In considering how emotion comes through in speech acts, the task will turn to the elements of the rhetor’s delivery that stretch beyond the words; namely the vocal and the physical. The vocal delivery includes such things as the rate, tone, volume, speed, pauses, pitch, inflection, voice quality, articulation and pronunciation. The physical delivery will consider such things as Kennedy’s appearance, posture, facial expressions, eye contact, body movement, and gestures.

The Kisceral Mode of Reasoning

The kisceral mode of argument derives “...from the Japanese term *ki* meaning energy, life-force, and connectedness, which covers the intuitive and non-sensory arenas.”⁶⁵ The kisceral involves sub-sensory elements, such as feelings of apprehension, as well as considers the context of choice-making. The energy of the event is what gives this 1968 speech an overall feeling of a dialogic moment. The connection, the unique situational context, and force of the moment are a few of the essential components that guide rhetorical critics to the ethical implications situated in this particular speech act. Such a philosophical turn will embrace the extra-sensory elements of kisceral argumentation, lead to the consideration of ethics in public address, as well as provide the beginnings to what is entailed in a dialogic rhetoric.⁶⁶

Audience member, Bill Gigerich, recalls the kisceral influence operating on April 4, 1968: “...but that day was just eerie. It was a normal day that went really really bad

real quick.”⁶⁷ Kisceral reasoning allows space for reflection on extra-sensory feelings and or spiritual renderings. Reverend Thomas Brown, also present in the audience, reflects on the other-worldly dimensions actively present in the kisceral reasoning of Kennedy’s announcement:

What King means is nothing but a manifestation of God, again, showing in a human personality, in a being, and a man of color, and of culture, the purpose of faith, and justice, and love. That you can't kill it. You may kill the body, but guess what? It transitions in a whole other dimension, a whole other world, a whole other cosmos. King and many others of all nationalities live in a whole new dimension of being that we cannot comprehend until we become free of fears. It is like King means to black people and everybody, liberation, holistic liberation - mind, body, and spirit.⁶⁸

Discourse is created by and for an Other, for multiple others, at different, yet multiple moments or in turns in time. Understanding the importance of the situational context or the once-occurrent moment, along with the extra-sensory elements that operate in and through lived situational experience, contributes to the study of rhetorical effects. In particular, scholars interested in uncovering the ethics of a communication exchange or those moved to describe the contextual residue of rhetorical effect would benefit from this work. The convergence of spoken language and pre-discursive, ontological response between beings presents an opportunity to orient human interaction phenomenologically through the concept of dialogic rhetoric. Thus, the final task of this research project is to explore what is entailed in a dialogic rhetoric as well as offer insight into what a more encompassing analysis – one that integrates logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral components – reveals about rhetorical effectivity.

Conclusion: Phenomenology & Multi-Modal Reasoning

Gilbert's (1997) modes have political, historical, cultural, social, and ethical effects. These modes are not products of the argument; rather, it is a process of coming to a conclusion through reasonable premises presented via modes of logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral perception. By examining all of these modes, one can come to a fuller understanding of the nonviolence in Indianapolis after King's assassination in 1968. A phenomenological account is necessary because the event demands it. To analyze it any other way would not do the speech justice—particularly because many of the first-hand accounts reference these often-masked features of the phenomena.

The urge to categorize this 1968 speech according to conceptual or theoretical categories is suppressed. The details of the event are retraced via the memories of those who actually experienced Kennedy's announcement in 1968. Those memories, along with historical insight, provide the foundation of the narrative. Theoretical contributions, critical reflection, and philosophy are infused into the narrative as a way to underpin the rhetorical implications. As such, the analysis presented will remain true to the actual lived situational experience of Kennedy's announcement as well as acknowledge and highlight the efficacy of a constitutive rhetoric by way emotional argument, the physicality of the experience, and connectivity between rhetor and audience by way of energy exchanged.

Phenomenology best serves this purpose, contends Langsdorf (1994), because phenomenology "...asks descriptive, rather than metaphysical, questions: the phenomenological question is always, how all entities present as meaningful participants, rather than, what entities in themselves, outside of communicative interactivity, are."⁶⁹

The next chapter is concerned with the phenomenology of an authentic human condition(s), one which problematizes how critical inquiry is executed and, more specifically, questions *how* we understand the artifacts, as well as how we choose to uncover political, cultural, historical, ethical, and social assumptions. Such a move requires that scholarship be open to the role of the immediate situational context and the presence of gendered, raced, or classed bodies.

Chapter Four: The Visceral Politics in a Raced Space: Visceral Reasoning in Critical Communication

“Dr. King is dead and a White man did it, why does he [Robert F. Kennedy] have to come here!”¹ Reverend Lewis Deer, a member of the audience that night, remembered “a Negro lady, grabbing his arm...” and crying out as she heard the news of King’s assassination from a transistor radio before Kennedy arrived on site.² As this scene of Kennedy’s announcement is set, it becomes evident that due attention must be paid to the visceral elements of communication interaction. What is needed is a phenomenological account of the event to help unveil the additional contributions made in addition to Kennedy’s spoken argument through aspects of physicality—Kennedy’s body, the audience as a collection of bodies, and the location. This chapter will argue that, in order to understand the various influences upon the rhetorical effect of Kennedy’s speech on the audience in Indianapolis and the resulting (surprising) nonviolence, it is necessary to investigate a version of this event that accounts for the power of visceral reasoning. This will be done by carefully exploring the politics of the participants involved along with the physicality of the space. In addition, the subjectivity obtainable in the phenomenology of the lived body(ies) pushes critical thought to consider visceral argumentation and, in this specific case, the role of race in body rhetoric.

The first part of this chapter will explore Charles Mills’ (1997) *The Racial Contract* which heightens the political implications of Gilbert’s (1997) visceral mode of

argumentation. The second part will explore what it means to be a visceral being by examining the significance of Kennedy's white body to uncover the political and racial assumptions that are embedded in argumentation. This section will also consider the marked bodies of the individual audience participants as well as reflect on the visceral impact of risk. The third section will focus on the physicality of the space and what types of bodies are allowed to operate in a raced space. The state of the inner-city Indianapolis neighborhood illustrates the racial tensions that heightened the risk of Kennedy's appearance. To conclude, this chapter will evaluate the terms of *The Racial Contract*, underwritten as a visceral mode of reasoning, present and operating on April 4, 1968.

The Racial Contract

Critical rhetoric advances anti-essentialist and social constructionist studies of race while including the concept of race as a lived and material experience. Race is historically situated and socially constructed. Acknowledgment of the reality of race requires a critical examination of how the terms of racism are created, circulated, and dramatized through rhetoric. *The Racial Contract* gives rhetorical studies a theoretical framework for situating discussions of race. A critical lens that explores the political, moral, and epistemological elements of race in terms of agreements (formal and/or informal) in civil society offers much to communication scholars. Concerns of invisibility/normativity,³ material wealth,⁴ interconnectedness of race/class/gender,⁵ identity construction,⁶ power/expressions of power,⁷ are only a few themes to consider when regarding Mills' notion of the racial contract.

Race is foundational. If, as Mills suggests, "...racism is *itself* a political system, a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties" then a global theoretical framework is needed to situate discussions of race and racism.⁸ Mills offers the racial contract in contrast to traditional conceptions of the 'social contract' as a way to supplement the lack of discussion about racial justice.⁹ Unlike the social contract, Mills' notion of the racial contract legitimates race as a stand-alone category that carries with it its own logic. The racial contract has a similar basis as the social contract – its terms of agreement are also between the government and individuals. However, the rules of society (based on equality) diverge when it is noted that the social contract was founded with the concept of white supremacy—an ideology based on the subjugation of nonwhites.¹⁰ Mill's also illustrates how race trumps the class category in which race becomes a primary ordering principle in modernity. *The Racial Contract* helps further the understanding that race is the undercurrent in all aspects of social being – morally, politically, and epistemologically. These features exist in contrast to the social contract, which contains only moral and political elements.

In Mill's work, he underpins the differences between the political, moral, and epistemological codes or contracts. Offering that the political contract,

...simply *codifies* a morality that already exists, writing it down and filling in the details, so we don't have to rely on a divinely implanted moral sense, or conscience, whose perceptions may on occasion be distorted by self-interest. What is right and wrong, just and unjust, in society will largely be determined by what is right and wrong, just and unjust, in the state of nature.¹¹

The moral contract, on the other hand, is foundational. Moral codes in which citizens regulate action are already in place prior to classification (via language, judiciary systems, etc.). In many ways, Kennedy drew upon an already existing moral contract that the citizens of Indianapolis could take up following King's assassination through his rhetorical invention and spoken words. By juxtaposing terms such as "love and lawlessness," Kennedy illustrates Mill's notion that the political contract merely codifies pre-existing moral codes of dominant ideology. Compassion, considered the moral element, is codified by maintaining order and avoiding lawlessness.

With regard to the epistemological element of the Racial Contract, Mills writes:

Thus in effect, on matters related to race, the Racial Contract prescribes for its signatories an inverted epistemology, and epistemology of ignorance, a particular pattern of localized and global cognitive dysfunctions (which are psychologically and socially functional), producing the ironic outcome that whites will in general be unable to understand the world they themselves have made¹²

Similar to notions of whiteness as the norm, Mills' epistemology of ignorance is consumed by the "everything-ness, that normalizing potential..." that resides in white discursive space and holds power over other discursive spaces.¹³ Mills summarizes, "By unquestioningly 'going along with things,' by accepting all the privileges of whiteness with concomitant complicity in the system of white supremacy, one can be said to have consented to Whiteness."¹⁴ The universality of whiteness is highlighted when considering that its defined position is everything.¹⁵ Working from a DuBoisian formulation, James W. Perkinson (2004) offers that white identity could be considered as a "double-*un*consciousness."¹⁶ Consider the categorization that,

...black is always marked as a colour (as the term “coloured” egregiously acknowledges), and is always particularizing; whereas white is not anything really, not an identity, not a particularizing quality, because it is everything – white is no colour because it is all colours.¹⁷

This categorization scheme becomes even more relevant when considering the visceral nature of argumentation. Whether or not Kennedy recognized and enacted his whiteness rather than rejecting or normalizing the role of race in the rhetoric speaks directly to the epistemological force of visceral reasoning.

The Racial Contract “decolorizes Whiteness by detaching it from whiteness,” thus offering that we could be talking about “Yellowness, Redness, Brownness, or Blackness... Whiteness is not really a color at all, but a set of power relations.”¹⁸ The universality of whiteness resides in its already defined position as everything. The masking and lack of reference to people’s whiteness and white privilege inevitably leads to racism and racist discourse, which presents the problem of silencing racial rhetoric. Carrie Crenshaw (1997) offers that “the ideology of white privilege maintains its invisibility through rhetorical silence” by way of assuming that white is the natural condition or assumed norm.¹⁹ Other scholars concerned with the normativity/invisibility of whiteness include D. J. Goodman (2001), who investigates how norms become invisible and taken for granted, as well as A. E. Lewis (2004), who addresses the problem of essentializing race. Lewis also offers that the invisibility of race cannot be separated from materialistic realities.²⁰

While Mills’ notion of an epistemology of ignorance resembles interest residing in critical whiteness studies, surprisingly few communication scholars have turned to *The*

Racial Contract. One notable exception is Mark Lawrence McPhail's (2004) essay, which considers the question of credibility in racial reconciliation."²¹ McPhail offers that the Racial Contract reveals itself, continuously, in the sharp contradiction between a willingness to forgive and the refusal to apologize; and, in the absence of apology, the credibility of the effort to reconcile is threatened.²² In order to expand McPhail's observation and move it in a different direction, this project will consider the ways in which the event of Kennedy's announcement could prompt a breaking of the Racial Contract creating an opportune moment for racial reconciliation.

There are two arguments found operating in *The Racial Contract* essential to this project. First, is that the Racial Contract can be defined as both embodied and a lived bodily phenomena. This is the work of the visceral. To classify a visceral mode of reasoning, in relation to Gilbert's system of argumentation, will allow for evaluation of whether or not the body is always implicated in discourse. *The Racial Contract* places political scaffolding onto Gilbert's theory of multi-modal argumentation. Also of concern, is how the body is occupied in a rhetoric of risk (Natanson, 1965). Coupling the work on visceral argumentation with body rhetoric will provide explicit insight into how the physical body, particularly a body at risk, holds the force of the argumentative move (DeLuca, 1999). Secondly, *The Racial Contract* maps out social, cultural, and political space which is codified and regulated, in part, by the bodies that occupy such places. Turning to their work on physical space/locality(ies), McKerrow (1999), Haymes (1995) and Perkinson bring the location of Kennedy's announcement to the forefront. When

everything is interpreted as racially significant, an embodied democracy that shifts and re-creates a politicized, subjective, and physical reality is revealed.

The Body: Visceral Argumentation, Risk, and Impact

Throughout his presidential campaign Robert Kennedy triggered the loyalty of African Americans across the United States. He attracted huge and sometimes frighteningly responsive crowds almost everywhere he went. Patterson (1996) recounts:

More than once, he emerged from crowds with torn clothes and with hands bleeding from the hundreds of squeezes and slaps that besieged him. Veteran political observers were astonished and shaken by the powerful emotions that Kennedy aroused.²³

He delivered the same candid and unpatronizing message wherever he went: assailing racial prejudice, denouncing riots, deploring the rise of welfare, celebrating the virtues of hard work. Like no other white politician of the time, Kennedy was able to capture the faith of African Americans and gain their admiration and respect. A closer look at the visceral implications of Kennedy's rhetoric will provide insight into this cross-cultural political connection.

Kennedy staffer, Peter Edelman (2008), recalls the significance of Kennedy's willingness to physically connect with the crowds. "He wanted to just get a feel," says Edelman. Kennedy was a visceral being. "Robert Kennedy was a man who learned by...going out in to the real world and talking to people and seeing and touch[ing], using all of his senses."²⁴ The visceral attraction toward Kennedy, from his followers, was marked by crowds "wanting to touch him" as reported by audience members feeling a need to be physically close to him. Lloyd Milliken (2008), then Democratic precinct

committeeman who worked a lot in the black communities to help with voter registration, remembers:

I'd been around him and with him before, and he drew, always drew enormous crowds and people very excited and wanting to touch him. Anybody, whoever got a chance, [wanted] to get up close to Bobby Kennedy in those situations....[W]hat I saw in Bobby Kennedy's eyes...was a decent human being. That's why I wanted to hear him speak that night.²⁵

Along with Milliken, several others were drawn to Kennedy's body that night in Indianapolis. As evidenced by the visual footage, when Kennedy appeared at the location, he made his way directly through the crowd, unprotected and within inches of individuals, on his way up to the flat bed truck upon which he was to speak.²⁶ The physical proximity of Kennedy's body to the bodies in his audience calls attention to the visceral impact of Kennedy's physical presence. This becomes an integral feature of Kennedy's argument as the risk of the rhetorical enactment is highlighted. Accounts of Kennedy's viscerality expound the need for a clearer lexicon and broader study of visceral reasoning in conjunction at work in rhetorical argumentation.

Visceral Argumentation and Body(ies) at Risk

According to Gilbert, visceral arguments "are primarily physical and can range from a touch to classical nonverbal communication, i.e., body language, to force."²⁷ Not unlike the aphorism that "actions speak louder than words," the visceral mode of communication is concerned with rhetorical effectivity as one that is based on the performance of the argument. It is the "physical actions" that make up the argument. Furthermore, the argument is comprised in such a way that it precludes "translation into the linguistic, logical mode." And as Gilbert notes, "...while we can certainly

linguistically describe the argument...it is not the description that [convinces]” but the overall behavior or performance of the participants.²⁸ Thus, Kennedy’s gestures, measured by the physical components as much as the words used to describe it, play an essential role in the overall force of the experience.

Elements such as the racialized space, power, and political hierarchy can all be considered contextual backing of the visceral mode. However, overall,

The greatest force of the physical comes from the general backing that we believe what we see, and we know “what’s going on.” This information comes from the same sources as our information about emotions, and, indeed, much of it is inter-related.²⁹

Here we see issues of authenticity through body rhetoric as well as how the modes of reasoning operate in conjunction with each other. For example, the feeling of fear can call upon all the logical, visceral, emotional, and kisceral modes of reasoning.³⁰

Body(ies) evoke a sense of emotional urgency that words alone do not. The presence of a body(ies) personalizes the argument and gives a face(s) to the proclamation. Kennedy, by placing his white political body in a racialized space to announce the assassination of Dr. King, injects an emotional urgency into the argument that can not be denied.

The postmodern turn to corporal or visual rhetoric offers the position that when you put an argument into words it loses the totality of the action, moment, and/or experience.³¹ This move toward a more inclusive understanding of rhetoric opens the realm of interpretation past the confines of rational logical argument and reflects the aims of this project to expand the consideration of rhetorical effect. Consideration of the body allows examination into the excess of the argument (or that which lies beyond the words)—what some would consider the physical force of the interaction.³² There are

different visceral or sensory reactions involved, as well as the reality and/or material weight of the body. Thus, body rhetoric foregrounds the immediate context by way of the physical and provides a shift in what we consider a legitimate argument. The body remains in the action, moment, and/or experience. Interaction with a body(ies) captures attention in a different way than written discourse. Rational argument assumes that you have been invited to the table to deliberate and the body is a common denominator that provides a point of access to the argument. In turn, the body extends the voice into a more powerful presence for marginalized or otherwise silenced groups and/or individuals.³³

The vulnerability of the body is an essential component used to measure the force of the physical argument. Vulnerability or risk can be seen operating in the visceral argument by how one situates, displays, or uses his or her body in communicative interactions. The level of risk involved also contributes to the genuine effectiveness of the rhetorical move. In other words, the more vulnerable the body is, the more heightened the possibility for authentic reception of the delivered message is. If one (or more than one) explicitly risks his or her selfhood in the very activity of the argument, then the body transcends that specific spoken argument to *being* the argument. Natanson summarizes,

I risk myself in an argument when I know or sense that the very nature of the activity I'm engaging in has its own rationale within which what I am and who I am must be determined.³⁴

Thus, Natanson defines genuine argument as "...nothing more than the commitment of the self to the full implications of a philosophical dialectic..." and a

willingness to realize that there is true risk involved when making an authentic argument. “Risk, then, is not really the condition of serious or genuine arguments; risk is rather the dialectical possibility of argument with intent to persuade.”³⁵ Such body rhetoric or visceral reasoning attempts to ameliorate the political hierarchy based on domination to recognize difference.

Similarly, DeLuca asks critics to reinforce “...bodies as a rich source of argumentative force. Such a task requires a reconsideration of argumentation so as to take account of public arguments that exceed the boundaries of reason and words.”³⁶ Similar to this project, DeLuca indicates the importance of considering the body as a fundamental component of the argumentative move.³⁷ Though “...the body is a site of incoherence...the body is both socially constructed and excessive. That is, bodies simultaneously are constructed in discourses and exceed those discourses.”³⁸ Agreeing that the force of the argument is the body itself and not the discursive explanation of the act directs the question of whether the body can ever be nondiscursive. DeLuca argues that there are no pre-discursive bodies when he says,

...I am not suggesting that a naked, pre-discursive body constitutes an argument. There are no *a priori* bodies. Bodies are enmeshed in a turbulent stream of multiple and conflictual discourses that shape what they mean in particular contexts.³⁹

Rhetorical tactics, then, are dependent on the body(ies) of the participants and the situational context of the immediate moment. The raced body(ies) of Kennedy and his audience are integral features to the overall rhetorical construction of the Indianapolis event via memories of passionate action in regards to time, space and race. The resolve to respond nonviolently developed from emotional connections that were felt physically

(and racially marked) as much as it came from logistic reasoning. The goal is to understand how a transgression of subjectivity was met by a momentary suspension of racialized terms of the day.

One of the main limitations of visceral reasoning is implicit meanings. As such, body arguments are open to multiple readings that have the potential to reject the force of the intended argument depending on who has the power to provide the verbal meanings to the body rhetoric. Such conclusions, particularly those regarding raced, gendered, or classed bodies, raise concern of how bodies operate in argumentation. There is a concern regarding whether or not bodies of color operate paradigmatically or if they lose the strength of their argument to outside forces that hold the power to determine the verbal translation of their body rhetoric. To dismiss the relevance of race when considering the body, however, is to contribute to the color-blindness that saturates our culture, society, and academic endeavors.

Kennedy's Body: A Rhetorical Enactment of Visceral Argumentation

With the visceral mode of reasoning, the "...the evidence 'speaks for itself,' and it does so physically."⁴⁰ Rhetorical enactment, as defined by Crenshaw, is "[a]n electrifying reflexive rhetorical form in which a speaker incarnates the argument; she [or he] is proof of her [or his] claim."⁴¹ This enactment can be achieved by rejecting racial, gender, or class stereotypes and "...by engaging in an act of symbolic self-definition."⁴² Kennedy's acceptance of the Indianapolis African American community and his fearlessness demonstrated by ignoring warnings not to continue forward allowed him to symbolically perform a rhetorical enactment as his white body worked as an interruption

to the terms put forth in *The Racial Contract*. His body was the key element that created space for pure dialogic connectivity.

William Crawford (2007), a prominent leader in the African American community who was also present at the Indianapolis event, reiterates the visceral impact of Kennedy's appearance:

I really, sincerely believe that there would have been a different reaction if there was a white man standing there, telling us that Dr. King had been killed by a white man and he said "white man" in his presentation. He said, "For those of you – you that are black, we can understand because it looks like a white man killed him. But also, a white man killed my brother," and he shared it...that tempered us, so if he had not been here, I think that the reaction would have been much different. It would have been similar to other communities because when we found out we would have been just wanting to reach out and react, as opposed to reflect.⁴³

Thus, according to Crawford, if Kennedy did not risk his body while announcing King's assassination, its rhetorical effect would have been different, and, perhaps, the outcome would have been more violent. Laverne Steward (2007), resident of the community and audience members, agrees and puts forth that,

It was like him being here made a great impact. It made a difference. Knowing that Martin had been killed by a white man, but yet here is a white man who cared for King as we did, who understood and whom we felt cared for us and how we were being treated, so yeah [it did make a difference].⁴⁴

Kennedy evoked more than logical reasoning. The visceral force of his argument comes from the rejection of racialized norms and acknowledgment of the responsibilities derivative of a privileged position. As noted by Crenshaw, "Some antiracism strategies can be complicit with the way in which whiteness operates rhetorically, but enactment is one powerful reflexive and personal form of resistance to racism."⁴⁵

A recollection provided by Vechel Rhodes, Sr., (2008), a neighborhood resident and audience member, highlights the subjective embodiment of the heard message and illustrates emotional feelings tied directly to the politics embedded in the raced space. Rhodes admits the resentment he felt towards “The White Man” as well as captures the rising emotional urgency of the event. Such a turn reminds us of the risk Kennedy took as he continued forward with hardly any police presence. Rhodes recollects:

Well, people just wanted to go out and destroy the white man. Fight. I mean, just that natural instant when you think...[or hear about] something [as tragic as King’s death]...People just get upset and that first moment you hear – let’s go do this, let’s go burn, let’s go destroy them, because King don’t deserve that. Who shot him, who knows? That’s the way they think, because [the] first thing they do is put it on a white man. It’s a lot of people who think like that. A lot of people would have done stuff like that, but by Kennedy being here I think that changed a lot of people’s thinking in a way. It went away by him being here, by him coming. We listened, because he had come to us. We didn’t go to him, and that meant a lot that he had come to our neighborhood. He had come, and that showed courage and so we took it to another level and understanding and listened to him.⁴⁶

Rhodes acknowledges that the force of Kennedy’s call for nonviolence resonated with the audience because he came to the Indianapolis urban neighborhood. Kennedy “showed courage” and came “to our neighborhood,” and because of that, Rhodes resolves, “we listened to him.” Such visceral power is important to the argumentative move and pointedly plays a fundamental role in its nonviolent rhetorical effect. Natanson reminds us that,

When an argument hurts me, cuts me, or cleanses and liberates me it is not because a particular stratum or segment of my world view is shaken up or jarred free but because *I* am wounded or enlivened – *I* in my particularity, and that means in my existential immediacy:

feelings, pride, love, and sullenness, the world of my actuality as I live it.⁴⁷

The emotional impact of the sudden news of King's death was met with logical reasoning embodied in the subjective reality known to the individuals present in Kennedy's audience. The immediate moment is suspended within the argumentative move, bringing personal histories, feelings, values, etc., to collide and transform with the tragic news of martyred leader. Twisted together, through immediate claims, the experience is felt and reasons to react in one way or another emerge from the crowd saturated with logical, visceral, emotional and kisceral residue. By acknowledging the importance of the body, particularly with attention paid to the subjective embodied risk, we begin to appreciate the constitutive nature of argumentation by way of rhetorical enactment and visceral impact. To fully understand the implications of the visceral force of the immediate neighborhood where Kennedy appeared, it is apt to reflect briefly on the city's history of race relations.

The Space: 17th & Broadway

In his visit to the city on April 4, 1968, Kennedy attempted to address issues that had long been a source of trouble in Indiana. His focus on race relations gave him influence with his audience because, at that time, residents of Indianapolis knew the tragedy of the racism that was customary in Hoosier culture and many knew it personally. Rozelle Boyd (2008), former City Councilman, audience member, and Indianapolis resident explains:

I have lived in Indianapolis all of my life. So I can remember, I can digest the Indianapolis of today and it's a great city. I am one of its greatest defenders but I am also very honest to what our history has

been, what the past has been in the city of Indianapolis. I am a product of a segregated elementary school system. When I went to Crispus Attucks High School, I went to a high school in a totally segregated situation. I can remember not being able to go to downtown theaters in the city of Indianapolis. I can remember not being able to go to many restaurants in the city of Indianapolis and this is just what our history was and it's important to remember that in order that we can put what is happening today in context. And it's also important to remember that in order [to grasp what] the background was for the 1968 period...going into the 1970s. We have a very speckled past in terms of race relations but I can refer to that quite honestly because I think we have come a very, very long way.⁴⁸

Lloyd Milliken (2008), a Democratic Precinct Committeeman who frequented African American neighborhoods to stir voter interest, agrees with Boyd and offers that Indianapolis, though not necessarily confrontational with regard to racial issues, remained divisive via discrimination and segregation. Milliken explains:

[W]hen I moved to Indianapolis in 1960 or 61 there was still a divide here, but I never felt that Indianapolis had quite the confrontational environment that was present in L.A. or other places like that. Maybe our black community was docile, but [there were] not heated personal confrontations going on all the time. There was clearly discrimination, and there was clearly ghettoization. The schools were very segregated until we had a busing order from the federal judge that helped change that over a little bit.⁴⁹

Milliken's and Boyd's recollections illustrate the racial divide operating in the Hoosier capital in 1968.⁵⁰ It is important to acknowledge the demarcation between the black and white worlds in Indianapolis at that time.⁵¹ "It's true that we had our place in this city or our society like everything else," states Robert Jackson (2008), an Indianapolis police detective on duty during the speech. "I'm going to say that and I really mean it. Everybody had their place and as long as you stayed in your place and did the right things you did alright."⁵² Based on these few examples, it is clear that racial

tensions were an integral part of Hoosier history, and, as a result, it seems likely that in the late 1960s, Indianapolis would be a site of racial violence.

The racialized assumptions surrounding the location of Kennedy's announcement is another important component to the story. A deeper understanding of the scene serves to present the visceral terms that *The Racial Contract* put forth regarding the physicality of a marked space. To gain a better understanding of the immediate space in which Kennedy announced the assassination of King, we will continue to narrow the scope of the spatial descriptions to account for the actual neighborhood. The personal remembrances suggest that the neighborhood selected for Kennedy's political rally was unsafe, poor, dangerous, and radical.

Broadway Christian Center: An Unsafe Neighborhood

The location of Kennedy's pre-planned political rally was to be held in an outdoor basketball court near the Broadway Christian Center (1654 Broadway Avenue). Ron Haldeman, a Quaker minister who was present at the Kennedy event, also held the title of Friends Minister to the Inner City and had an office at the center. Haldeman describes the location:

[The] Broadway Christian Center was an old Disciples church building which at that time had no congregation meeting but it was the main headquarters for a lot of inner city work. The legal service organization had its office there. Some units of the poverty program were there. The Disciples had a social service and maintained the building. Community organizations mostly worked out of there. There were programs almost every evening there. It was a hotspot for anti-war activities and integration activities.⁵³

The neighborhood was victim to urban decay. “The whole neighborhood was needing major help. That's why it was being remade into an urban renewal area.”⁵⁴

Haldeman continues:

It was really a very rundown neighborhood. The city's main gay bar was about two blocks away. There were houses that should be torn down and were within a couple years. The city was just in the process of writing an application for federal funding to make that an urban renewal area. There was no park. There was no health center. It was just a run-down neighborhood. The only community building that was serving the neighborhood was the Broadway Christian Center...[The neighborhood initially] had some element of integration. It had turned largely African-American. The house that we're in we bought from a Latvian family 'cause the Latvian congregation had just moved out and it had been integrated so, in a minor way till about two or three years before that... There wouldn't have been a white family within or a Chinese family or any Caucasians, non-African-American within a couple blocks of Broadway Christian⁵⁵

Haldeman's description of the state the neighborhood delineates the space as a marked or racialized space. As described in the work of Mill and Haymes, African American communities function as contested spaces between dominant discursive practices that identify black people as dangerous others. Collected personal accounts support this line of research. Additionally, the run-down neighborhood in which Kennedy was to speak is remembered as a dangerous and radical space. Haldeman continues:

It was a dangerous place in the police's mind. Partly because it was a radical center. The Christian Inter-city association had their offices there and they were always screaming about something to the city. So...the city always felt like this was a hot bed and to a degree it was.⁵⁶

Though Haldeman never worried about his safety he reminds us that “...most people considered it a dangerous neighborhood.”⁵⁷ He continues:

And as they say this was the place where the radicals in the black community also hung out. The Panthers had their headquarters in the neighborhood. The black radical action project, their headquarters [was] in this neighborhood. The gay newsletter came out of this neighborhood. The neighborhood [was] all, quite a bit different.⁵⁸

Haldeman's account of the state of the neighborhood resonates clearly with the terms put forth in Mills' *The Racial Contract*. The imagery of racialized spaces, set apart by segregation and decay, are discursively re-presented by the dominant (or white) version of African American identity. As such, the problems experienced by that community are often confined and bound in the spaces that the community occupies. Of similar importance are the political, cultural, and ethical consequences that result from those perceptions.

Spatial Subjectivity: The Visceral Terms of Racial Demarcation

Space is ideological and political, subjective and visceral. "Space is that enclosure or "place" in which actions of one kind, but not of others, can occur;" writes McKerrow, "it can be located through mapping one's place as distinct from other places."⁵⁹ Furthermore, there are "certain times" and "better places" for various messages, gestures, performances, etc., to occur, which regulate the appropriateness of social discourse.⁶⁰ Thus, it was highly unlikely for the Kennedy crowd to have responded positively to a "political message" in the moment of King's death. To have control of time and space is to hold symbolic power via discursive practices. "Space-time structures life, and through that influence, affects discourse in unseen, unfelt ways," claims McKerrow. He provides a relevant discussion of "space-time" that emphasizes,

...the necessity for a re-orientation that moves the critic from *logos* to *nomos*, from the modernist logic constraining, regulating, and at times stultifying spatial practices, to a postmodern polity in which the openness of space and a more inclusive sense of the alternative styles of lived time experienced within cultures is recognized and values as a viable and useful alternative.⁶¹

Relying on the “triadic perspective” of Lefebvre (1974/1991), McKerrow provides a composite overview of three spatial types and dimensions: spatial practices, representations of space, and spaces of representation.⁶² Such scholarship highlights the necessity to move forward in re-conceptualizing “the manner in which space implicates relations of power and conditions of discursive practice.”⁶³

Visceral reasoning not only includes asking what “certain spaces” signify but also includes an analysis of who can occupy such spaces. Space is set up in the Racial Contract by recognizing the limitations of what bodies can occupy marked spaces at what times. The place in which Kennedy delivered his speech should be considered a racialized space occupied by racialized bodies. “The audience at the speech was not all black, although it was heavily black. I'd say probably 80 or 90%, most of them standing,” remembers Frank Mankiewicz, Kennedy press secretary.⁶⁴ Mills explains in *The Racial Contract*:

Part of the purpose of the color bar/the color line/apartheid/jim crow is to maintain these spaces in their place, to have the checkerboard of virtue and vice, light and dark space, ours and theirs, clearly demarked so that the human geography prescribed by the *Racial Contract* can be preserved.⁶⁵

Therefore, it is reasonable to consider that racialized spaces connect with the racial stereotype that black = violent and/or irrational. Furthermore, Mills’ connection of racialized spaces to the upkeep of the Racial Contract points to relevancy of Kennedy’s

move to reject such stereotypical notions by continuing forward with his trip. “This was not an area that was well populated. It was like a park and whatnot, and it was dark,” remembers Billie Breaux, local Kennedy volunteer.⁶⁶

In considering the stereotype that black equals violent/irrational, Mills’ notion of “norming” space is beneficial. Norming the individual by situating them to a space, where the other is represented by racial profiling and/or stereotyping, can be harmful and untrue. Mills’ further explains by saying, “You are what you are in part because you originate from a certain kind of space, and that space has those properties in part because it is inhabited by creatures like yourself.”⁶⁷ Along the same lines, S. N. Haymes offers that the stereotype of black = violent is a result of urban mythology. Haymes writes:

This portrayal of blackness in urban mythology is central to the social construction of the city as a representation of the id and the superego...In this urban mythology black and white represent the id and superego respectively. It has been this urban mythology that has identified blacks with disorder and danger in the city.⁶⁸

The work on racialized space and the portrayal of the bodies which operate within those spaces becomes especially helpful when interested the visceral terms of racial demarcation. “White men who are (definitionally) already part of society encounter non-whites who are not, who are “savage” residents of a state of nature characterized in terms of wilderness, jungle, wasteland”⁶⁹ or what the *Indianapolis News* regularly referred to as a “ghetto.”⁷⁰ With the rise of the Black Power movement and outbreak of race riots across the country during the later half of the 1960s, evidence suggests that racialization in the United States was being discursively re-produced. As Perkinson proposes:

The black way of being-in-the-world thus exhibited did not only terrify, but finally, also mysteriously attracted. For the first time

ever in American history – in the full glare of the media gaze – black identity was displayed as the proud sign of a manifold ability. Before the uncomprehending gaze, but not unfeeling gut, of a cowed and angry white public, black style asserted a double dare, a twofold trope.⁷¹

African Americans, particularly during the later half of the 1960s, were racialized as violent and Indianapolis was no different. Similar to racialized spaces, such perceptions and images provide insight into a rhetorical framework through which we represent, interpret, and understand some aspects of social existence. Situating African Americans as violent other(s) illustrates what Crenshaw calls rhetorical “othering” or “...the rhetorical practice of depicting people of color as having the characteristic of race while simultaneously assuming that white people are not “raced.”⁷²

Such an understanding of the marked/lived body(ies) creates the need to see how raced, gendered, or classed bodies can escape or transcend particular conditions, definitions, or stereotypical roles. Iris Marion Young began her own work with phenomenology years ago with much needed awareness directed toward the gendered body and how the body operates in and through situational context/s.⁷³ Noting the “remarkable difference” between the masculine and feminine body(ies), Young called for a phenomenological turn to account for “...such a differentiation of the modalities of the lived body.”⁷⁴ She furthered this call by noting that “Every human existence is defined by its *situation*...”⁷⁵ Like this project, Young recognized that the existence of a person is “no less defined by the historical, cultural, social, and economic limits of her [or his] situation.”⁷⁶ Thus, the body is constituted by its surroundings and comes to be in living action.

To dismiss the contextuality of a scene via occupation of space(s) by physical bodies is to reproduce hegemonic standards of rhetorical effect. Rather, Young posits that bodily existence,

...is a set of structures and conditions that delimit the typical situation of being a woman [or raced body] in a particular society, as well as the typical way in which this situation is lived by the women [or raced individuals] themselves.⁷⁷

Young's essay continues by examining some specific features of bodily comportments, physical performativity, and self-image. She goes on to illustrate the implications of an oppressed group by giving a phenomenological account of the modalities of bodily comportment and motility. As such, the tensions between subjectivity and objectivity are revealed.

In a more recent introduction, Young reflects back on Merleau-Ponty, Beauvoir, and other existential phenomenologists:

...that this philosophy offers a unique approach to theorizing subjectivity. An existential phenomenological approach aims to speak from the point of view of the constituted subject's experience, in ways that complement but do not duplicate the observational or interpretive methods of Foucault, Butler, or Bourdieu.⁷⁸

Expanding on Merleau-Ponty's definition of phenomenology, Young acknowledges that "...the consciousness that constitutes the world is the body as lived in a tangible encounter with human and nonhuman others."⁷⁹ As such, the moments of human interaction, in which various experiences intersect, are the places in which social criticism and transformation can be found. In an effort to extend Young's work with this project, it is necessary to take a step back from the research and reexamine it from multiple perspectives. Only by rotating the method of research – in an almost

kaleidoscope shifting of angles – can one contribute to the ideological work necessary to undermine race, privilege, and patriarchy as it exists today (in both academe and in society overall). Therefore, only by taking a phenomenological approach to Kennedy’s announcement of King’s assassination can we truly reveal the possibilities of suspending the terms of the racial contract. Such suspension, even if only momentary, is an unlikely feat considering the high probability of a racialized embodied experience that is spatially regulated and often manipulated by negative stereotyping.

Any effort to expose opportunity for momentarily suspending the terms of the Racial Contract should be found among the lived, embodied, and emotional experience. In her book, *Inclusion and Democracy*, Young posits that true inclusionary democracy discovers the dividing social elements that distance the marginalized and the privileged and deconstructs those dividers instead of simply ignoring the typical boundaries described in *The Racial Contract*. Such a move exemplifies social knowledge via multivocality and allows for a more communal, compassionate, and ethically just society.⁸⁰ One way to break down those inequities is to look closely at one extraordinary event in which compassion and justice prevailed alongside revelation and celebration of cultural differences. In this historical and political example, we see the possibility for a break in racialized codes which often work to impede true democratic inclusion.

Suspending the Terms of the Racial Contract: A Visceral Interruption

The neighborhood in which Kennedy had his pre-scheduled rally was perceived as a site for racial violence, especially in light of the announcement of King’s assassination. Such a stereotypical perspective—of African Americans as violent—

originates from white discourse regarding inner city “ghettos.” Not unlike the urban mythology put forth by Haymes or Mills’ notion of “norming” racialized spaces, the neighborhood in which Kennedy’s announcement took place, according to those who were present, was, in fact, considered a marked, violent, unsafe, dangerous, and radical location. As noted by Rozelle Boyd, former Indiana Councilor at Large and an African American community leader present at the speech, “You may be aware that when his [Kennedy’s] plane landed in Indianapolis he was advised by some folk that maybe this is not a stop you want to make.”⁸¹

As mentioned in the opening of this project, upon learning of King’s death, Kennedy was advised by city officials, law enforcement officers, his campaign staff, and family members to cancel his trip to the Indianapolis urban neighborhood. Several indicated that they feared for the safety of Kennedy’s own life if he were to continue on with his scheduled appearance. According to Mills (1997), “In entering these (dark) spaces, one is entering a region normatively discontinuous with white political space, where the rules are different in ways ranging from differential funding...to the absence of police protection.”⁸²

The Subjective Scene: A Militant, Marked, and Supportive Crowd

“We had maybe twenty police men at the event, most not visible in uniform,” remembers Haldeman.⁸³ Overall, there were “... a majority of twenty policemen...actually overseeing the event from their different sides. Some...sitting in cars.”⁸⁴ Those who remember the role of the police remember a distanced participation;

they often remained in their cars, or even lingered on the outskirts of the speech site. As Mankiewicz puts forth,

...the police were not to be seen. They peeled off when they got to the boundary line, whatever that was. I don't know the name of the street, but it pretty much divided the city. They were just not to be seen after [they] crossed and moved into an area that seemed to be all black.⁸⁵

Adam Walinsky, Kennedy's primary speech writer at the time, was traveling separately from Kennedy to the Broadway Christian Center. He remembers being stopped by the police outside of the neighborhood and warned not to continue forward.

Somewhere, where we got to where the appearance was, we were stopped by a police car. The police told us not to go any further, because this was getting in to the ghetto, and there was going to be violence. So, I think we might have said, why don't you come along? No, they said. We're not going to do that. Actually, it was probably a wise decision, because it might have been more of a provocation than actually any kind of security. We just went on.⁸⁶

The divisiveness of Mankiewicz's (2008) memory, along with the warning Walinsky received from officials is pertinent the overall notion that the Indianapolis neighborhood was a racialized space that occupied the marked other. Some police officials swarmed the area but did not go in to the space. Other police representatives, those that did go in, failed to identify themselves as a police force. Rather, those police officers that were on site remained undercover and, for the most part, blended in with the crowd. Jerome Forestal (2008) explains,

I really didn't see any uniformed people in the crowd. I knew there were a lot of plain clothes officers in the crowd because they did send them up earlier in the crowd that day to let them know that Dr. King had been shot. That was before they got word that he had died. They were going through the crowd passing the word around

to sort of like let them know that he had been shot. As far as a uniformed presence, I really can't recall at all.⁸⁷

Abie Robinson, local resident and a member of audience, also does not recall uniformed officers being at the event. "I don't remember a police presence," says Robinson (2008). "Maybe that's the time we were living in. But it wasn't. I don't remember the escorts or them quadrenting off areas. I don't remember any of that. I don't think it took place."⁸⁸ The invisibility of the police presence can be viewed as providing the atmosphere for nonviolence. However, the police were nonetheless involved and, as such, their presence, invisible or not, contributes to the stereotypical framing of the neighborhood as violent.

The idea of potential violence contributes to the overall framework of the visceral argument. Only through recognition of the possibility of a violent eruption does one get the full comprehension of the scene Kennedy faced. Furthermore, the fact that there were potentially violent individuals in the crowd and the rhetorical effect ultimately remained nonviolent directs due attention to the honorable response of the audience itself. Thus, a turn to embrace the potential rioters is presented.

Forestal (2006) remembers meeting Snookie Hendricks and Ben Brath, leaders of the black militant groups in Indianapolis, upon his arrival at the site. At the time, he thought, "Those guys might – we may be having some trouble tonight. Because we – when they make the announcement, we had no idea how the crowd was gonna accept it."⁸⁹ Trulock (2008) remembers:

These were guys that were pretty rough hewn and had lead a pretty rough and savaged life...From the time that the news of that [King's death] soaked into all of us it began to dawn on us that we are, as

well as in the rest of the nation, we are right now, in this moment, [in] a pretty volatile situation.⁹⁰

Karl Anatol (2008), a graduate student who interviewed militants and others in the neighborhood within four weeks of the event, along with his colleague John Bittner, reports that:

We found that Snookie Hendricks group to be a well reasoned, calmly disposed group. In the midst of all of this grief they were going to hold to the line of law so to speak but there was this group called the Ten Percenters and we had the opportunity, particularly John Bittner had the opportunity to chat with one or two of the people and they made it very clear to us that they went to the site of the Kennedy speech with clear intention of doing damage, doing injury to whomever at the slightest provocation. They said we were there, the pot was boiling, steam was rising and Kennedy was speaking, and after he was done, we couldn't get anywhere with this crowd. As if to suggest, that they were not really pulled into Kennedy's reasoning at all. They were still a stand alone group there to do one thing, and that was to create damage but no matter how they tried with their usual buddies to get something going, to create a rumble, they couldn't get anywhere at all. One fellow says "I really don't know how it happened. I don't know how it happened."⁹¹

Here we see the beginnings of a paradoxical representation of the militant members of the crowd. On one hand, Anatol points out that known leaders of the Indianapolis militant movement were "well reasoned" and a "calmly disposed group." On the other hand, Anatol notes that there were, in fact, militant members present who were ready to take up violence despite the overwhelmingly call for peace and nonviolence. Anatol further reflects on this portion of the crowd:

There still is a tendency in the black community especially, among people who sense themselves to be involved in a struggle of some sort...to have a kind of a quote, power military undertone to things that are being done. So this idea that Kennedy is coming in from the Weir-Cook International Airport we are now going to become the militia to make sure that nothing happens. So they got into the trees

and they're looking to see if there were any untold activities in the people who were either on their way to the parade or [from] people who were just milling around doing their daily chores. In the 60s, 1968, the fact that happened was not surprising to me at all, because after all we had lived through the Black Panther movement. We saw them with their guns, and the bandoliers, their bullets you know and the rest of it. This was very much in keeping with the style I think of the militancy in that day. It is remarkable to me...that it was [in] one sense of vigilance and it was vigilance reportedly to avoid violence.⁹²

Anatol's reflection indicates that the Indianapolis militants, around and in the area of the Broadway Christian Center, held the traditional stereotype as violent motivators. However, while acknowledging that there were, in fact, members of organizations such as the Black Panthers or the Radical Action Program present in the actual audience, Anatol presents an alternative perspective. Rather than remembering the militant members of the community as those likely to cause violence he presents them as supporters of Kennedy and protectors of peace. This paradoxical view of the Indianapolis militants reminds us that the people gathered in the "marked" neighborhood were there, first and for the most part, to support Kennedy in the presidential primary race.

The final and most obvious group of individuals present in the audience were those who were supportive of the Kennedy campaign. "The whole idea of being able to see Bobby Kennedy...was the motivating factor of me coming. I was wanting to be a part of and seeing first hand what he was like, what he sounded like," tells, audience and community member, Abie Robinson.⁹³ Most had gathered to hear a democratic primary candidate give a speech on why he was the best leader for the nomination.

In the months leading up to Kennedy's visit, several members of the African American community met with Kennedy staffers to assess the campaign and discuss ways in which the Indianapolis African American community could be brought into politics. In an article published on April 4, 1968, Robert P. Mooney of *The Indianapolis Star* reported,

Benjamin F. Bell, project director of the College Room neighborhood youth center and treasurer of the Radical Action Program (RAP) protest group of young Negroes, was at the Kennedy headquarters yesterday to help organize [a] basketball court appearance. Bell and Charles (Snookie) Hendricks, a RAP spokesman, met Tuesday night with Kennedy representatives and discussed a possible special drive for Negro votes on [Kennedy's behalf].⁹⁴

Donald Janson, of *The New York Times*, reported that the Kennedy organization had "...engaged John Lewis, former chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee to stimulate black interest in the Kennedy candidacy and push a voter registration drive among potential Kennedy voters in the slums."⁹⁵ City leaders also collaborated with Kennedy's staff in an attempt to involve the African American community in the presidential race. African American leaders believed that Kennedy's appearance in such a location would significantly pull the vote in his favor. Mrs. Doris M. Ward, a schoolteacher and president of the moderate National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in Indianapolis, said all elements of the "Negro community" would support Senator Kennedy.⁹⁶

The opinions of the Indianapolis African American leaders illustrate, in part, what type of audience Kennedy addressed. Thus, the immediate scene was a gathering of marked, militant, and supportive bodies, awaiting a radical shift of immediacy. Though

the scene was primed for a celebratory political reception, there had been rumors about King's assassination circulating through the crowd prior to Kennedy's arrival. Based on the memories of those in the audience that night, it is evident that the circulating rumors are prime examples of the rising racial tensions that overwhelmed the occasion. As such, the visceral reasoning is heightened by the escalating tensions put forth in a racialized risk of emotional vulnerability.

Rumors Surmount and Racial Tensions Build: The Physical Fear is Real

By that time the news of Dr. King's assassination had reached the ghetto and portions of the crowd. Negro and White confrontations were beginning to take place and yells such as "what are you doing here whitey" and "get out of here you white son-of-a-bitch" caused two White spectators on the outskirts of the crowd to leave the scene immediately. Other Whites in the central crowd could go nowhere.⁹⁷

As reported by Anatol and Bittner (1968), Reverend Lewis Deer, a white pastor of the Brotherhood Center, noted that "transistor radios began to pop up everywhere. People were jammed in groups of six or seven listening to developments." As Reverend Deer surveyed the crowd, "he turned to a familiar Negro who had worked on numerous church projects at the Center [and] he was met by the Black man's surprising up thrust hands and an antagonistic verbal "NO!" Anatol later reflects back on the interviews he collected immediately following the event:

I remember chatting, separately, but with two individuals, and it is rather noteworthy that the same pejoratives were used in both situations where these individuals were there simply to listen to a speech perhaps having a lot of good will to a black community, a black audience, a black individual but there they were innocently awaiting a performance by a politician and being confronted without provocation by black individuals. What are you doing here whitey?

Why don't you get out of here you white son of a bitch and listening to these two individuals I could just imagine myself in that situation as a black individual being confronted by a white audience and realizing I had no place to go and not knowing what the outcome would be at that particular moment as far as I'm concerned a researcher. I thought that that was a rather significant situation that depended on somebody really trying to unscramble the propensity for violence and again I come back to the point that thank God on that day there was a man like Robert Kennedy who could deflect and diffuse.⁹⁸

Anatol's reflection highlights the racial complexities that were formulated within the visceral moment. As the news circulated, emotions swelled, and the anticipation of violence rose. In particular, the resentment towards "Whitey" projects the raising risk for Kennedy himself as well as any other white member of the crowd. Forestal, the man who ultimately stood directly to the right of Kennedy during his announcement, describes his thoughts as he looked upon the crowd expecting Kennedy's arrival:

As far as me, I was never fearful of the black community at all and that night I really didn't think much about it until after I heard later about all the problems they had around the country. In a way I really did joke about it and say that when he tells them that Dr. King has died, there were houses around the plaza up there then and all we need is Ben Bell or somebody to lean out the window up there and say "Get Whitey." You think about it and there could have been, not him, but there could have been some people very angry. I thought about how they're going to receive it.⁹⁹

Forestal, physically occupying the same space as Kennedy, recognized the visceral threat as the rumors of King's assassination surmounted. Directing attention to the fear involved when the race of one's body is exposed as the enemy and, as such, the target of violent intentions, Anatol offers:

Whitey was a term that packed a lot of dread and fear in it and I can just imagine that these individuals in this sea of people, hearing that term directly coming at them face to face would have been quite

frightening. In that one little comment, little sliver of comment there, we get a picture of the 1960s with the confrontations between blacks and whites. It really puts this in perspective. It was face to face confrontation. Blacks were not at all afraid of challenging and threatening whites on the spot. That was out in the ghetto. Now on a campus even though the terms were thrown around and tossed around. You sort of depended upon some civility prevailing. But there in Indianapolis, at that time, in that crowd, these few individuals, who ever they were really could not anticipate that there would not have been a negative outcome from that confrontation.¹⁰⁰

While the immediate situational context shifted, and feelings of racial resentment rose, the unpredictable effect of Kennedy moving forward with his address remained uncertain. However, the rising racial tension evidenced by the personal remembrances illustrate that the situation Kennedy faced was a serious one. It is apt to pause and reflect on the four modes of reason and how they can often be found working in conjunction with each other as well as surrounding the context of Kennedy's appearance. Of particular interest, at this point of analysis, is the feeling of fear as a combination of the visceral, emotional, and kisceral. As Gilbert explains,

A feeling of fear may well be grounded in the perception of real danger, and that danger may be read from physical, but difficult to locate, signals coming from another person. In this regard, the visceral and kisceral often work in combination, as when someone "has a sense" that an individual is angry or threatening.¹⁰¹

Kennedy's brief, hesitant decision to continue forward with this trip into the African American neighborhood despite warnings illustrates the visceral resolve working within the kisceral function of argumentation.¹⁰² Not knowing how the audience would react to the announcement of King's death reasonably places Kennedy's body at the mercy of his audience. As such, feelings of anxiety, fear, and nervousness present themselves as part of the overall composition of Kennedy's argument.

“People today fail to realize that back then the candidates didn't get Secret Service protection. They didn't have guards,” reports Bill Gigerich (2008), a former Kennedy staffer.

They didn't have people walking down the line watching people's hands and seeing who was back here and breaking the room into quarters and watching whose moving. There was none of that. It was just the guys from the L.A. football team. I mean it was the Rosie Geers and the Lemar Lundies. Those guys were traveling with him. That was his security and they didn't have guns. They were just big guys.¹⁰³

From the perspective of an audience member, Darlene Howard (2008), it seems that even a white police officer would not have been safe on the scene:

A white policeman in that crowd, he wouldn't have lasted three minutes. [Kennedy] was the only white man I remember seeing. I mean it was a couple of people up there but I don't even remember who they were but I do know that I didn't see any policemen. If they were there, I did not see them. My main focus was getting out of there. Had I been an officer at that time, a female officer certainly if I had been white, I would have went home and risked getting fired. I would have done that. There would be no way I would have gone over there.¹⁰⁴

Despite possible feelings of fear, Kennedy, as history reveals, decided to continue forward with his trip. “Aware of the unrest in the ghetto, Kennedy made the decision to bypass a planned stop to downtown headquarters and proceed directly to 17th and Broadway,” reports Anatol and Bittner (1968), “Many local politicians remained at the downtown headquarters because they feared the crowd reaction.”¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, they noted that “Many negroes interviewed were aware of this fact [that many politicians decided not to come] and resented it.”¹⁰⁶

Thus, Kennedy's decision to continue forward with his pre-planned political appearance is of importance. Rather than going along with the dominant perception that an African American site is violent and then canceling his trip, Kennedy went forward, showing no small degree of courage, to tell the racialized community that Martin Luther King, Jr. had been assassinated.

One has to overcome the internalization of subpersonhood prescribed by the Racial Contract and recognize one's own humanity, resisting the official category of despised aboriginal, natural slave, colonial ward [or as naturally violent beings]. One has to learn the basic self-respect...¹⁰⁷

Such a move highlights his rejection of the racialized notions of African Americans as violent as well as illustrates a breaking of the Racial Contract in which he created a rhetorical interruption by entering a racialized space.

Breaking the Racialized Terms of Visceral Reasoning

In acknowledging the terms of the Racial Contract, we should consider the event as a negotiation, or as a written back-and-forth, contested exchange. In his speech, Kennedy stated:

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization -- black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand, and to comprehend, and replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion and love.¹⁰⁸

Here Kennedy acknowledges two opposing worldviews operating in the United States – the black worldview and the white worldview. Such an acknowledgement indicates that the terms of the Racial Contract were alive and fully functioning that April in 1968. Abie Robinson, who was an audience member in 1968, reflects back on Kennedy's speech,

I think that the Kennedy name was already established...what I think it [the speech] did, it made me think that this American experiment...what I think this whole country was and...still is (an experiment in progress) could possibly work. What [Kennedy was] saying, to me was, “Okay, yes it can work. If we look at it as we’re all here in this country and we’ve got to make it work together.”¹⁰⁹

If democracy is a unifying American experiment, it presents problems for the individuals who make up the collective. Members of a collective are individuals first and foremost. Recognizing that, we must realize that individuals have a variety of life histories that make each and every one of us very different—all of us have different goals, motivations, and ideologies. However, for that moment, Kennedy and his audience members, including Abie Robinson when he said, “The American dream, everyone wants to be a part of it in one aspect,”¹¹⁰ believed in the contractual obligations to one another. Kennedy reaffirms his commitment to the dream,

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life, and want justice for all human beings that abide in our land.¹¹¹

By calling for a recommitment to compassion and understanding, Kennedy also acknowledged the residual tensions that stand in the foundation of a unified democracy. Significantly, he brought forth race and spoke about the emotional tensions possibly felt by those in his audience. This identifying element is important as it served as a piece of Kennedy’s move toward undermining the terms of the Racial Contract. This is one element of the multifaceted rhetorical effect.

Kennedy stated,

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is

not violence and lawlessness, but is love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black.¹¹²

Beyond the constant reminder of the racial divide in his words, Kennedy as a white body (or a white *Kennedy* body) highlights the importance of visceral reasoning in argumentation. To suggest that he was dissociating himself from his whiteness is unrealistic.¹¹³

Kennedy, as a white body at risk in a racialized space, served as a visceral interruption of the Racial Contract. Along with the racial implications of the body rhetoric found in the April 4th event, Kennedy's physical embodiment of the announcement points to a visceral gesture. Thus, to extend analysis beyond Kennedy's words, consideration of the physicality of the experience, by way of visceral reasoning, extends our evaluation of the constitutive nature of argumentation. Such a move to embrace the phenomena, through contextual, embodied, and subjective immediacy, heightens the opportunity for exposing moments of reconciliation, between differences, through dialogue.

Kennedy's gesture illustrates a rhetorical interruption. Kennedy, by placing his white body in a racialized space created a zone of vulnerability—another indication of the temporary suspension of the terms of the Racial Contract. Further illustration of this suspension is evidenced by Kennedy's rejection of the violent stereotypes underpinning the black marked body(ies). “[W]hy he done it I don't know,” offers Vechel Rhodes, Sr., (2008) community member in the audience, “but coming in [to] that neighborhood, that was all black, at that time...was kind of strange.” Rhodes continues and suggests that the

Kennedy's represented something else to the black community. Rhodes felt that Bobby Kennedy,

...was trusted because he understood and knows better than other whites...I guess he wasn't worried because that was the type of person he was. He seen something different that's in blacks that other whites didn't see.¹¹⁴

Kennedy rejected the stereotypical underpinnings embedded in the Racial Contract and took up the idea that African Americans were rational beings. "Historically the paradigm indicator of subpersonhood has been deficient rationality, the inability to exercise in full the characteristic classically thought of as distinguishing us from animals."¹¹⁵ Kennedy recognized the power (or rationality) of the African American individual to make the appropriate choice.

Considering Kennedy's recognition of the power of reasonable choice, it is essential to illuminate the Kennedy campaign effort to schedule a political rally in a "marked" community. This ground-breaking move signals the reformulation of what was considered an appropriate space for political public address. Further, working together with members of the community to plan the political rally illustrates, at minimum, that the Kennedy campaign recognized the power of the African American neighborhood as having potential voters.

Rather than amplify or add to the psychological dysfunction of the African American community by reaffirming the prejudice that black = violent or black = insignificant votes, Kennedy made steps to break away from this way of thinking. Instead, he opted to recognize the power of the African American people, rejecting

negative stereotypes and went forth, in part seeking his own support, but also seeking support and equality for the country overall.

The Visceral Impact: Subjective Space and Embodied Rhetoric

The immediate situation of the Kennedy speech foregrounds, most prominently, issues of race. Race is at the forefront when considering that Kennedy's announcement occurred during the rise of black power and Kennedy, speaking mainly to an African American audience, informed them of the assassination of Dr. King.¹¹⁶ Realizing that race is foundational, multi-dimensional, and hegemonic, it became clear that this project needed a reflexive turn to foreground racial concepts to get at Kennedy's full message on April 4, 1968. The presence of race in Kennedy's words, along with the raw impact embodied in the experience, points us directly towards the physicality of the rhetorical situation.

On April 4, 1968 Kennedy acted courageously (or what some might consider irrationally) on behalf of the shift in immediate context as well as in recognition of the African American other. Such a move demonstrates his commitment to emotional connectivity as much as instrumental reason. In the act of physically placing his white body in a racialized space, Kennedy transgressed the notion of a privileged subjectivity, which is often set in reason, to risk his body and reject the terms regulating a racialized space. Kennedy expanded his subjectivity of a white political figure to one who also mourns. Here we see the rise of emotional argument and lived experiences as important components to the evaluation of rhetorical effectivity.

A better understanding of the political and moral responsibility of white political representatives, as well as the importance of bodily gesture in breaking racialized codes, is needed in communication research. Through his embodiment, Kennedy sensed the mood of the crowd and before an emotion-filled, impressionable Indianapolis audience, Kennedy altered his body rhetoric to fit a tragedy no one could have foreseen. Rhetorical scholars need phenomenology to understand the multitude of influences upon rhetorical effect. Only by doing the reflective work necessary can one begin to understand the multifaceted argumentative moves inherent in real lived communication interaction.¹¹⁷

Chapter Five: The Emotional A Common Tragedy: The Rhetorical Power of Emotional Reasoning

“Folk[s] would come up to me and they would hug me and they would cry,” remembers Rozelle Boyd, a long-time member of the county council.¹ The late Representative Julia Carson remembers, “I burst into tears and couldn't stop crying [be]cause at that time I said to myself, what are we going to do? MLK is dead. What are we going to do?”² John Lewis, renowned civil rights leader and audience member contends, “I think Robert Kennedy; I think we all shed some tears that night. It was very emotional.”³ Similarly, audience member LaVerne Steward recalls, “I think [...] everybody in the crowd was just crying and weeping and it was a sad time. I don't know, [...] it was a very emotional time.”⁴

Boyd remembers the Kennedy political rally as one of the stops on his own personal itinerary for that day. “This was an opportunity not only to be involved in the Kennedy campaign,” recounts Boyd, “and I was a supporter of his at that time, but it was also an opportunity to see friends and colleagues, certainly political colleagues in an atmosphere which was politically charged and which had all of the potential for being great in that sense.”⁵ Acknowledging the situational circumstance of politics prior to Dr. King's assassination, Boyd represents one of the audience members who was not aware of King's assassination prior to Kennedy's announcement. Boyd recalls:

I don't know if there were people who had different kinds of contact for the communication but his arrival was so close to the event itself that the word had not generally spread to the crowd and you could tell that there was not that awareness because when Kennedy did make the announcement that he had some very sad news to share with the audience and did indeed indicate that King had been assassinated there was a kind of collective gasp in the audience and indeed some crying, some sobbing, if you will, within that group. Certainly it was a very emotional experience and no one at that time would have envied Kennedy, his position of having to be the bearer of those kinds of tidings.⁶

Recognizing that Kennedy's arrival and his subsequent confirmation of King's death was marked by a collective gasp is relevant because it places the audience at the center of an emotional turn—the audience was not expecting such shocking news. This collective utterance indicates the emotional reasoning present in Indianapolis. Similar to the echoing emotional “No!” the collective gasp reveals the raw emotions by those gathered in the Indianapolis inner-city neighborhood. Boyd continues and provides a preview of other emotional markers beyond the gasp that support the rhetorical power of emotional reasoning. Tears fell and “indeed some crying, some sobbing” mark the visceral representation of physiological emotional distress.

However, there is something about being there in the moment. Boyd emphasizes that in order to fully understand the actual experience of Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination, “You would have to have been a part of the crowd when people were hugging each other, were coming up to persons that they didn't even know and putting their heads on their shoulders and crying.”⁷ Emotional expressiveness surged through the crowd and, almost instantly, individuals steeped with dialectical tensions came together through a moment of grief, mourning, reconciliation, and community.

“You'd have to be a part of that experience in order to understand what the emotional swelling was within that group.”⁸ Representing the audience perspective, Boyd offers personal reflection embedded in the overall group experience. “I do not consider myself to have been any more controlled, any more disciplined,” Boyd reflects, “I did not rise above that any more than all of the people there and I felt the same kind of thing. The Kennedy speech was a leavening for that.”⁹

When listening to Boyd's recollection, along with other remembrances from that night, it becomes apparent that the rhetorical effect of Kennedy's address is a combination of Kennedy's words, bodily experience, and emotional expressiveness. The shift in the situational context and Kennedy's emotional presentation also plays a role in the emergence of emotional reasoning in this instance. “That evening this man spoke from his heart,” recalls John Lewis, renowned civil rights activist and audience member.¹⁰ Lewis acknowledges Kennedy's presentation as one that combined logical, visceral, and kisceral reasoning when he reemphasizes that, “He spoke from his gut.”¹¹ In terms of verbal discourse it is understood that someone can say something without the pressure of emotional performativity. However, true feelings are said to reveal themselves in what someone does. In other words, actions speak louder than words when it comes to strong feelings, particularly when the occasion warrants feelings of deep sadness.¹²

Emotion, more often times than not, tells us what people believe and, more importantly, that there is something else operating alongside the spoken word.¹³ Numerous scholars in various academic disciplines dedicate their lives to understanding

emotions and many work to understand how one's actions are guided by psychological forces beyond the control of logical reason making.¹⁴ They investigate the variety of ways cultures relate to emotions depending on the appropriateness of diverse situations.¹⁵

Communication scholars study ways in which emotional messages are delivered and received as well as work to better understand the emotional components of interpersonal relationships.¹⁶ Rhetoricians critique emotion found in public argument and emphasize the importance of emotional presentational skills to scores of public speaking students.¹⁷ Argumentation scholars consider the role of emotion in argument and debate whether or not such emotional presence contributes positively, ethically, and/or negatively to the experience of argument.¹⁸ Michael A. Gilbert claims that "Emotion plays the role we expect it to, communicating information about our internal states, feelings, beliefs, and desires."¹⁹ He goes on to examine the "Principle of Pragmatic Emotionalization" which states that when an emotional message does not align with the logical message, the receiver may assume that the logical message may be unreliable, compound, and/or the goals of the sender may be misidentified or not even fully revealed.²⁰

Such evaluation is important to the analysis of Kennedy's speech because so many people in the audience measured the authenticity of the speaker via emotional displays embedded in his message. "Emotional messages," states Gilbert, "tell us...how strongly someone feels about an issue, or even whether or not to believe someone's verbal statement."²¹ In other words, had Kennedy announced King's assassination with a monotonous vocal tone and little gesture or facial expressiveness he would have been

thought to be insincere and unmoved by the tragedy. However, Gilbert warns, "...it is better not to think of emotional expressions as forming speech acts, but rather as involving *message* acts."²² Message acts place less emphasis on the verbal.²³

In order to follow the lead of the argument, whether it is verbal or not, communication scholars, particularly those interested in how *real* life argumentation occurs, should be open to research that "must go where the argument goes."²⁴ Embracing a phenomenological methodology provides the opportunity to draw upon a multiple disciplines that, ultimately, contribute to the overall make up, understanding, and conceptualization of emotional argumentation and/or reasoning. Robert C. Solomon (2006) offers that "The phenomenology of emotions is the investigation of the essential structures of emotional experience. The most important of these structures...is *intentionality*, but with a nod toward Merleau-Ponty, something like *motility* as well."²⁵ Solomon also traces the roots of phenomenology and emotion noting that Aristotle "gave us a detailed and deeply insightful analysis of emotions in his *Rhetoric* (c.350BCE), focusing especially on anger."²⁶ He speaks of the Stoics and their "cognitive" perspective on aspects of emotion as well as Descartes and his interest in analyzing the mind and body. Additionally, he calls upon Hume and notes that he "provided us with an elaborate quasi-phenomenological description of several emotions, struggling with the idea of intentionality ("an original connection"), and making it clear that the phenomenology of emotion was complex not simple."²⁷

Solomon further warns that "phenomenology is not and should not try to be a-historical. Rather, more emphasis should be placed understanding that "The essential

structures of emotional experience, as the essential structures of human experience more generally, are dependent on historical and social context and on the evolution of language.”²⁸ A phenomenology of emotions is complex, dynamic, and contextual. Calling upon descriptions of the various layers of an emotional message becomes essential in understanding the overall influence of emotional reasoning. Such descriptions are widely varied. Expressing emotional tenants through various features of the emotional message, such as the bodily sensations or “physiological responses” of emotional discourse, explanations of emotions felt, and/or judgments of the historical, political, social, and/or cultural situational experience, becomes a difficult task. Furthermore, these various features are unique per each individual experiencing the argument, adding more complexity to the phenomenological description.²⁹

Guided by the overwhelming evidence provided in the recollections of actual audience members, this chapter will argue that emotional reasoning contributes to the rhetorical effect of nonviolence in Indianapolis despite the hundreds of other communities that responded violently to the news of King’s assassination. A closer look at emotional reasoning reveals otherwise underreported features, such as the power of common tragedy and the importance of sincere response, that contributes to the constitutive appreciation of rhetorical construction. How these key conceptualizations extend the research on emotional argumentation contribute to a better understanding of the emotional reasoning that worked within the overall effect of nonviolence in Indianapolis following the assassination of King.

A Common Tragedy: Kennedy Connects to his Audience with Emotional Reciprocity

A significant component of Kennedy's message was that he was able to adapt to the emotional response expressed by the audience. Throughout the event of the announcement of King's assassination, Kennedy was able to genuinely access the emotion reflected in the moment and modified his presentation to fit the situational circumstance. As the seriousness of occasion mounted, Kennedy's sincerity embedded in his own feelings of loss rejoined the feelings of the audience and produced an opportunity for dialogic connectivity through common tragedy.³⁰ Kennedy made an appeal to the emotions of the audience members when he said:

For those of you who are black -- considering the evidence evidently is that there were white people who were responsible -- *you can be filled with bitterness, and with hatred, and a desire for revenge.*

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization -- black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, *filled with hatred toward one another.* Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand, and to comprehend, and replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, *with an effort to understand, compassion and love.*³¹

Kennedy then turned his testimony to the emotions he felt after President Kennedy's assassination. Griffin states, "The emotional message act is the actual demonstration of emotional content itself. It communicates to the audience that a specific emotion is present in the actor."³² Kennedy made an appeal to emotion, both through his delivery and spoken reflection, and then strengthened it with sound reasoning. Griffin continues "When you balance emotion and reason, you audience will see more than one dimension of your persuasive appeals and will be persuaded on more than one level."³³ By using an example of his own personal tragedy, Kennedy was able to reinforce his

overall emotional message for “*an effort to understand, compassion and love*” and express his personal commitment to his audience in the throes of a tragic circumstance.³⁴

Kennedy was able to connect with his audience in several ways. Not only did Kennedy match the tone and delivery of his message with the physicality of the crowd’s emotions, he also offered poignant words attuned with the moment—so much so that they cannot be dismissed in effort to downplay the logical mode of reasoning. After all, influential messages are more likely composed of several modes of reasoning at the same time, and, certainly, the logical can influence the emotional (and vice versa). The recognition of multiple rhetorical components contributing to the opportunity for dialogue, in spite of difference, in certain argument cultures, is what is essential.

Kennedy used language to help his audience connect to his message both emotionally and rationally. This was a skill Kennedy used, not only in Indianapolis, but in most of his public appearances. Evan Thomas, Kennedy biographer, expounds:

Bobby Kennedy was not the most articulate public speaker in the world, his hands shook, he had to grab the podium to stay calm, but I think his very inarticulateness actually helped him speak to people who also felt tongue-tied and weren't able to articulate their needs and their wants, who felt silenced. They saw this man struggling with his own pain and they could relate to it. They said “this guy can understand how we feel too.” It was a kind of transference, I guess, if you use a psychological term. They saw themselves in him, even though he was this rich Kennedy, he was, in a way, like them, at least he understood them.³⁵

Most people admire speakers who appear to know exactly how to choose the most appropriate and effective words.³⁶ Thus, Kennedy’s move to speak out on his brother’s assassination that night, reportedly for the first time publicly, is understandably a connective feature of Kennedy’s address that many audience members remembered and

identified with (most likely because of the emotional import of the evidence).

Mankiewicz, seasoned aide and Kennedy companion reports, “I never heard it before or since, any discussion by him, publicly or privately any discussion about President Kennedy's death, about the assassination.”³⁷

Kennedy, by speaking out on his brother's death, was able to connect with his audience emotionally and further draw them into his claims and overall argument for rejecting violence in the name of understanding, compassion, and justice. Audience member, Billie Breaux, recounts:

When he came to the bed [of the flat-bed truck], he told us that [...] he had some sad news for us, that Dr. King had been shot and was dead and he could not know exactly how we felt, but he too had had a brother and his brother had been killed by a white man and that he could have been really angry, but he knew that that was not the way to go about doing it. He urged us all to go home and say a prayer for the King family and say a prayer for America in hopes that we could all overcome this.³⁸

It was only a few years before that the country mourned the national tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination. Identifying with his audience through his own familial death worked. This connection is evidenced in the memory of audience member Lloyd Milliken, “I thought it was a very clever way of relating. Not only [relating that audience to] himself and his family, but the white community to the black community at that time. I thought it was pretty moving.”³⁹

Along with the testimony of his own brother's death, Kennedy also quoted Aeschylus and the Greeks at the closing of his emotional message in Indianapolis. Karl Anatol, a researcher who spoke with community members shortly after Kennedy's appearance, reflects on Kennedy's turn to the classics:

What is sort of overlooked in all of this...was the Aeschylus moment because if there was one recitation that seemed not to be ripe for a given moment—that was it. We don't know how Kennedy decided. Out of all the things that he could reflect from emotions collected in tranquility, you know back there in his yesterday, why that? Why did he reach for that? I spent, not too much time, but reading this stuff and it's a very simple portrayal of emotions. My favorite poem. My favorite poet was Aeschylus. He once wrote “even in our sleep, pain which can not forget falls drop by drop upon the heart until in our own great despair, against our will comes wisdom through the awful grace of God.” There in Indianapolis, its past 8 o'clock in the evening, tension high, and you want to string a peal of Greek poetry upon an audience? Where did that come from? Why did it work? That's what I remember from the speech. I don't remember the rest of the stuff because when you really analyze it line by line, it was a rather pedestrian speech. What it had going for it was that heart throb of empathy and emotion.... Aeschylus to that audience and shortly thereafter the group wanders off. That's magic.⁴⁰

Anatol, like Milliken, provides evidence for connecting vivid language to an emotional tone, ultimately impacting the reasoning involved. “Captivating language attracts and holds an audience by virtue of its beauty or brilliance. Captivating language can also elicit delight and variety of emotions.”⁴¹ As such, moving and inspiring messages are often built with poetic language that lingers and promotes feelings of love and wisdom. As Boyd recalls, Kennedy was,

...also concerned that [we] somehow [got] out of the situation, [that] we [were] able, or should be able, to extract love. That was pretty difficult to expect of that group of people in that situation. Somehow or other we need[ed] to continue to push forward this whole concept of love, even when people have done very, very unlovely things. Then his reference to Aeschylus and his reference to the Greek philosophers, poets, [was] just very, very much on target.⁴²

Such an unexpected rhetorical move by Kennedy reinforced the emotional urgency of his message in Indianapolis. Many audience members recall this particular

moment of his speech and note that it brought an emotional surge over the audience. Others reported that such a rhetorical turn toward Greek poetry and classical artistry, at this particular tragic moment, was reflective of Kennedy's personality and thus contributed to his overall credibility as a sincere and authentic leader. Peter Edelman, personal staff to Kennedy, reflects:

Robert Kennedy was a reader as well as a person who learned in every other way, by touching people and he loved the Greeks. He [had] them in his mind, because he read them over and over, and thought about these things over and over again. Some portions of text shall we say, and so it was very natural for him to do that. That was Robert Kennedy.⁴³

Frank Mankiewicz, also close to Kennedy, disagrees that it would have been natural for him to call upon the Greeks during the Indianapolis announcement of King's assassination. Instead, he suggests that for Kennedy to include the lines from Aeschylus was a way for him to go into a truly deep place, a place full of tragedy, feeling, and reflection. Mankiewicz explains:

But the stuff with the Greeks is what astounds me. He never talked about the Greeks. He never quoted, he just read. He had Edith Hamilton's books and he had a Greek writing, poetry, Aeschylus and others, but that was never part of his conversation. Clearly, it penetrated really deeply because that's what he thought about. I mean, that's what he called up.⁴⁴

Either way, Kennedy's inclusion of these few lines from Aeschylus traced the symbolic meaning of loss and mourning thousands years back and then forward again to the moment when he stood facing an angry, surprised, saddened, fearful, and disgusted crowd. The traceable meaning travels onward into the public memory of today as these few lines of Kennedy's announcement stand at the forefront of participant's recollections.

Kennedy's language and use of personal testimony contributed to the audience reception of an emotional message that compounded the gravity of the moment and the physiological feelings of anger, surprise, and grief felt by both Kennedy and his audience.

Vechel Rhodes, Sr., audience member and resident of the urban community in which Kennedy spoke, offers insight on the influence of his own emotional reasoning. "That's all you can do is just respond on an action of how a person presents [himself]." Rhodes acknowledges that sincerity and authenticity can be measured in Kennedy's actions, "You know a person when they trying to speak from they heart and mean what they say..."⁴⁵ Similarly, Edelman also reasons that Kennedy's message was sincere, authentic, and emotional. "What he said was from his heart, it wasn't scripted, it was no speech that somebody wrote. He just got up and he said what came out of his heart."⁴⁶ These and other audience members use the experience of visceral emotions to make instinctive decisions regarding Kennedy's honesty and trustworthiness. "How comfortable a speaker is in his own skin, how he stands and moves, how he looks at others in the room, his tone of voice, even the clothes he wears," explains Gary Genard, "—together, these variables constitute a constant flow of data running underneath whatever the speaker is saying."⁴⁷ These extra-sensory features were met with Kennedy's moving words regarding his own brother's assassination and words of wisdom put forth through classical philosophy and artistry.

A balance of head and heart seems to be one of the many strengths of Kennedy's appeal. Cindy L. Griffin asserts that, "[o]verly emotional speeches may stimulate your audience, but without sound reasoning, they are less likely to be persuaded by your

arguments.”⁴⁸ However, the use of emotional appeals to contribute to reasoning could ultimately help the credibility and trustworthiness of the message by showing a more personal and emotional side to the evidence, as was the case with Kennedy’s use of personal testimony in combination with reference to classical Greek quotes.

Kennedy’s emotional message was heightened by audience identification. As Kennedy speechwriter Adam Walinsky remembers, the audience actually responded with applause a few times during the message:

I think he was interrupted just twice by applause, and each time it was when he, it followed a sentiment in which he said that what we have to do is look for compassion, in a sense, of justice toward all people in our country. Whether they be white or they be black. That was the sentiment that triggered applause.⁴⁹

The occasion of King’s assassination inevitably brought forth themes of race, equality, a fight for justice, African American culture, civil rights history, hope, and non-violence, and was met with Kennedy’s sincere recognition of such symbolic meaning for that particular audience. Gilbert’s notion of the “emotional information act”, in contrast to the emotional message act, “...is the communicative assertion that some causal relationship exists between the expression of emotion and the issue at hand.”⁵⁰ Kennedy makes clear that the issue at hand was emotionally relevant and felt by him as well as his audience. “On the linguistic side, the information act corresponds to the propositional act wherein a particular prediction takes place.” Gilbert further explains:

There is a predication taking place in the message act as well. A protagonist is communicating the information that there is a certain relationship between the presence of an emotion as exhibited in the message act and the interaction taking place.⁵¹

Context, of course, fills in the gaps of the verbally communicated message. Gilbert also offers the “illocutionary act” or “the force of the experience taken as a communicative event.” This can take on several forms including appealing to, warning, blaming, threatening, and/or pacifying the audience.⁵² In a sense, Kennedy’s illocutionary act could be evaluated through either verbal or nondiscursive argumentation and certainly both can occur at the same time. By shifting the tone of the occasion, performing a “heartfelt” delivery, and personalizing his claims with powerful emotional testimony and aesthetic quotations, Kennedy produced a memorable call to action that held historical impact.

The more an audience can establish a common bond with a speaker, the more likely they are to attach a higher credibility to the overall message.⁵³ Walinsky continues,

[What] I thought was extraordinary about the speech is that he told the truth. He did not shy away from it. He said quite openly that he could understand that black people might be filled with feelings of hatred and a desire for revenge against white people. He also said, “I can understand that, because I had a member of my family killed.” He didn’t say it’s wrong or evil to feel that. He said, “I can understand that.” Then he went on to say, we in this country can have that kind of division, or we can try and move past it. So, he went on to talk of course about the fact that we could live in violence and hatred toward one another, or we could make an effort to rise about that. He also said, “that it’s not the end of violence, it’s not the end of hatred, it’s not the end of lawlessness.” These things are with us, that’s human condition, and we are going to have to deal with that on a continuing basis. So, that’s again the truth. That’s not sugar coating it. It’s not wallowing in the bad, because he’s saying, look we’ve got to get past it. We’ve got to do better, but it’s understanding that you must start from a recognition of what is, of what the truth situation is and of what you’re hearers maybe feeling.⁵⁴

Along with Walinsky's praise of the extraordinary truth-telling that directly connected with the audience, Kennedy was respected by the Indianapolis African American community for being honest and forthcoming with his reflection on the state of the nation post-King's assassination. "He did not sugarcoat anything. He says it the way it should be said," Remembers Vechel Rhodes, Sr., "and he says it in a way for us to understand it, in what Martin Luther King would want, and that's what we were there for."⁵⁵ Anatol (2008) remembers interviewing community members directly following the Indianapolis event and emphasizes the role of trust present in the emotional reasoning that historical night:

I recall standing in a little cluster of people, a little knot of people and this hand on my shoulder and I looked toward somebody who was trying to get my attention and I looked. He was trying to tie a ribbon on what others had said, and he said to me "Like I say man, the cat tell the truth like it is." I think I remember saying to him, well what happened. He says, "The cat told the truth like it is and that was okay. That was okay with us" As if to suggest then that Kennedy is telling the truth. A truth then for which he, this man that was seeking, was sufficient to tell him that it was not the time to do what he had come there to do and that was to create some kind of mayhem or injury or violence or what have you.⁵⁶

Kennedy's purpose was to expose, via a raw emotional display of power, the injustice that everyone involved could feel. Even in an argument that satisfies the full range of argumentative concepts, the element that makes the address stand out is the emotion behind it that comes forth in the sensitive yet unyielding outcry for justice, compassion, and understanding.

Locating Sentiment through the Physical Manifestations of Emotion

Since an argument's value is intrinsically tied to its impact, it would be a mistake to consider logic alone as the true power of the address. "Emotional arguments are arguments that rely more or less heavily on the use and expression of emotion," acknowledges Gilbert. "These emotions are often communicated to us without the benefit of language, or where language is purely ancillary to the main thrust of the communication."⁵⁷ This supports the need to expand our research of communicated argumentation to include more than the traditional spoken or verbal discourse.

Rozelle Boyd, then a young, politically-active community member, remembers the emotional residue entangled in the experience of hearing the news of King's death, first hand, from Kennedy.

Well first of all, obviously, I felt a lot of anger at that time. Someone has taken one of the country's great heroes and certainly one of the people's great heroes, particularly black folk. That is an identity that I never can shed or never want to shed, but certainly a hero had been taken, a hero of unquestionable credentials. Certainly the natural tendency is to be angry, to want to lash out at someone, to have someone feel your kick, to have someone feel your anger, to somehow or other express that in that kind of setting. That's why I think the Kennedy speech was so important. It addressed that kind of feeling in persons like myself.⁵⁸

Boyd acknowledges one of the primary emotions of anger and reflects on how this emotion resonates in physiological feelings of wanting "to have someone feel your kick" and "have someone feel your anger." Boyd also reveals a sense of frustration stemming from the loss of the great civil rights leader and thus pointedly recognizes potential emotions of sadness, disgust, surprise, and/or fear.

In difference to Boyd, the memories of Billie Breaux acknowledge a second order of emotions present:

I don't recall being angry, I really don't. I just recall being very disappointed and hurt that this had happened and that it happened at a time when we so needed someone to speak to us and to be someone that we could look up to.⁵⁹

While both Boyd and Breaux recognize the overwhelming emotions of sadness and disgust at such a tragic event, Breaux brings in secondary emotions when she says she was “disappointed and hurt.” This next level begins to extend our conception of emotion to acknowledge even more emotional components such as pride, guilt, shame, reverence, and mourning.⁶⁰

A common emotion embedded in the experience of hearing Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination was *anger*, or “a feeling of annoyance, irritation, or rage.”⁶¹ Coupled with *sadness*, or “a feeling of unhappiness, grief, or sorrow,” an emotional stage swells within the situational context of this historical night.⁶² Because the audience was gathered for a political celebration, they were not prepared for the turn of events and were met by an emotional *surprise* or “a feeling of sudden wonder or amazement, especially because of something unexpected.”⁶³ Such surprise could then drive either a sense of *fear*, “an unpleasant feeling of apprehension or distress; the anticipation of danger or threat” or *disgust*, “a feeling of horrified or sickened distaste for something.”⁶⁴ Recognizing these primary emotions, along with some secondary emotions such as pride, guilt, shame, and reverence, Griffin sets in motion a beginning framework in which to see the value of the argument by way of emotional impact.⁶⁵ Another secondary emotion worthy of recognition, particularly for this project, is *mourning*.⁶⁶

If the value of the argument resides in the rhetorical impact then we can begin to recognize the role of emotions in argumentation. Since emotions can be used as warrants or data for claims in an argument, bringing forth a basic understanding of the emotions involved in the communication interaction becomes a required first step. Furthermore, the backing of the emotional mode reveals the appropriateness of the moment and calls forth certain types of behavior. This is evident when examining Kennedy's Indianapolis speech, and is apparent in the responses by both Kennedy and his audience— responses that were true, authentic, and/or sincere. One way to identify such emotions is to locate moments of emotional expression embodied in bursts of visceral feelings. Such peaks of emotion manifest themselves in the visceral representations of emotion such as hugging, crying, crying out, gasping, and/or standing in silence.

Rhetorical arguments can produce images, set tones, and indeed, easily convince and even persuade audiences. But how can rhetoric be responsible solely for these reactions? Rhetoric's true personal impact can only be measured by its feeling. Based on rhetoric's ability to mold an argument into visual and sensual imagery, it can be said to be the master of feeling. But as Robert C. Solomon (1993) notes, feeling is fundamentally different than emotion. Feelings are outbursts of emotions – peaks, or an apex, of an emotional condition. They embody what psychologists have tried innumerable times to link with physiological responses. They are visceral. By exploring the visceral embodiment of the emotions felt this night, by both Kennedy and his audience, we begin to understand the tone of the occasion which ultimately set in motion such powerful feelings.

Genuine Gestures

When considering how an audience draws conclusions about arguments, to a surprising extent, oftentimes it is not on the basis of what people say but by what people do. More specifically, how individuals communicate with body movement, facial expressions, gestures, and eye contact directs us to the importance of the body in argument.⁶⁷ Kinesics, or how we study body motions as a mode of communication, points to the importance of body language in public speaking. Lucas affirms, “When a speaker's body language is inconsistent with his or her words, listeners often believe the body language rather than the words,” which indicates personal appearance, movement, gestures, and eye contact as overall components to the delivery of a message.⁶⁸ Feelings contribute to the make of the emotional tone of the message that comes forth through feelings marking the climatic peak of a rhetorical condition.

Examining the gestures Kennedy made during his speech is one way to acknowledge the emotional mode of reasoning operating in the event. The phenomenological experience of Kennedy’s words, in addition to the entire performance of the announcement, is examined by foregrounding the physicality (of how one feels when) expressing and/or hearing the news of King’s death, and is further supported by the testimony from participants in the 1968 event.

Griffin posits, “Gestures are movements, usually of the hands but sometimes of the full body, that express meaning and emotion or offer clarity to a message.”⁶⁹ Thus, it is important to recognize the importance of Kennedy’s overall gesture of continuing forward with his trip to the inner-city neighborhood to announce the assassination King as well as some of his immediate gestures—his hand and body movements, facial

expressions, and tone. Kennedy not only showed up to make the announcement, an admirable gesture in and of itself, but he used smaller gestures throughout his delivery to mark the sincere urgency of his emotional message. According to Gilbert, “That is, someone can say something, but true feelings are demonstrated by what someone does. Following this line, we might propositionalize the warrant as, say, “We only exhibit deep sadness over something about which we feel strongly.”⁷⁰ The physical markings of nonverbal discourse are one way to connect with one's audience via emotional argument.

In an examination of Kennedy's hand gestures, one observes that he both points directly at the crowd as well as pointing to himself.⁷¹ In this way, the connection between Kennedy and the audience is vividly and visually drawn in the air, so to speak. The back and forth motion of his hands imitates the back and forth exchange as he delivers his response *for* the audience. Douglass states “Simple hand gestures can speak volumes about personal feelings.”⁷² Focusing on the specificity of movement by the speaker can express meaning through spontaneous hand gestures, those visual signals we all use to express to others how we feel. “[I]t was so impactful,” remembers audience member Breaux, “he had that quiet manner about him that just sort of drew you into the palm of his hand as if he was talking just to you and his honesty and whatnot just came through.”⁷³

Kennedy Cries: Facial Expressions and Visceral Emotions

Kennedy never looks away from the audience—an expression of sincerity. This facial connection with the audience remains throughout the entirety of his speech and continues while he is departing from the stage.⁷⁴ Lucas explains:

The eyeball itself expresses no emotion. Yet by manipulating the eyeball and the areas of the face around it—especially the upper

eyelids and the eyebrows—we are able to convey an intricate array of nonverbal messages. So revealing are these messages that we think of the eyes as ‘the windows of the soul.’ We look to them to help gauge the truthfulness, intelligence, attitudes, and feelings of a speaker.⁷⁵

Breaux reflects, “I think it's something about a person's eyes and the way he looks at you. When he looked at you, and you talked, he listened and you could feel his concern and his involvement with that.”⁷⁶ This memory provides evidence that emotions used in reflective reasoning resonate and are expressed through physical features that lie behind the words of a message. Sincerity, authenticity, and attitude are measured through nonverbal discourse that more times than not, surrounds the argument and influences the overall rhetorical effect.

“One elderly Black gentlemen said that Kennedy ‘had tears in his eyes, I saw it, he felt it man, he cried,’ and a friend nearby concurred, ‘yea he did, right there, he had tears,’” reports Anatol and Bittner. However, “There was no way to determine whether Kennedy actually did shed tears, the result, however, was apparently one of deep emotional impact on the crowd.”⁷⁷ Audience member LaVerne Steward also remembers “...how sad Bobby Kennedy looked as he approached the stage.”⁷⁸

Kennedy’s tears are a physical representation of sincere emotion. According to Genard, “Your face usually reflects what you're thinking and feeling even more revealingly than your gestures.”⁷⁹ More specifically, one would use the face, or the eyebrows, eyes, cheeks, mouth, lips, nose, neck, and teeth, to express emotion.⁸⁰ As such, “Your face plays a central role in communicating with your audience, letting them know your attitudes, emotional states, and sometimes even your inner thoughts.”⁸¹ Therefore,

the emotion expressed in Kennedy's face, along with his gestures, communicated his feelings of sadness which allowed the 1968 audience to appreciate that he was being honest with them and the situation, even if they ultimately disagreed with his race, response or message act.

Emotions Embedded in Kennedy's Voice: Rate, Pauses, Tone

Kennedy, unquestionably, had a distinctly recognizable voice. Some aspects of voice that contribute to uniqueness are volume, pitch, rate, pauses, variety, pronunciation, articulation, and dialect. As argued by Genard, "Empathy...is an 'in-the-moment' quality that tells your listeners you're connecting with them on an individual and emotional level. And it's our voice that carries that message loud and clear—or not—for our audiences."⁸² In the moment of argument and/or dialogue, the speaker and listeners are participating in the same communication interaction. The speaker can use his/her voice to reflect goodwill toward the audience as well as express the commitment and sincerity of the message. This is done through the language choice of the speaker as well as the vocal delivery of the message. Some standout features of Kennedy's voice, as reported by audience accounts, include his rate, pauses, and rhythmic tone.

Frank Mankiewicz recalls specific features of Kennedy's vocal delivery that particular night. Kennedy was:

[A] Little hesitant, repeating himself, searching for the right response. There's some pauses in that speech where he is clearly [reflecting on] what comes next here. What's appropriate? Well I think that's right, he's saying, here's not just what I'm saying it, but here's how I'm saying it. I urge you to join me in that regard for this moment in this event. I mean he wasn't talking about taxation or housing. Where it's okay to be a little pedestrian. This was life in death, not just for a man but for them. For his audience.⁸³

Rate, the speed at which a speaker speaks, also contributes to meaning or the emotional tone of the argument. “The rate at which we speak conveys different feelings,” reports Griffin. “When we speak quickly, we project a sense of urgency, excitement, or even haste. When we speak slowly, we convey seriousness, heaviness, or even uncertainty.”⁸⁴ Mankiewicz acknowledges Kennedy’s slow rate along with his use of effective pauses. Pauses, or a momentary break in the vocal delivery, “...can signal the end of a thought unit, give an idea time to sink in, and lend dramatic impact to a statement.”⁸⁵ Pauses are used to punctuate verbal discourse, establish mood, mark a transition, offer time for reflection, and/or underscore a particular point.⁸⁶ Rate, effective pauses, and the overall tone of a speaker’s voice helps communicate the emotional urgency as well as connective energy exchanged between individuals (both speaker and/or audience members) involved in the message act. Such features are audience-centered because, “We want to engage our audience, and our rate of speaking helps us by communicating certain emotions or energies.”⁸⁷

The Gasp! An Emotional Reaction

The tenants of emotional reasoning that were involved in the overall rhetorical effect of Kennedy’s announcement on April 4, 1968 were not only embedded in the physical expressiveness of emotions via Kennedy’s body. Emotions reflected in the physiological recollections of individual crowd members play just as an important role by providing additional evidence regarding the presence of the emotional reasoning within the physicality of this historical act. The tragic news of King’s death sent an emotional surge through the crowd that was most pointedly marked by the collective “Gasp!”

exposed and heard blocks away from 17th & Broadway. Anatol reflects on one Indianapolis resident who felt the emotional impact even though she was not on site at the speech:

As...[i]t turns out, she was not really at the speech, but this black lady was driving her car and was stunned by this collective “ooh” which was an explosion of some emotion. She didn't really know what was going on or what caused it, but she was struck by it. I mean, it really registered with her and in the aftermath she discovered that that was the moment when Kennedy had made the announcement that Martin Luther King was shot.⁸⁸

A gasp – or utterance, to use Bakhtin’s term – went through the crowd, and screams of “No!” echoed over the basketball court. “Even the slightest allusion to another’s utterance,” writes Bakhtin “gives the speech a dialogical turn that cannot be produced by any purely referential theme with its own object.”⁸⁹ Thus, Kennedy’s voice found meaning through the voices of the individuals in his audience. As apparent in his introduction, Kennedy was responding to the utterances of the crowd, which in turn moves this towards dialogue rather than the traditional persuasive political speech. Through his tone and non-verbal gestures, Kennedy was finally able to connect with the audience and get across the news of King’s assassination. Furthermore, the audience gasps can be considered a physical release of emotions felt upon hearing the shocking news of King’s death.

Audience member, Julia Carson, reflected on the moment when she first heard of the tragedy from Kennedy: “He says, “I've got bad news.” I say what. He says, “Martin's been killed.” I said, “Martin who, sure to God not MLK?” So he stood up on the make-shift podium at the church, Broadway and made the announcement and the crowd just

went ooohh. They just went oohhh no.”⁹⁰ Another audience member, one who was standing directly to the right of Kennedy, Jerome Forestal, recalled that: “Because he said that Dr. King died, you heard these gasps, I can just remember that night. That’s when I was sitting right there, I was standing by a white man also. And several hadn’t really thought about it yet [but] this was a racial event.”⁹¹

As Bakhtin suggests, along with Kennedy’s internal contradictions surrounding King’s assassination and, at that time, his presence in an African American neighborhood, Kennedy was witness to and participating in the unveiling of “social heteroglossia,” or the conditions that gave special meaning to his announcement.⁹² Kennedy had to take the reactions of his individual audience members seriously, as reflected in the emotional outbursts, while he deliberately and cautiously moved forward with his message of King’s assassination. As Gilbert notes, “It is the audience that provides one with the initial agreed upon presumptions required to being the argument, as well as providing the frame for the substance and style of the argumentation.”⁹³

Here we begin to see the fundamental role of the audience in the shaping of the overall message. Kennedy moved forward with his message via cues from the audience’s emotional responses. Mankiewicz reflects on the other few times during Kennedy’s speech that the audience responded with some kind of emotional outburst:

The crowd noise that you hear on two occasions was from a rather small portion of the crowd. It was a big crowd, several thousand. It sounded like several hundred, but most of them were silent I think. So they must have been absorbing it. There was very little comment as he went along, which you don't hear very often in that kind of speech, usually, particularly with black people in those days and maybe still. There were no comments like “yes, that's right” or “uh huh,” or “say more,” you know? The thing that struck me just now,

and every time I hear it, was the silence except for those two bursts of cheering.⁹⁴

Emotional appeals need to match the audience in which they are presented. One's history, age, gender, religion, ethnicity, and culture all work to influence how a person views an issue and accordingly the emotional appeals attached to a particular issue. Griffin puts forth, "Although no speaker can predict with total accuracy how an audience will respond to an emotional appeal, you can consider your audience carefully and select those appeals to emotions that seem most appropriate."⁹⁵ With the few emotional outbursts from the crowd, Kennedy was able to create a reciprocal emotional exchange by using the energy exuded from his audience. Mankiewicz offers insight into how the emotional urgency was present in both Kennedy *and* his audience:

I think he took some strength from the crowd, from the fact that they were orderly and peaceful at least through the speech and so far as he knew, after. Notice he said he wanted them to go home. I thought that was an important element of that...Don't go out in the streets, don't do that. Go home, go say a prayer."⁹⁶

Such dialectical tensions, exposed in the emotional arguments of all the individuals involved, bonded in and through common tragedy. Rhodes reflects on the momentary tensions he felt upon hearing the news:

I was there and he announced it. The day, the day when he was there speaking. It happened and I heard him. Well, at that point, what could I say? We all just, you know, said ahhh. We thought it was awful, but he just kept talking and we kept listening to him. If they come. A few people got upset, let's do this and let's do that. Everybody talked to everybody and that's what we did. We just stayed calm. It helped; it helped him with being here probably. If he wasn't here and he didn't talk, it would have been like a lot of other states. You know, people just went berserk.⁹⁷

A Peaceful Disposition: The Indianapolis Audience is Calm

As audience member Vechel Rhodes acknowledges, despite the overwhelming “awful” feelings and potential for violence because “a few people got upset” the audience “stayed calm”.⁹⁸ Julia Carson also recalls the potential danger of hostile emotions that were diffused by Kennedy’s emotional impact:

So what he said and they way he demonstrated it worked ‘cause you have to have to have some calmness in times like this. It's hard to derive. It's hard [to] generate. You want me to be calm and they just killed a civil rights leader? Please. But they were and they sort of walked away very calmly. I remember that. How I was feeling watching the crowd, how non-violent they were.⁹⁹

While it is common knowledge that emotional argumentation is subjective and can be unsuitable to use in certain situations as a lens to explore reason, it evokes more power and gravity than any other type. As Gilbert makes clear, “Emotional arguments demonstrate how we feel about certain claims or aspects of the argumentation procedure, and communicate emotional reactions through a variety of means....” Furthermore, Gilbert notes that “emotions are sometimes used as warrants or data for claims.”¹⁰⁰

Regardless of setting, scene, or situation, emotional arguments must be executed with proper timing and appropriateness. “Backing contains within it rules of conduct, procedure and argument. When a different mode of backing is the appropriate one, different rules and different forms of argument are relevant.”¹⁰¹ Here we see the relevance of situational context as a place where emotional backing is used to guide occasional appropriateness and regulate decorous argument. To be clear, a balance between emotion and reason is a more realistic interpretation real life argumentation.

The visceral feelings were evoked by emotional language that was heightened by the timing of a momentary tragedy. As audience member Billie Breaux, so eloquently points out,

...the words themselves just sort of drip drop and you can just sort of see it happening and it just sort of calms you. It also makes you very cold. I think again that it shows the kind of person that he really was. The right words just came out at the right time.¹⁰²

Such overlap embedded in the multiple modes of reasoning comes forth through Breaux's recollection of Kennedy's words "drip dropping" and causing an effect that "just sort of calms you." Breaux goes on to acknowledge the physicality of emotional messages even more when she says, the words "...also makes you very cold." The few heartening remarks delivered from Kennedy that night seemed to be, at least to this audience member, "The right words...at the right time." Thus, the situational occasion appears again at the forefront of the emotional message. John Lewis also acknowledges that there was emotional reasoning contributing to the peaceful reaction in Indianapolis. "...because of what Robert Kennedy said, the way he said it, there was not any violence in Indianapolis. It was order. It was peace."¹⁰³

The authenticity of Kennedy's message not only came through in his words but also how they were delivered. "Those are probably some of the most powerful words that have ever been spoken," recalls Lewis, "and to come off the top of his head and not have it written down, again just shows to me what kind of soul he really had."¹⁰⁴ Defining emotional reasoning as judgments based on value and physical feelings experienced by individuals in a unique moment, uncovers possibilities for further exploring how difference can be reconciled through common tragedy, community, and courage.

Rozelle Boyd's memory reveals that the rhetorical condition following Kennedy's announcement was similar to a community reaction at a funeral setting rather than a scene of destruction, anger, and rioting:

There was people to whom I was reaching out that I would hug and it was almost a case, in many instances, of parents saying to their children, children saying to their parents, "Hey, we've got to get by this. It's the worst thing in the world that could have possibly happened at this time, but we have got to get by it." It's sort of like uncomfortably close to a funeral situation where people gather who have not seen, talked to each other in perhaps years, but who in that circumstance feel a different kind of spirit, a kindred spirit if you will. Well certainly this was something that was very prevalent during that time in Indianapolis, particularly on the scene. We are all the losers in this kind of situation and we need to address it as best we can. We need to digest it as best we can.¹⁰⁵

Such reflection of mourning solidifies the place of emotional reasoning in forming community solidarity and reflection from situations of common tragedy. "...I guess it's because of the loss that I felt and I think it might have been an overwhelming sentiment to a lot of people," reflects Abie Robinson, audience member and community resident, "We felt a sense of personal loss. And at a time like that, I just wanted to go home and be with my family."¹⁰⁶

The echoing quiet rose out of the moment, "It was like silence, a dead silence that went through the crowd," remembers Breaux.¹⁰⁷ "People stood, some in silence and others started to cry," reports Lewis.¹⁰⁸ Then Democratic Councilman, Jerome Forestal (2008), also remembers the silent response put forth by the crowd:

I don't ever recall anyone out in the crowd being, making any noise or trying to stir up trouble or anything. In fact I say after he finished his speech that's the thought that there might be some unhappy people but there wasn't anyone yelling. It seemed like everybody was, they got his message about going home and saying a prayer for

the King family and the country and they were going to go home and they quietly disbursed. I don't remember any, as we drove through the crowd, I don't remember any noise or anybody shouting or anything. As I say it was really kind of eerie the way he sort of just dispersed them and everybody just started leaving.¹⁰⁹

The connective emotional energy reflected in the silent response of the crowd pointedly acknowledges the situational sense of community mourning. Such a reflective coming together, in feelings of love and compassion, creates courage enough to withstand, at least in this instance, more negative emotional pulls. The emotional crowd dispersed quickly and nonviolently. “It was a situation I felt in one sense a need to be a part of, but then in another sense, it was a situation I was wanting to get out of,” recalls Boyd. He continues,

That's the kind of thing that happens and you want to spend just a little time with self so that you can do your personal adjusting to what that situation was and handle your anger and handle your grief, so I did not stay in that setting for any long period of time.¹¹⁰

Boyd's memory illustrates community tragedy—where people are bound together by strained emotions. What ultimately happened was an extraordinary creation of peacefulness that flowed across the crowd. “I'm not a physical fighter anyway. I would have hated to pick up a brick that night and started throwing. It's just not me,” reflects Carson. However, she points out,

But I would have you know, joined crowds but I was glad we did not engage in the kind of stuff. There were those who tried to incite riots. Some of the radical leaders if you will but it didn't work. Everybody went home.¹¹¹

As the crowd dispersed quickly and quietly, they also retreated in honor of King's memory. The urge for reconciliation was powerful and lingered as the saddened

individuals departed from 17th & Broadway. “The whole concept of reconciliation, that was very prevalent,” Boyd recalls. He recounts Kennedy’s message and reflects on the racial implications of the situation:

We've got to reconcile what is happening in this country and we've got to make sure that what would seem to be a natural disaster in terms of race relations, that it doesn't become a natural and national disaster.” So reconciliation was definitely a part of the theme.¹¹²

Boyd continues and describes the role of emotional reasoning operating in the moment when feelings raged and community members cried, “There was probably the awareness that in order for the city, the system, the people, my people to come out of this situation, there would have to be some reconciliation.” While there was definite need for emotional reconciliation, in a sense, Boyd also acknowledges the need to make some kind of reasonable judgment with regard to those emotions:

There would have to be some addressing of the issues and concerns. Sure, I was mad like the rest of the folk there, but I was also aware that pure madness was not going to carry the day, it was not going to solve the problems and issues.¹¹³

Conclusion: The Power of Emotional Reasoning on Rhetorical Effects

Emotion—that which we all share, which we all revere, and which is the riskiest for us to expose, holds the greatest argumentative power because it is committed to value, exposed in visceral feelings, expressed in the moment, and offers opportunity for judgment of the message. These opportunities for judgment is where emotional reasoning resides. Investigating how emotional messages are embodied allows for identification of primary and secondary emotions as well as sets forth the basic tenants of emotional

argument. The emotional message of April 4th, 1968 was expressed through feelings that resonated physiologically in both Kennedy and his audience.

Emotions were present in the body rhetoric of Kennedy's delivery as well as reflected in the physicality of the crowd. In such a complex yet dynamic moment, the opportunity for judgment of the historical, political, cultural, and ethical context is present. Recognizing emotional reasoning as judgment-making that is based on value and physical feelings experienced in the unique moment by a collection of individuals, offers possibilities for exploring how difference can be reconciled through common tragedy, courage, and community. Crawford reminds us that there was a judgment to be made that night and because of the emotional appeal of Kennedy, along with the unification of the audience through community tragedy, the Indianapolis crowd chose a higher ground:

We would have been the ones that would have instituted, would have initiate a violent reaction, and so – but the way Bobby and the sincerity of his shared pain. We didn't know what to do, but we know we had to commit ourselves to doing something and so that just led to increased community activism.¹¹⁴

It is a combination of elements that allows for an emotional message to produce certain types of rhetorical effects. However, in this particular historical example, we can clearly see that emotional messages are committed to value, are expressed through physical feelings, and exist in the moment. When Kennedy arrived at the Broadway Christian Center, the audience participants revealed in retrospect that the political mood shifted to one of shock and grief. Kennedy's personal appearance as well as his changing tone, visible through Kennedy's body rhetoric, was acknowledged as projecting

emotional sadness as he made his way through the crowd. Details of his emotional message were retold with attention paid to genuine gestures, facial expressions, and vocal tone. The visceral emotive “Gasp!” exerted by audience members underscored the emotional experience of the moment. An overlap of emotional and visceral reasoning is clear.

These emotional features work together, through both rhetor and audience, to establish identification through common tragedy. Such common tragedy, as displayed in Indianapolis on April 4, 1968, allows for further reflection on how emotions hold opportunities for judgment of historical, political, cultural, and ethical context. Furthermore, such emotional reasoning allows for courage and peace to stem from a sense of communal loss. Kennedy evoked emotion by speaking about his own experience with death, as well as quoting Aeschylus, which worked to connect to his audience. This component of Kennedy’s verbal rhetoric allows for consideration of emotional argumentation via philosophical summons.

Without consideration of the emotional contribution we would not be able to fully understand the ethical components featured in moments of dialogic communication. By further examining the eventfulness of the experience, the situational community via a funeral-like atmosphere, and the presence of King’s legacy, the next chapter will focus on the visceral mode of reasoning.¹¹⁵ The ethical implications step to the forefront as Kennedy *and* his audience work together to create a break in the racialized codes of the day. The spirituality and provocative power of this speech will be revealed as the African

American community is praised in keeping the peace while potential sites for racial reconciliation are examined.

Along with Kennedy's tone and overall performance, Abie Robinson pointedly acknowledges that more is going into Kennedy's reasoning process as experienced by those individuals present in the audience that night. Robinson previews the importance in examination of other-worldly sensations playing a part in the overall experience of Kennedy's announcement:

After seeing him and after hearing him gave me an even greater sense of profound respect for him is because he was the kind of person who carried something of a presence around him. He was believable. I hadn't done any research on him or seen any political record on him or anything. His, for lack of better words, aura. There was believability about him, sincereness in his tone, in his speaking that made him believable.¹¹⁶

Chapter Six: The Kisceral Ethical Reasoning through Kisceral Connectivity in the Dialogic Moment

“You know I don't know if he prevented a riot in this town or not,” reflects Jim Trulock, then recording secretary for a community action council formed under a local union concerned for social justice. “I'll never know that. We'll never know that; but I know that everyone there, who heard him that night, would not have thought of doing such a thing after hearing him.”¹ Trulock goes on to acknowledge that the experience of Kennedy's speech was much more than a political address aimed at persuading its spectators to remain calm. For this audience member, reacting violently to the news was out of the question. It was not about “venting our anger,” reports Trulock, “It was about very quickly dealing with a tragedy in a positive way.” The audience was struck with a visceral and emotional tide brought by the news of King's assassination. Trulock offers that “...the answer from him [Kennedy] was to go home and dwell in your grief in the context that this struggle will go on [and, t]hat it will, perhaps, always be.”²

Identifying that the contextual moment of Kennedy's speech acknowledged death, tragedy, and hope, Trulock felt “...that who ever among us [could] pick up a part of the mantle dropped when King fell to the ground would have to do that now.”³ Trulock continues:

I remember he related the grief of everybody there of the nation... what he had personally felt in the loss of his own brother and he

quoted a Greek poet...that time assuaged the awful grief that we have in moment[s] like this.⁴

The connective energy which pulls all participants into the rhetorical act and transcends the rational, yet resides entirely in the overall outcome, becomes the focus of this chapter. Critical rhetoricians should not concern themselves solely with the persuasive features of argument. Of equal concern is how kisceral reasoning is used to activate moral consciousness along side the other modes – logical, visceral, and emotional.⁵ By exploring the kisceral nature of argument we discover the importance of energy and connectivity as integral features of the constitutive account. That is, we cannot make sense of the power of Kennedy’s speech without a closer look at the multiple locations, including extra-sensory spaces, in which its rhetorical effect is derivative.

This chapter will focus on the philosophical insight of Emmanuel Levinas in effort to expand on Michael A. Gilbert’s ideas regarding the kisceral mode of argumentation.⁶ Levinas’ contribution to rhetorical scholars resides in Ethics, most notably, with regards to relationship forged in response to the Other. Levinas also draws upon the unique connection created in the immediate moment. Highlighting the pre-discursive turn to respond to the Other triggers consideration of non-sensory elements of the communication interaction often left out of rhetorical discussion but certainly found in the kisceral mode of reasoning. An investigation of Levinas’s philosophy will lead to the consideration of ethics in public address as well as provide the introduction to the elements of dialogic rhetoric.

The Ethical Argument: Using Levinas to Expand on Kisceral Reasoning

The definition of kisceral is derived "...from the Japanese term *ki* meaning energy, life-force, and connectedness, which covers the intuitive and non-sensory arenas."⁷ It involves sub-sensory elements, such as feelings of apprehension and dismay, as well as considers the context of choice-making. The connection, the situational context, and the force of the moment are some of the essential components (along with the energy of the event) that guide rhetorical critics to the ethical implications situated in Kennedy's speech act.

Not unlike Gilbert's mode of kisceral argumentation, George Kennedy puts forth a theory of rhetoric that is concerned with the emotional energy that is transmitted from a speaker (or writer) to an audience through a speech act (or text).⁸ Through a review of multiple cultures, each with distinctive traits and sense-making skills, George Kennedy works to identify commonalities in rhetorical traditions that cross time and space. This attempt at a universal theory redefines rhetoric as a "form of mental or emotional energy" which a "natural phenomenon," based on emotional reaction/s, directs some form of utterance "aimed at affecting the situation."⁹ In order to account for all possible (timeless or cross-cultural) influences on effectivity, rhetorical and argumentation theorists should be open to embracing any utterance that comes forth as part of the reasoning process. While such a universal approach has been critiqued—namely for the difficulty of locating a stopping point—Kennedy's reaction to the energetic force of the event and the audience is relevant to this project.¹⁰ As audience members continue to report "that day was just eerie"¹¹ or that we "...were working with energy then," and that "It was a peculiar

energy that took place that night;”¹² it is clear that an account of kisceral reasoning is required.

Kisceral reasoning includes several pieces of information that are often not considered by rhetorical scholars. The kisceral phenomena should be considered as “hunches,” “feelings,” and/or “coincidences” and, while this type of reasoning may seem hard to identify, it is “...common and ordinary, even, for the rationalist, entirely explicable in ordinary terms,” as Gilbert asserts.¹³ According to Gilbert, the intuitiveness, or strong gut feeling, of kisceral reasoning can come forth in, “a strong vision,” or “palpable insight.”¹⁴ This is evident when audience member Abie Robinson says, “I believe it was a super-natural power, which caused us not to respond in lawlessness, but to hold on to the principles and ideas of non-violence that were the bench mark of Martin Luther Kings’ legacy.”¹⁵ Although there are myriad reasons why the Indianapolis audience decided to react nonviolently, part of the reasoning was kisceral.

Gilbert asserts that the kisceral “[...] relies on a form of nonlogical communication that is a synthesis of experience and insight.”¹⁶ He goes on to say that, “such oddities as astrology, Bible quotations, channeling, and so on,” may, in fact, be a driving force of the overall reasoning that takes place in the argumentative moment.¹⁷ For example, notice how one Kennedy biographer, Evan Thomas, evokes an extra-sensory (and in this case religious) force to his description:

Bobby Kennedy had a real appreciation for human nature, the dark side as well as the light. He had a way of calling on our better angels, I mean, of finding what is good in people and trying to summon that, recognizing that there are other forces or other

demons they may have, but they need to fight that and overcome it and try to do the right thing.¹⁸

While “angels” and “demons” may not be the most legitimate base for some; to others, it most absolutely is. As Gilbert aptly reminds us, “It is not the concern of an argumentation theorist to judge the validity of such sources, but rather to understand their use in argumentative interactions.”¹⁹ Thus, to fully grasp the nonviolent rhetorical effect, we must turn to a phenomenological account of argument that foregrounds opportunities to redefine political space in order for discovery of dialogic connectivity via extra-sensory information residing in elements such as legacy and grief.

Levinasian Phenomenology

Levinas’ phenomenology of face-to-face encounter or the intersubjective ethical connection which happens at the pre-sensory level is similar to the kisceral basis of “human sensibility” characterized by Bettina Bergo as “a continuum of sensibility and affectivity, in other words, sentience and emotion in their interconnection.”²⁰ In his own words, Levinas explains:

I have attempted a “phenomenology” of sociality starting from the face of the other person – from proximity – by understanding in its rectitude a voice that commands before all mimicry and verbal expression, in the mortality of the face, from the bottom of this weakness. It commands me to not remain indifferent to this death, to not let the Other die alone, that is, to answer for the life of the other person, at the risk of becoming an accomplice in that person’s death. The facing-up of the Other, in his rectitude, would signify both the precariousness of the Other and an authority lacking to a simply logical *alterity*, which, as the counterpart of the identity of facts and concepts, distinguishes one from another, or reciprocally opposes the notions of them by contradiction or contrariety. The alterity of the Other is the extreme point of the “thou shalt not kill” and, in me, the fear of all the violence and usurpation that my existing, despite the innocence of its intentions, risks committing.

Here is the risk of occupying – from the *Da* of my *Dasein* – the place of an Other and, thus, in the concrete, of exiling him, dooming him to a miserable condition in some “third” or “fourth” world, bringing him death. Thus an unlimited responsibility would emerge in this fear for the other person, a responsibility with which one is never done, which does not cease...²¹

Not unlike this project, Levinas sought to understand the constitution of subjectivity that resides in relationships created in and through the diversity of human nature. But how do we make sense of this mysterious face? Levinas uses a phenomenological structure to move towards alterity and away from totality, which is, as Levinas’s translator Richard A. Cohen asserts, “driven by a desire to break out of the circuits of sameness rather than a yearning for complete comprehension.”²² Cohen goes on to explain in his introduction to Levinas’s *Time and the Other*:

It begins with existence without existents, describes the origination of the distinct existent, the subject, then moves to the progressively more complex constitutive layers of subjectivity, its materiality and solitude, its insertion in the world, its labor and representation, its suffering and mortality, to conclude with the subject’s encounter with the other person, dealt with specifically in terms of eros, voluptuousness and fecundity.²³

Like Levinasian phenomenology, the kisceral mode of reasoning is built around a multitude of beliefs that are often formed in extra-numinous spaces. Gilbert explains: “That is, they (extra-numinous spaces) come from sensory computation that is very fast even though complex, and this results in an assessment of a situation or event without an *awareness* of cognition.”²⁴ He goes on to describe that the intuition to respond, one way or another, is derived “from a multitude of minuscule sensory clues [that] simply pop into one’s mind.”²⁵ Kisceral reasons “...are considered to be intuitions, and, secondly, they cannot be otherwise replicated in anything like their entirety.”²⁶ This intuition is similar

to Levinasian ethics and the inability to recreate intuition heightens the uniqueness of momentary dialogic connectivity.

Levinasian phenomenology differs from other philosophies in that it acknowledges the shared intersubjective life constituted in the social world.²⁷ For Levinas, the greatest event, the one that most effectively disrupts consciousness, is the face-to-face encounter with the Other. The Other lies at the core of intersubjectivity and summons a response in the moment via initial acknowledgement and direct address. Levinas approaches this kind of encounter through a multitude of themes including, but not limited to, alterity, ethics, responsibility, the saying, the said, the trace, time, and death.

Responding to the Call: An Intersubjective Risk of Immediacy

According to Bergo, Levinasian phenomenology “strips away accumulated layers of conceptualization, in order to reveal experience as it comes to light.”²⁸ Levinas suggests that the call comes from the Other’s existence or what can be understood as the most valuable resource of alterity. This intersubjective experience “proves ‘ethical’ in the simple sense that an ‘I’ discovers its own particularity when it is singled out by the gaze of the other.”²⁹ Levinas asserts that this gaze says “do not kill me” which proves to be vital, yet jarring, as one’s own humanity is faced with death.³⁰ The call or summons from the Other,

...is part of the intrinsic relationality. With the response comes the beginning of language as dialogue. The origin of language, for Levinas, is always response – a-responding-to-another, that is, to her summons. Dialogue arises ultimately through that response. Herein lie the roots of intersubjectivity as lived immediacy.³¹

The essence of dialogue for Levinas, according to Gardiner (1996), “is that it demands a response – not for what was said, its semantic content or descriptive elements, but in terms of the nature of the *relation* it forges.”³² Thus, for Levinas, it is the responsibility to the Other that presupposes articulated thought or self-awareness. Such a claim acknowledges why a phenomenological approach is needed to understand lived experience in which responsibility emerges prior to verbal formation. Factors such as intuition, connectedness, energy, and other non-sensory elements that derive from a synthesis of insight and experience become just as important as the spoken words in measuring its rhetorical effect. Furthermore, the relationship between the rhetor and audience should be taken into account. Levinas holds that the essence of dialogue is the relationship created in the responses between each side of the communication interaction. This call and response happens because of the visceral nature of face-to-face interaction. We are “interrupted” in the affective moment.

Levinas writes that, “It is the ethical interruption of essence that energizes the reduction,” of the intersubjective connection, exposing an “otherwise than being.”³³ In order to explore this assertion further, we must examine and acknowledge three components of Levinasian philosophy – the face, the saying, and the trace. The presence of the face is where the call is located as well as the place where the communication of the trace happens. Regarding the call and response, Levinas writes that, “[t]he other obligates a relationship by virtue of his or her presence...The other both commands through the presence and lays forth a vulnerability to which the self cannot help but respond.”³⁴ With the mere presence of the face of the other the self hears the ethical

summons “Where Art Thou?” Further, this call happens before any discursive communication is sent. “The face “speaks *to me* before and beyond speaking *about something*.”³⁵

Michael J. Hyde (2001) considers the face a rhetorical interruption, pointing to the significance of the pre-discursive call of the other. Levinas asserts: “When in the presence of the Other, I say “Here I am!” This, “Here I am!” is the place through which the Infinite enters into language, but without giving itself to be seen.”³⁶ Thus, how Kennedy’s face met and responded to the individuals in his audience, in the moment, becomes just as important as his overall gesture of responding to King’s death by physically facing an unknowing crowd. The call, for Hyde, is one of conscience that manifests as a rhetorical event. He writes,

The call of conscience calls for what it, itself, is: a saying/speaking that discloses the truth of something and does so in a compelling and thus moving way. With the call of conscience there comes the most primordial form of epideictic and eloquent discourse that there is.³⁷

The face, as a pre-discursive call, could be considered a visceral, emotional, and kisceral interruption in which one’s own consciousness is questioned “...as we agonize over the right thing to do and the right thing to say.”³⁸ This brings forth the multi-functionality of the communication interaction which often goes unrecognized because it defies direct translation. Therein lie the difficulties of acknowledging that the face of the Other is, at the most basic level, expressiveness. Such “affective interruptions” must be translated into common knowledge and understanding.³⁹ One way to do that is to compare it to “a force” as seen in the work of Gilbert’s kisceral argumentation which acknowledges the separation, yet interdependency, of what is spoken and unsaid.

Jovanovic & Wood offer an explanation of Levinas' ethical *saying* in relation to the ontological *said*:

Antecedent [or prior] to words, the *saying* is the commitment of an approach to the other, the move to response, the signifying of signification. Second, the saying moves into language where it is subordinated to the *said*. It is in the coordination of the *saying* and the *said* that ethics shows itself or is betrayed.⁴⁰

Therefore, the ethical move is not the *said* but rather the response right prior to discursive language. Here another indicator of the importance to consider non-sensory elements of the communicative act presents itself. The first message comes from the Other and this initial calling is the place in which the *saying* begins. But this is not to dismiss discourse as only discursive. As Levinas suggests,

All saying is direct discourse or a part of direct discourse... Directness of the face-to-face, a 'between us' [*entre-nous*], already conversation [*entre-tien*], already dialogue and hence distance and quite the opposite of the contact in which coincidence and identification occur. But this is precisely the *distance* of proximity, the marvel of the social relation.⁴¹

Therefore, the differences between I and the Other remain; however, it is how one approaches these differences with "non-indifference" that is of concern.⁴²

In explaining "non-indifference," Levinas offers that it is "[l]ike the non-indifference between close friends or relatives. Being concerned by the alterity of the other: fraternity....An extraordinary relation."⁴³ Thus, the connection of the *saying* can realize differences but does so without assigning meaning to those differences. Kennedy had to turn to his audience without seeming indifferent, that is, Kennedy could not have addressed them as "African Americans," especially not as "African Americans" that were most likely violent. With the rise of the Black Power movement and outbreak of race

riots across the country, evidence suggests that racialization in the United States was being discursively produced during the time of Kenney's Indianapolis appearance. To label them as Others is to totalize them. However, Kennedy's gesture resonated in his choice to recognize the alterity of the crowd but to also reject stereotypical assumptions and, for that moment, recognize the humanity with which he was confronted.⁴⁴

Understanding the volatile situation in which he had placed his white body at the mercy of a "racialized" space, Kennedy altered his message and delivered, extemporaneously, a compelling message.⁴⁵ Is this an instance in which "'whiteness' both recoiled from and dissembled toward a position not merely opposite, but tangent, to its own fragmentary-ness," as Perkinson says, a moment when a white man was "finally, briefly, made to look in the mirror of race and confront a gaze that looked back, but did not look alike?"⁴⁶ The risk emerges in the immediacy of the face-to-face encounter and is exposed through a phenomenological description.⁴⁷

Intersubjective Responsibility & Transcendence

It is Levinas' phenomenology of intersubjective responsibility "...that unfolds into dialogical sociality. It is also Levinas's unique way of defining transcendence in relation to the world and to what Heidegger called Being."⁴⁸ Levinas writes,

It is a responsibility that, without doubt, keeps the secret of sociality, whose total gravity – be it vain to the limit – is called "love of the neighbor" – that is, the very possibility of the unicity of the unique one (beyond the particularity of the individual in a genus). It is a love without concupiscence, but as irrefragable as death.⁴⁹

This is an ethical experience, an ethical phenomenology. In the vulnerable face of the Other one finds responsibility.

Ethics for Levinas is "...metaphysical responsibility, and exorbitant and infinite responsibility for other human beings, to care not for being, for the unraveling of its plot, but for what is beyond and against being, the alterity of the other person."⁵⁰ Levinas is not merely offering an ethics but an "ethics of ethics" that focuses on the role of the responsible self of the other/for the other/toward the other. Unlike previous ethicists and other moral theorists who have focused on the role of the self prior to the other, Levinas places emphasis on turning toward the other, constituting an ethics rather than offering a prescription for interaction. Such emphasis on the pre-discursive "turning toward" raises concerns as to the dimensions of such an ethical act. In other words, Levinasian ethics could be considered an expression that one must do something, not what it is that must be done.

Furthermore, Jovanovic and Wood (2004) offer that "...ethics is *otherwise than being*. The demand issued by the other is felt corporeally. It is, if you will, an ethical impulse or compulsion that disrupts, calls the self into a dialogical encounter."⁵¹ Levinas' notion of the call to responsibility reflects Kennedy's primacy of the experience over philosophical or theoretical reasoning. Nealon (1997) has written that "ethics is born and maintained through the necessity of response to the other person, and such responsiveness (which [Levinas] calls responsibility) comes necessarily before the solidification of any theoretical rules or political norms of ethical conduct."⁵²

This is similar to Levinas' intersubjective responsibility and transcendence via dialogical sociality, "The kisceral mode covers, in its simplest guise, the intuitive realm."⁵³ As Gilbert explains,

This mode can range far and wide over information covering everything from what is beautiful to what extrasensory experiences are valid, to the justification of nonsensory alethic propositions. Belief in the existence of a god, goddess or deity of some sort is an example of a common kisceral belief.⁵⁴

From talk of “presence” to “the very psyche” of Indianapolis, kisceral connectivity in the moment of Kennedy’s announcement comes forth in a variety of ways. “For Robert Kennedy to come and speak the way he did,” remembers John Lewis, was true to a dialogic experience. “He reached out and embraced the crowd and the crowd embraced him.”⁵⁵ Lewis also acknowledges extra-sensory experiences affecting his interpretation of the effectivity that connected Kennedy to the Indianapolis crowd:

I think his rare presence; his speech had a cooling effect on the very psyche of the people of that city. I know even I have what I call an executive session with myself. I said we don't have MLK Jr. but we still have Robert Kennedy.⁵⁶

This memory provides proof that the kisceral mode, when he notes the “rare presence” that influenced the “psyche” of a city, was operating in the transcendent moment. The visceral, found in the “cooling effect,” joined the logical in “an executive session” to produce an emotional effect weighing in on the immediate claims of the event overall. The multiplicity of such modes of reasoning, found operating for each audience member, is infinite.

Additionally, there were some audience members who were more moved by a kisceral force saturated in religious reason. “I think that he [Kennedy] was a deeply religious person,” says Jim Tolan. “I think that he was a very strong, believing, practicing Catholic. I believe that he suffered when his brother was killed and I think that he emerged from that suffering a different person.”⁵⁷ Tolan goes on to equate the

religious backing to possible reasons of why Kennedy was able to connect with the audience:

So I think the fact that he was a deeply religious person, the fact that he suffered and he saw other people suffering, and the fact that for the first time I think he knew he had to stand on his two feet and do something. He had these feelings. He had these inclinations. He had this commitment that was imposed upon him because of his religious beliefs. He had to do something. And I think he saw a way to do it was by getting into and by being an elected official and then having the power to do things positively.⁵⁸

Tolan acknowledges Kennedy's "inclinations" which presented a "call" or summons "that was imposed on him because of his religious beliefs." The backing for this intuitive mode is derived from the same places you would find support for the visceral and emotional modes of reasoning. However, as noted by Gilbert,

The visceral mode offers options based on field acceptance that is only mildly mirrored in the other modes. By this I mean that one can be more or less religious, mystical, new age, other-worldly, or what have you. Depending on the degree of one's subscription and commitment to such a field, the backing will vary.⁵⁹

Thus, as one's level of belief in an extra-sensory realm of evidence (such as religion, astrology, etc.) is shifted, so to moves the relative force of the backing material.

There are some audience members, however, who reported little to no visceral impact. "I never thought it was that special a moment," explains Forestal. He continues:

At the time I didn't. It's probably like any other political gathering. I never thought I would be as special as it is... I guess as time goes on, it becomes a special moment. People have come to town and have just gone by there to see it. I can't remember it being a special time. We had planned to meet the senator at the airport and take him up there before King's assassination happened. It was really just like another political rally.⁶⁰

As evidenced in the visceral chapter, Jerome Forestal was overwhelmed with visceral impact as he stood shoulder to shoulder with Kennedy. Perhaps, this is why the visceral impact lies far from the foreground of his own reflective reasoning. Either way, the essential point is that critical analysis should not withhold attention to one mode over another. “It’s finding magic in that one bottled event,” reflects Anatol.⁶¹

While the visceral force of reasoning remains unique per individual, it remains clear, in these few examples, that there was some kind of extra-sensory connectivity that happened in the moment of Kennedy’s announcement. The most demanding place in which we see the visceral nature of connective argument in this case, lives within King’s legacy. “He gave us hope. He gave us a way out,” reflects Darlene Howard:

“He taught us the way of love, the way of peace, the way of non-violence and our country is a better country because of MLK Jr., and we are a better people because of Dr. King. I see Dr. MLK, Jr., as one of the founding fathers of the new America if it hadn't been for MLK, Jr. I don't know what would have happened to our nation. I don't know what would have happened to me as an individual as a human being. He freed me. He liberated me. He freed our nation and liberated us all.”⁶²

Death, Canonization, and Memory: The Rhetorical Implications of Shifting Grief

With the assassination of King, the process of canonization begins almost instantaneously. Already recognized as the prominent leader of the civil rights movement, King, upon assassination, was quickly elevated to heroic status. Additionally, as evidenced by both the lives of Kennedy and King, martyred heroes never really die; rather, they live on through memories, which allow their legacies take on a life of their own.⁶³ It will be argued that the shift in temperament was a result of community grief that celebrated King’s legacy of nonviolence in light of his tragic passing. Such a legacy,

activated in visceral reasoning, redefines our political space to exist in dialogic conversation with each other despite difference.

Acknowledging that Kennedy was announcing the assassination of King becomes an essential component of analyzing the rhetorical strategies used that night in 1968. Considering the shift from a celebratory gathering (to gain political support) to one immersed in grief, shock, and sadness is imperative. Kennedy, upon finding out of King's death, was faced with a different circumstantial situation that could not be dismissed. Such a shift, and the response of Kennedy and his audience, puts forth ethical implications of momentary rendering.

Levinasian Death and a Call of Legacy

Levinas "sees in death and mortality not the uttermost possibility of subjectivity, but a countermovement against subjectivity."⁶⁴ Through this shift Levinas finds time, another important concept within Levinasian phenomenology. As noted by Cohen, Levinas began to speak on time in his work *Existence and Existents*,

...in terms of an escape from subjectivity, subjectivity's desire to get out of itself, to rid itself of itself, to "save" itself from the mastery and burden of its material self-relationship as a distinct existent. The instant has no past or future, it is fragile, evanescent, worldless, and thus sees in the past and future, in the horizons of the world, in the dialectic of temporal horizons, an exit from itself.⁶⁵

A person finds her/himself, her/his grief, her/his compassion, her/his understanding only "...in the ecstatic movement which seems to offer the promise of an escape outside of itself....Ecstatic time delays rather than disrupts the time of subjectivity; it is postponement of immediacy rather than a deposition of immanence.

For Levinas it is insufficiently other.”⁶⁶ Death evokes an immediate claim that summons an ethical response from the kisceral realm. Levinas writes:

Dying is agony because in dying a being does not come to end while coming to an end; he has no more time, that is, can no longer wend his way anywhere, but thus he goes where one cannot go, suffocates – how much longer...⁶⁷

According to Cohen, the future does not come from “out of me in my being-toward-death,” but, rather, “comes *at* me, ungraspable, outside my possibilities, not as the mystery of death but as the very *mystery* of the death which always come to take me against my will, too soon.”⁶⁸ Such a relationship with the mystery of death, which resides outside of one’s control, is to see death as mystery in the alterity of the Other.

“My solitude is thus not confirmed by death but broken by it,” Levinas explains.⁶⁹ That alterity begins, of course, with the Other. “Thus Levinas discovers the alterity of the future not in death as a possibility, which is insufficiently other to escape the subject’s self-presence,” writes Cohen, “and is even the very dynamism, the very courage, resoluteness, or mastery of self-presence, but in death as *mystery*, and mystery as the alterity of the other person.”⁷⁰ Thus, the response of both Kennedy and his audience to King’s death becomes a place for kisceral reasoning.

Even though the audience actively experienced the announcement of King’s death it is also likely that King’s legacy (particularly, his legacy of nonviolence) was accepted and understood via cultural visions and aspirations shared among individuals participating in the event. Also of concern is how King, as an iconic figure, contributed to Indianapolis remaining nonviolent as part of the overall rhetorical effect. When

considering public figures as agents of social meaning by way of public speech acts, how one is situated in the complexities of social and cultural relationships is of interest.

The Martyred King

“He became iconic even before he was murdered, because he was built up, not inappropriately, but he was built up as the maximum leader if you will. As the major leader in the black community.”⁷¹ King’s death ignites a memory of an archetypal figure that favors peace over violence. “He was one of the most moving people our country has ever seen,” Lloyd Milliken explains, emphasizing the visceral energy that was evoked through the canonization of this leader. King “energized, not only the movement, but made people who were not necessarily involved in the movement and maybe were even opposed to it, realized that there was no stopping this.” For Milliken, “King is one of the great men of the twentieth century. Not only in the United States, but in the World.”⁷²

How can iconic figures employ a rhetorical persona that masks the individual person via symbolic relationships, ideas, and experiences? With Martin Luther King, his persona changed after his death. His “I Have a Dream” speech supplanted the “villain” King who spoke on poverty and against the Vietnam War.⁷³ Evaluation of King’s persona as one that is presented as a rhetorical archetype of nonviolence, illustrates how other features, such as King’s legacy, contributes to the overall construction of its rhetorical effect of nonviolence. By recognizing the value of a constitutive rhetoric by way death, canonization, and memory we move closer to understanding how shifting community grief can re-create a space primed for ethical response.

Because “King embodied accomplishment,” reflects Billie Breaux, it was easy for the Indianapolis audience to reflect his heroic legacy in times of distress—even at the time of his death. Breaux continues:

He also set the standard for all people working together. He also seemed to put others before himself. He seemed to be, again, a person who was more concerned about doing the right thing for the right reasons, rather than just to give him a mic and to let him speak. In a sense, he was our inspiration. He was our hope that this world was beginning to change and that there would be a new day for all America. We put all of our hopes and dreams into his dream.⁷⁴

Breaux, along with several members of Kennedy’s audience, embraced the public memory of the iconic and inspirational leader of the civil rights movement. “Dr. MLK Jr., this young black Baptist preacher meant everything. This man gave us hope in a time of hopelessness. He had the ability to bring light to dark places.”⁷⁵ There are those, however, who realized “...that one might have had the feeling that there was some undo glorification, first because he had been murdered so the deserved position he had was even enhanced in his memory.”⁷⁶ However, Edelman continues,

But also, because for a lot of people, that was really a short hand for a larger set of social forces that had taken place. When they said Dr. King, many of them even understood, even if they didn't say it, that they were talking about Dr. King plus millions of other people who wouldn't have been as active without him, but without their activism he wouldn't have been the leader.⁷⁷

For the most part, with assassination, canonization begins immediately. This triggers an extra-sensory awakening of kisceral reasoning that makes way for momentary renderings of dialogic connectivity. “We were in the midst of a campaign and we, all of us, one way or another had some connections with Dr. King,” offers John Lewis.

Some of us knew Dr. King better than others. For me he was my hero. He was my friend he was my big brother. He had inspired me and if it hadn't been for Dr. King I don't know what would have happened to me. Both Robert Kennedy and MLK, Jr., had emerged as people that I really believed in.⁷⁸

What is one to do with mystical canonization? Edwin Black is the first scholar to move rhetorical criticism away from case-based research to one that makes political and moral judgments.⁷⁹ Case-based research is concerned with whether or not the rhetor was able to translate a position and a direct message to the audience. In addition, the conditions that make that transaction possible are evaluated to measure the success of the communication interaction. Black suggests that critics should examine moral judgment and whether or not it measures up to ideology. Black is interested in a move toward the investigation of language for what moral effect discourse could possibly have. Ideology is at the level of perception, and perception is not only understood but is shaped by language. Perception, combined with the notion that ideology is our practical consciousness, reveals the second persona as the person *being* discourse (and not just responding to it). When Kennedy evoked the legacy of King by offering the audience a choice to react in a nonviolent, compassionate, King-like way, it is evident that King's second persona, as one who is *being* nonviolence, was desired. Kennedy stated,

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization -- black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and to comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread out across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion and love.⁸⁰

Consideration of how the ideology of the Indianapolis audience aligned with Kennedy's evocation of King's second persona, of *being* nonviolence, contributes to the

idea of kisceral reasoning. Such an exploration will lead to the discovery of how political figures can use rhetorical persona to evoke positive (and ethical) ways of being in and through discourse. Furthermore, through the second persona the audience (both actual and implied) is present in the construction of the message. How the Indianapolis audience (as well as Kennedy's implied audience) perceived and accepted King's nonviolent legacy furthers understanding of the multiple components of the peaceful rhetorical effect. King was best known for his nonviolent efforts in the civil rights movement and the Indianapolis audience chose to respond in honor of the man who stood for peace and compassion.⁸¹ "As they say he would have rolled over in his grave [if the crowd erupted in violence]. He was a peaceful man," offers Howard.⁸²

"What King means is nothing but a manifestation of God, again, showing in a human personality, in a being, and a man of color, and of culture, the purpose of faith, and justice, and love," reflects Rev. Thomas L. Brown. Acknowledging the mystical presence of King's legacy that was present and operating in its rhetorical effect, Brown explains,

That you can't kill it. You may kill the body, but guess what? It transitions in a whole other dimension, a whole other world, a whole other cosmos. King and many others of all nationalities live in a whole new dimension of being that we cannot comprehend until we become free of fears. It is like King means to black people and everybody, liberation, holistic liberation—mind, body, and spirit.⁸³

The kisceral impact of the argument then begins to see light "in a whole other cosmos", "holistic liberation", and "spirit", as well as in an "awareness and then drive to do it." As Robinson reflects, "I think it's the drive...higher than us and the ability to

achieve it certainly comes from a power higher from us. And only from connecting to that power do you get that.”⁸⁴ However, Robinson reminds that,

Knowing and being aware is one thing but caring is another. And I think that that’s the difference I guess in people like Bobby Kennedy, John Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, people who actually do something....people don't care about what you know unless they know how much you care. And if you put your knowledge into that framework and show how much you care based upon how much you know, then you can make a difference.⁸⁵

Such a focus on care is reflective of Levinasian philosophy. As the late Representative Julia Carson reminds, “So when people live, my opinion has always been that they shouldn't live for themselves, they should live for others.”⁸⁶ And in the wake of King’s death, his legacy called for an ethical response of nonviolence. This call resonated in the kisceral spirit. “I was happy to have been there but I was more happy to have known King and to have spent several fleeting moments with him and to have caught a spirit that radiated from him,” offers Ron Haldeman.⁸⁷

“Certainly you could get some impression, some feeling for how he impacted the citizens of the city of Indianapolis and particularly how black folk, like myself, identified with that presence,” reflects Rozelle Boyd.

So that it is understandable what the reaction was, not only here in the city of Indianapolis but perhaps some more severe reactions if you will in other places around the country. He carried a mantra with him that was just a very impactful. You knew that you were in the presence of a giant. To have lost that giant [...] had more of an impact than most people will ever know.⁸⁸

Non-violence was reemphasized throughout Kennedy’s address. As interpreted by Carson, Kennedy said,

“As we stand here today and as we stand here tonight, as we're feeling violent because we have been violated, we have got to perpetuate the thought and the character and the personality of Martin Luther King by not reacting violently to what was very obviously a violent situation.” So he said “take his philosophy of non-violence and make that then the theme for the evening. Make that the theme for the future.” The best way, and I know I may be over interpreting him here, but the best way to show homage to this man is to not become violent in a situation in which more than most would sort of justify violence in. He was concerned that there would be non-violence.”⁸⁹

What Carson was interpreting is the visceral nature of Kennedy's argument in which intersubjective connectivity resides in King's legacy. “In other cities, Chicago, big cities, they were burning the towns down. We didn't do that. I think we realized it wouldn't recall MLK. It wouldn't solve anything. So I was proud of Indianapolis.”⁹⁰ This remarkable force, unique to Indianapolis and evoked in the presence of King's legacy, allowed the political space to exist in dialogic conversation, creating an overall grieving community within moments of the news of King's death.

A Decorous Occasion: A Grieving Community

“To me the natural reaction was to mourn and I think that's what most people did,” remembers Robinson. “That decided you know he didn't die for nothing...the words that Bobby spoke were words that made sense.”⁹¹ Recognizing the power of King's legacy embedded in his own reasoning process, Robinson continues, “What we need is what Martin Luther King was standing for. So if you were going to do anything, let's do something in that mode, in that name.”⁹² Mourning, taken as political or apolitical, can reflect both positive and negative meanings.

Originally delivered at the cemetery upon the death of Levinas, Jacques Derrida's

Adieu highlights the fundamental characteristics of human beings:

Often those who come forward to speak, to speak publicly, thereby interrupting the animated whispering, the secret or intimate exchange that always links one, deep inside, to a dead friend or master, those who make themselves heard in a cemetery, end up addressing *directly, straight on*, the one who, as we say, is no longer, is no longer living, no longer there, who will no longer respond. With tears in their voices, they sometimes speak familiarly to the other who keeps silent, calling upon him without detour or mediation, apostrophizing him, even greeting him or confiding in him.⁹³

Derrida's eulogy, similar to Kennedy's announcement of King's death, makes clear the relevance of summoning someone that exists in the visceral. In the face of death, we see our own (and others) mortality. The lesson with suffering is that it helps us to better understand the suffering of others. Derrida continues, acknowledging the faults of language, namely its constrictive nature, and the possible effects on a suffering community:

It is rather so as to traverse speech at the very point where words fail us, since all language that would return to the self, to us, would seem indecent, a reflexive discourse that would end up coming back to the stricken community, to its consolation or its mourning, to what is called, in a confused and terrible expression, "the work of mourning."⁹⁴

The situational context presented an opportunity for community mourning. Such a decorous occasion calls for a specific response; and as Derrida reminds us, for Levinas, the response is an " 'unlimited' responsibility that exceeds and precedes my freedom, that of an 'unconditional yes.' "⁹⁵ In the face of King's death, his audience was met with a Levinasian call of responsibility that was connected to his legacy of nonviolence. There

“...was a lot of unbelief. And there were people that were really, that were upset,” reflects Boyd.

But the majority of people were so grief stricken I think that it was, they were like me, they had more of a sense to go home, to mourn... I wanted to go home and be with my family. There was a sense of loss. That's what I felt and that's what motivated me to go home.⁹⁶

The funeral-like setting enhanced a sense of community in which individuals, collectively experiencing the event, could bond. “Because that was a very emotional situation for all of the people in the crowd,” offers Boyd, “And, again, you have to think in terms of this primarily black crowd in a black community, primarily a democratic crowd receiving a democratic candidate. All of those things sort of blended in to a sense of community, “Hey, it’s us.”⁹⁷

The mourning that occurred in the wake of Kennedy’s announcement in place of violent outbursts is a key component to its rhetorical effectivity. “There was people to whom I was reaching out that I would hug and it was almost a case, in many instances, of parents saying to their children, children saying to their parents, “Hey, we've got to get by this,” recalls Boyd. “It's the worst thing in the world that could have possibly happened at this time, but we have got to get by it.” Boyd continues,

There was a sense of community in that group that you would have not been able to get at any other setting. It's sort of like [being] uncomfortably close to a funeral situation where people gather who have not seen, talked to each other in perhaps years, but who in that circumstance feel a different kind of spirit, a kindred spirit if you will. Well certainly this was something that was very prevalent during that time in Indianapolis, particularly on the scene. We are all the losers in this kind of situation and we need to address it as best we can. We need to digest it as best we can.⁹⁸

What was happening in the Indianapolis community was yielding to what Derrida stated to those gathered at Levinas' funeral:

Today, I draw from this that our infinite sadness must shy away from everything in mourning that would turn toward nothingness, that is, toward what still, even potentially, would link guilt to murder. Levinas indeed speaks of the survivor's guilt, but it is a guilt without fault and without debt; it is, in truth, an *entrusted responsibility*, entrusted in a moment of unparalleled emotion, at the moment when death remains the absolute ex-ception.⁹⁹

Members in Kennedy's audience, experiencing a kisceral connectivity or ethical summons through spiritual provocation, answered the call for genuine compassion. "We would have been the ones that would have instituted, would have initiate a violent reaction," offers William Crawford, "but the way Bobby and the sincerity of his shared pain. We didn't know what to do, but we know we had to commit ourselves to doing something and so that just led to increased community activism."¹⁰⁰

Conclusion: The Trace of Kisceral Reasoning

Rhetorical effectivity is one element of this great speech; even more so, it offers that one cannot understand the power of this speech without an understanding of a unique dialogic moment. "That night was kind of, as I look back it, like it didn't happen," reflects John Lewis.

I mean, I know I was there, and I know kind of what I did, but it's not real that that night happened. We know it happened, I know the people who were there, I know pretty much what I did, but still to this day, it's just one of those things that you just don't believe it happened and you were there. Just two months later, the Senator's killed. You tie those things together and you wonder what is that all about...but it was a strange feeling.¹⁰¹

The trace, a third element in Levinas' philosophy, used here to better understand the import of the relationship built in and through response, can be conceived as a metaphorically lingering gift—something that can be detected through tone or the sense from the infinite other. Through an examination of tone, one is better able to measure if the move to capture that infinity was successful or not. The trace is where you see the call of responsibility through an “unheard question.”¹⁰² The self experiences the saying through the trace, as seen in the communication of the face. This can be done verbally through language, including voice and tone, or the trace can reveal the saying nonverbally or through non-discursive communication such as facial expressions or gestures. The trace beckons an interruption “...and arouses a desire to move toward the other, not knowing what may come.”¹⁰³

With the trace, Levinas evokes infinity and “...signifies presence in absence.”¹⁰⁴ The trace itself challenges rational thought and is ambiguous.¹⁰⁵ Thus, it is nonsensical and belongs to a peripheral mode of communication. The trace of the saying is what compels Kennedy to illustrate his sincerity through the words he speaks as well as points to the intuitiveness of Kennedy's response. The non-sensory elements, such as grief and legacy, are also important features in assessing the trace.

Noticing that the description of the call and the face are entangled in the immediate moment it is necessary to consider the relationship between discourse and these Levinasian elements. Levinas informs us:

Face and discourse are tied. The face speaks. It speaks, it is in this that it renders possible and begins all discourse. I have just refused the notion of vision to describe the authentic relationship with the

Other; it is discourse and, more exactly, response or responsibility which is this authentic relationship.¹⁰⁶

Following Levinas, the trace can be seen through the communication of the face. “MLK, Jr. would have been very disappointed in all of the violence that occurred after and because of his death around the nation,” reflects Adam Walinsky, “but he would have been very proud of the order and the sense of peace and tranquility that existed in Indianapolis.”¹⁰⁷

Sincerity is also an important element to consider in the discussion of the saying. Levinas states that, “[s]incerity is not an attribute of saying; it is saying that realizes sincerity.”¹⁰⁸ Hence, the reasoning behind this project’s phenomenological methodology which focuses on the often unrecognized modes of rhetoric and the assumption that lived experience involves feelings. As Jovanovic & Wood (2004) assert,

Speech is far from sophistry. Communication is instead the sacrifice of moving from the safety of the self toward the knowing possibilities that the other presents. Speech has its roots at the bedrock of ethics, always aimed outward toward another.... We have often treated the elements of communication that lie beyond the message as mere meta-communication or bodily action that supports the message. To get to the heart of ethics, the saying, and communication, scholars should look to tone, to voice, to body, and to other unarticulated traces of answerability that signals responsibility of the self to the other. There we might detect the residue of the saying that carries forward from the place of ethics.¹⁰⁹

Though the logical spoken word is a fundamental piece of the communicative interaction, the other, extra-sensory and perhaps non-logical, modes are frequently involved in the communication act. In the case of Kennedy’s Indianapolis speech, the persuasive force included in his announcement of King’s death is driven by the presence of King’s nonviolent legacy. The visceral nature of the argument, reflected in the

community grief, redefines the political space of mourning to exist in dialogic conversation with each other, despite differences. Considering the emotional state of Kennedy, his audience, and the intersubjective connectivity between the two, becomes as relevant as the logistic and visceral reasoning of his address. In turn, we move toward the concept of dialogic rhetoric.

Chapter Seven: The Conclusion

Dialogic Dimensions of Kennedy's Announcement: Authentic Connection in the Situational Moment

Kennedy's Indianapolis appearance is an exemplar account of how an encompassing view of rhetorical effect can contribute to the study of argument. Kennedy, aware of the frequent racial outbursts in urban communities, as well as his obligation to bring hope of unity and reconciliation, addressed a mostly African American audience at a moment of crisis when the race relations, not just in the Hoosier capital but also across the United States, was tumultuous. Whether Kennedy's address helped quell violence in Indianapolis as violence erupted in cities across the nation cannot be answered absolutely. However, investigating Kennedy's address through a phenomenological account of argument allows for a better understanding of how rhetorical effectivity is multidimensional.

"He [Kennedy] came and spoke as if he were speaking in your living room to you alone," reflects Jim Trulock. This audience member, recognizing the authenticity of the moment, was impressed with the connection he felt with the speaker. Trulock continues,

[It was as if] He was talking to me. He was talking to the lady next to me. He was talking to the kids down in front. He was talking to each one of us...and the demeanor of it was such...it seemed to me that everybody knew that yeah, he's talking right to me. He's talking about a basic human thing all of a sudden.¹

When analyzing the overall reaction from his audience members, it becomes clear that those present at Kennedy's speech in Indianapolis are less likely to remember exactly what was said. Instead, based on the collection of oral histories used in this study, it is more likely that the emotional tone and/or "feeling" of the entire event is remembered. This moves the rhetorical effect beyond Kennedy's words and into the realm of extra-sensory embodied emotions that exist in the relational nature of argumentation.

Kennedy's Indianapolis speech demonstrates a way in which honorable aspirations via words *and feelings* can be achieved through communication interaction. When a rhetor makes a speech, he is acting in an episode in a social drama, living in and responding to society. In order to expand the understanding of the communicative patterns of the speaker and the audience, rhetorical scholars must move beyond traditional rhetorical analysis to pursue a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity. Furthermore, because of the role of social transformations and ideological assumptions involved in dialogue, one must be open to an array of disciplinary works (i.e., argumentation studies, communication ethics, critical cultural studies, historiography, foundational philosophy, etc.). As communication researchers, we should welcome multiple perspectives and theoretical insight if we are *truly* concerned with how discourse circulates, creates, and influences reason.

By using a phenomenological perspective we can begin to locate exceptional times when terms of subjectivity can be temporarily suspended in a moment of true dialogic rhetoric. Such opportunities for convergence, as found in this case, can reside in moments of calamity via ethical calls to act (or re-act) with regard to an Other(s).

Emotional outbursts, often signified by visceral feelings, help us locate these rare moments of authentic connectivity—and certainly, spoken discourse often directs us to those emotional feelings. The theoretical payoff is a new account for argumentation and rhetoric—one that fully integrates the logical, emotional, visceral and kisceral modes of argumentation: a dialogic rhetoric.²

The aim of such a rhetoric is to bring about understanding and agreement between individuals across multiple dimensions of reasoning as experienced in the immediate situation. In doing so, the problematic concerning the politics of difference is addressed. Such politics—of race, class, and/or gender—resonate in the situational context of communication interaction and, in turn, create real social, political, cultural, and historical problems. The question of how to overcome such differences in order to further understanding between groups and/or individuals, even if only in exceptional moments, becomes a key contribution of this work.

A closer look at dialogic rhetoric, through the various elements at work on April 4, 1968, reveals the types of reasoning that *actually* occur in authentic connections. From this, communication scholars, particularly argumentation theorists, can see the foundational significance of relational constitution and contextual immediacy presented through extra-sensory discourse in the creation of consequential messages. This project also provides a clear example of how the instrumental approach to message construction and criticism relies on, and lives within, the constitutive nature of discourse. Scholars interested in uncovering the ethics of a communication exchange or those moved to describe the contextual residue of rhetorical effectivity—whether it is connection,

prejudice, enlightenment, reconciliation, or violence, etc. – would also benefit from this work.

A Dialogic Rhetoric: Using Phenomenology to Understand April 4, 1968

Dialogic rhetoric embraces the constitutive and relational nature of arguments by exposing the multidimensionality of reasoning embodied in emotional connective energy. The impact of the message is found in the situational context as the risk of the immediate claim is heightened by the visceral display of emotion. Exposing such extraordinary moments of dialogic connection, despite difference, allows, at minimum, opportunities to see rhetorical effectivity as a dynamic exchange unique to participating individuals. As such, it is necessary to have a willingness to explore a variety of approaches to scholarship in order to fully understand the phenomenological character of dialogic rhetoric.

Rhetoric and Phenomenology: A Likely Pair?

Dialogic rhetoric and the convergence between the philosophical and rhetorical provide an opportunity for the production of a form of dialogical critical reason. The discussion of convergence reflects on the resistance to bring together multiple viewpoints and theoretical insights because it could hinder the creation of new concepts, such as dialogic rhetoric. Many scholars have worked to understand the importance of combining various perspectives while still maintaining the individuality of the disciplinary histories and assumptions. Following is a brief summary of the ongoing discussion of how philosophy could benefit from the rhetorical tradition and how, in turn, rhetoric can learn from philosophical insight.

One way to frame the debate between philosophy and rhetoric is to present them as competing versions of critical rhetoric. Setting the postmodern parameters of the debate, Angus and Langsdorf write:

Philosophy has oscillated between a commitment to an architectonic of knowledge and a skeptical denial of generalizable knowledge-claims. In being divided between these two extremes, philosophy has tended to evacuate the space of practical action that rhetoric has claimed – usually with reference to a pragmatic criterion of truth.³

The continuum of philosophical reason, which, on one end, is the steps or building blocks to knowledge and, on the other, rejection of generalizable knowledge claims, leaves open a critique for lack of representation of human experience. Rhetoric can fill the space left open by philosophy through a linguistic turn to resolve the “...dualities of reason and speech, knowledge and persuasion, truth and opinion.”⁴ Critical reason, for rhetoricians, is found in human interaction and lived experience, whereas the philosophical tradition holds reason as a “logic of logics” or way of being in the world. A disciplinary convergence is beneficial both modes because rhetoric and philosophy extend into and essentially need one another.

Understanding that self articulates ways of being, and purposes for a particular way of being, through language; then a place for rhetoric in philosophical understanding emerges. Regarding the influence of language on human interaction, Lenore Langsdorf writes:

In speaking and then in the cognition inferred as the interior of that speaking, a personality is indicated, referred to, mentioned, even summoned. The product of this linguistic activity is the self, constituted by words about it. In sum, the self is cited in language; it owes its being to its being said.⁵

Langsdorf goes on to suggest that the rhetorical saying and the philosophical seeing are working together to present new opportunities for defining the self, which is one essential side to the dialogic pair. The self interacts with an Other/s and, in some moments, experiences a transcendent connection. Defining the self through language allows for interactions with the world and contributes to meaning and construction of social response.

Michael J. Hyde describes the self as one that answers the call of conscience or rhetorical interruption and works to illustrate the convergence between philosophy and rhetoric by framing the discussion in terms of the call of conscience and the practice of rhetoric. He writes that, philosophical theories

...encourage one to see how the call of conscience requires the development of rhetorical competency, of knowing how to evoke from others a response to a particular situation so as to...promote reasonable judgment and civic virtue [which] thereby lends itself to the task of enriching the moral character of a people's communal existence.⁶

Through his work, Hyde acknowledges that the theories of Heidegger and Levinas posit a negative reflection of rhetoric, aligning with the longstanding tradition of philosophy in opposition to rhetoric. Hyde rejects the prejudiced perception of rhetoric and suggests that much is to be learned about a phenomenon through both the philosophical and the rhetorical tradition. Stating "that the call of conscience is a rhetorical interruption in its purest form," Hyde directs attention to the "movement of the rhetoric" or its "intentionality" which is similar to "that primordial movement of human existence (being for) that forms the basis of morality."⁷

Dialogic Rhetoric: A Philosophical Account

Dialogic rhetoric is more descriptive than prescriptive and holds no universalistic code of ethics above another. It is situational and context-based, which reflects the uniqueness or once-occurrent component of the interaction. Through the philosophical insight of Bakhtin, Levinas, and Buber, the phenomenology of dialogic rhetoric can be further explicated.

Bakhtin states the importance of the “once-occurrent act of being” as well as calls attention to the emotional-volitional tone of an utterance.⁸ The work of Bakhtin also offers insight into the convergence between beings through discussion of a “centripetal/centrifugal” fusion and brings attention to the idea of answerability—an essential element of ethical behavior.⁹ With emphasis on the relationship forged in response to the Other, Levinasian phenomenology draws upon the once-occurrent connection. Levinas, highlighting the pre-discursive turn to answer the call of the Other, also triggers consideration of non-sensory or meta-communicative elements often left out of rhetorical discussion.¹⁰ Buber reinforces the uniqueness of the single moment by elevating it to almost a spiritual level, a spontaneous act of communication.¹¹ Dialogue, in this sense, takes over and shapes itself in the immediate rather than following restrictive rules or structure.

For Buber, the dialogical influence resides in the moment in which the rhetor gives up control by turning towards the audience in an effort to be present. In order for dialogue to occur, “the rhetor [must] turn toward and attend to the partner’s address...the rhetor must make the partner present...and the rhetor must respond unreservedly from his or her base of lived truth without seeming.”¹² Each person is unique and separated from

all others because each possesses unique values, opinions, and experiences. For Buber, dialogue is the rapturous moment of realization that one is separate from all others but can still come together for some understanding, in the moment, before returning to the separated self.

Buber elevates dialogue to a sacred level which indicates the presence of the extra-sensory (or kisceral) features of argument. Kaufmann writes of Buber's *I/Thou*:

The central stress falls on You – not Thou. God is present when I confront You. But if I look away from You, I ignore him. As long as I merely experience or use you, I deny God. But when I encounter You I encounter him.¹³

Here is evidence of Buber's assertion that one finds God through people, or what Levinas would term "the face of the Other." Dialogue is a moment in real time that lets us fully expose ourselves, unreservedly, in the immediacy of the interaction. It forwards themes of openness, purity, and other-worldliness. Of more importance is Buber's emphasis on dialogue as a way of being with the Other. Hyde and Bineham (2000) offer that dialogue is a relational space, indicating that it also operates as a form of discourse. They connect this ontological aspect to the work of Buber by considering "the *between*, the *interhuman*, and the *I-Thou*."¹⁴ Their analysis presents themes of trust, connectedness, presence, and understanding which are derived from the shared experience of living.

Buber's writes, "The essential act that here establishes directness is usually understood as a feeling, and thus misunderstood. Feelings accompany the metaphysical and the feelings that accompany it can be very different."¹⁵ Just as Levinas presented the pre-discursive turning toward the Other and Bakhtin discussed the idea of the emotional-

volitional tone, Buber offers feelings as an essential component of dialogue. Discourse, then, is more than words. Discourse provides, creates, and circulates meaning and is not restricted to representational verbal expressions. Conceptual excursions that explore argumentation from multiple viewpoints, with particular attention paid to the extra-sensory and sometimes pre-discursive, contribute to the ethical dimension of communication studies.

Taken together and focusing on dialogue, the philosophical insights of Bakhtin, Levinas, and Buber highlight the role of the Other in the communicative interaction. Discourse is created by and for an Other, for multiple Others, at different, yet multiple moments or in turns in time.¹⁶ Thus, understanding the importance of the relational nature of the situational context or the once-occurrent moment, along with the extra-sensory elements that operate in and through argumentation, is intrinsic to a rhetorical approach of argumentation.

Situational Context and Immediate Claims

“Everything that I have to do with is given to me in an emotional-volitional tone,” writes Bakhtin, “for everything is given to me as a constituent moment of the event in which I’m participating.”¹⁷ Bakhtin’s emotional-volitional tone situates and gives meaning to the extra-sensory or often outlying features of an argument which gain force by considering his conception of the “once-occurrent act of being.” Levinas and Buber illuminate the importance of immediate situational context in measuring its rhetorical effect. With these ideas in mind, we can apply this to Kennedy’s success in connecting

the experience of the announcement to the individuals actively engaged with it. In this way, Kennedy was able to overcome ambiguity and create a dialogic moment.

The immediacy of the situational context can be understood by considering Bakhtin's notion of the once-occurrent act of being. "All that which is theoretical or aesthetic," writes Bakhtin, "must be determined as a constituent moment in the once-occurrent event of being..."¹⁸ Further, Buber's philosophy of dialogue which "focuses on concrete, once-only human meetings whose point is the meeting itself and whose encounters cannot be strategically planned," is relevant to the understanding dialogic rhetoric as a moment rather than an ongoing phenomenon.¹⁹ For Levinas, dialogue is the ethical choice in which shared communication brings about a shared understanding. This shared understanding is a progression toward the ultimate truth by suspending one's personal beliefs by taking into consideration the interests of the Other.

Levinas also emphasizes the importance of the "present act of being" in dialogic encounters and states that, in the moment, one is answerable to the other. Because there are two sides to a communicative act, both of which hold subjective differences, it is important to recognize that the points of connectivity where individuals open up to the other in effort of unity are exceptional. Therefore, locating dialogue in a rhetorical approach to argumentation becomes the next task at hand.

Locating Dialogue in a Rhetorical Approach to Argumentation

In considering communication as a social phenomenon in which reality is symbolically constructed through rhetoric, it is important to consider that some constructions have more power and resonance than others. Further, if reason is

considered rhetorical, it too is socially constructed and, as a result, some reasons have more force than others. Thus, a new conception of rhetoric as an art of diverse and comparative ideas is necessary and would expand the traditional conception of rhetoric as an art of persuasive measures. A dialogic rhetoric which considers the speaker, the listener, *and* the relationship between the two works towards understanding the intellectual exchange in constructing reality claims. As one makes a claim, that claim, in part, becomes validated in and through the acceptance by another person/s. This project presents dialogic rhetoric as one conceivable means as to how that acceptance comes to be validated.

Dialogue is a complex concept and has been perceived in various ways by various scholars. According to Anderson, Cissna, & Arnett, “Dialogue is a dimension of communication quality that keeps communicators more focused on mutuality and relationship than on self interest, more concerned with discovering truth than with disclosing, more interested in access than in domination.”²⁰ Further, “...dialogue is a joint performance wherein participants are responsive to each other and to their environment.”²¹ Dialogue has also been characterized as a moment of profound connectedness.²² These definitions are only preliminary explorations of the concept, but enforce the foundational theme of connection with the Other, that will be covered in a rhetorical approach to argumentation.

Until recently, there has been a clear separation of mind and body, logic and rhetoric in the study of dialogue. As a result, certain modes of reasoning such as the visceral, emotional, and kisceral are viewed as irrelevant or manipulative to the

argument. Furthermore, such examination of these often outlying modes of reasoning are often conducted outside of any contextual reflection of the situational moment.²³ If “we are concerned with how people do in fact argue, with what sorts of material, evidence, modes of communication, maneuvers, fallacies, and persuasive devices people *actually do draw upon*,” writes Gilbert, “then we must go beyond the linguistic and even beyond the rational, narrowly conceived. To do otherwise is to limit argument, by fiat, to a partial realm of the category of communications that persuade and/or convince.”²⁴ With a rhetorical approach to argumentation we begin to see dialogic rhetoric as constitutive, relational, and multidimensional.

“Understanding another person’s point of view requires more than getting right the meanings of the words being used,” writes Gilbert. Continuing, he explains how meaningful discourse is not always expressed in the spoken form:

Communication does not even occur with words, but with messages that use words as one aspect of their communicative shell. Words, especially when used in dialogic situations, do not give the entire message, but only part of it. The remainder, which many vary from a small percentage to practically the entire communication, is embedded in the context, tonality, history, and personalities of the arguers.²⁵

The notion of dialogic rhetoric contributes to the understanding of human interaction. However, it requires that we conceive of rhetoric, not simply as an art of persuasion to prove individualistic differences, but also as an art of comparing oppositions to find potential sites of unity. Further, it offers an opportunity to investigate intellectual exchange. A constitutive rhetoric is an alternative to traditional persuasive emphasis which helps explain how discourse works independently of having caused

effects. As evidenced throughout this project, Kennedy's speech is studied half-way if only the words are analyzed. In a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity there is a multifaceted approach that provides a more encompassing method to apply to real situational experience. This method takes into account the rhetor, the audience, *and* the relationship between the two. Situational contexts, emotion, visceral feelings of the event, as well as the uniqueness of the occurrence are indicative elements of a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity. A constitutive turn also expands consideration of what is produced via the rhetorical act (i.e., identity, subjectivity, identification, temporal experience, political culture, political community, language, etc).

Dialogic rhetoric is relational. As Bakhtin reminds us, "Responsive understanding is a fundamental force, one that participates in the formulation of discourse, and it is moreover an active understanding, one that discourse senses as resistance or support enriching the discourse."²⁶ Therefore, we need to understand the strength of evidence in dialogue as it is mediated by the relationship between arguers.

In his book *Why?*, Tilly works to establish why reason-giving is always a relational act. He asks, "...how, why, and in what different ways people supply the reasons that they do, that others do, that happen to them, or that happen to other people" that are supplied and/or accepted in times of judgment, hardship, or, in this case, tragedy.²⁷ The connection of the visceral, emotional, and kisceral are indicative of the relationship between arguer and audience. "This relationship is not part of the argument but is a precondition for what kind of interaction the argument can be, and therefore whether the argument could succeed."²⁸ Tilly further explains, "Regardless of their

content, however, reasons provide rationales for behaving one way or another and shared accounts of what is happening. They also make statements about relations between the people giving and receiving those reasons”²⁹

Discourse shapes the range of permissible relationships between individuals and, in turn, produces social meanings. Constituted in reciprocal argumentation, values, attitudes, ideologies, are formed and, as such, communication studies should be concerned with *how* those social meanings are created. “The defining characteristic of dialogic communication,” writes Pearce and Pearce,

...is that all of these speech acts [responding, listening, asking, arguing, etc.] are done in ways that hold one’s own position but allow others the space to hold theirs, and are profoundly open to hearing others’ positions without needing to oppose or assimilate them. When communicating dialogically, participants often have important agendas and purposes, but make them inseparable from their relationship in the moment with others who have equally strong but perhaps conflicting agendas and purposes.³⁰

The inter-subjective basis of discourse and dialogue can only be reached through a phenomenological interpretation. Otherwise, the relational role of reasoning is discovered from ideas distant from the immediacy of the face-to-face exchange. “To transcend arguments in order to locate the person is to recognize the claims of immediacy and respond to them in dialectical reciprocity,” writes Natanson. “The philosophical act which liberates the self is the same act which acknowledges the mystery of dialogue by engaging in a rhetoric of risk.”³¹ To get to the bottom of the mystery, we must embrace the multidimensionality of reason as emergent in the risk found and constituted in a relational dialogic rhetoric.

Over the last several chapters the complexity of Kennedy's announcement was presented and analyzed. It is evident that there are many components that constituted its rhetorical effect of peacefulness. As the persuasive force of the argument was re-evaluated, the often outlying modes of reasoning—the visceral, emotional, and kisceral—presented themselves as foundational to the workings of rhetorical effectivity. By considering the event from different angles and various viewpoints, new insight into the historical, the political, the cultural, the ethical, and the rhetorical was discovered.

April 4, 1968: Exposing Dialogic Rhetoric in Public Address

Long before Robert Kennedy arrived in Indianapolis on April 4, 1968, he had become an active participant in and witness to the social tensions that had troubled U.S. society. “Robert Kennedy in my view was a very complex individual. But the thing about him that attracted (at least) me to him,” offers Jim Tolan, audience member and Kennedy volunteer, “was he had an inherent decency and goodness. He cared about people.”³² Tolan continues and emphasizes that it was Kennedy's overall demeanor toward *all* kinds of people that was extraordinary. Kennedy cared,

Not necessarily [about] people who could take care of themselves and not necessarily people who could do better because they had the talents and the will to do better, but those people who were really disadvantaged, he cared about them. I mean he really cared about them. And that sincerity and that gentleness and that goodness was shown when you were with them and with those people. That's what attracted me to him.³³

John Lewis agrees and acknowledges Kennedy's skill to attract all kinds of people:

Robert Kennedy had the ability; he had the capacity in my estimation to bring people together. It really didn't matter whether they were black, white. Hispanic, Native American, Asian American. It didn't matter whether you were poor or middle class or

rich. He had something very special about him and people identified with that. He became one of all of us.³⁴

David J. Klinkose also recognizes Kennedy's concern for the disenfranchised as a reason he was attracted to the political leader, "I think he was a person of fairness...he was a person that was looking at some of the downtrodden of the country at the time ... I thought he had a real concern about people."³⁵ These, and other audience recollections, acknowledge Kennedy's connection with a classed as well as a raced people.

Darlene Howard, a member of the Indianapolis African American community, speaks about the trust involved in regard to Kennedy. Despite the difference in economic prosperity and racial stature, Howard reflects on the positive relationship built between Kennedy and the African American community. Howard claims that she has nothing but:

Respect for the small unafraid white man that stood in the midst of all this turbulence without fear....I mean...this was someone who was working for our good as well as Dr. King's so there is nobody else to trust; they've murdered Dr. King. Robert Kennedy was what we had at the time to help us understand and to help us get ourselves back together as a people...He was a person that in my community looked out for equal treatment...Robert Kennedy's reputation was that of fairness and equality. I think even more so than his brother.³⁶

Though there are remnants of the contractual obligations of the American Dream or indications of the "boot-strap" philosophy,³⁷ Howard acknowledges the identifying features, namely fairness and equality, between Kennedy and the African American community.

The aim of dialogic rhetoric is to inhabit multiple modes of reasoning in as many ways as possible. Thus, phenomenology is needed to underpin the multidimensionality of rhetorical effectivity. A full exploration of the reactions from the crowd, as captured

in oral histories, helps to determine which aspects of Kennedy's message are essential, and a reflection back on the chapters regarding the visceral, emotional and kisceral modes of reasoning help establish fundamental characteristics of a dialogic rhetoric.

Dialogic Rhetoric Involves Risk: The Visceral

Moving beyond the traditional functional rhetoric, in which a study of Kennedy's speech would have relied solely on "general principles, rules, and resources...in formulating his message," this study focuses on a philosophy of dialogue and recognizes that Kennedy was in a situation that demanded of him "a reaction which [could] not be prepared before hand."³⁸ As such, Kennedy's response involved risk. Several indicated that they feared for the safety of Kennedy's own life if he were to continue on with his trip to 17th & Broadway. "I was mortified," recalls Mankiewicz.

I was mortified I would never get out of that park alive...I didn't want to be there. For [Kennedy] to [go] – I felt his presence saved most of us.³⁹

Kennedy went into the neighborhood, which was regularly referred to as a "ghetto"; refused warnings to cancel his trip, and continued not knowing what the implications of his appearance would bring. As Levinas has written, "with the appearance of the human – and this is my entire philosophy – there is something more important than my life, and that is the life of the other."⁴⁰

"For Bakhtin," Jeffery W. Murray suggests, "the notion of situated action is central to understanding our nature as concretely situated, historical actors."⁴¹ Bakhtin asserts that an utterance—in this case Kennedy's address to an Indianapolis urban audience—is a link in the chain of speech communication, both prior to and subsequently

connected with the specific utterance of Kennedy on April 4, 1968. Though Bakhtin rejects the presence of these communication links during the creation of the utterance he states: “But from the very beginning, the utterance is constructed while taking into account possible responsive reactions, for whose sake, in essence, it is actually created.”⁴² Aware that the United States was continually falling deeper into patterns of violence and protest, especially in concern to race relations, Kennedy had to evaluate the response of his listeners prior to his arrival.

Kennedy’s audience could have chosen between reacting violently and keeping the peace in Indianapolis following King’s assassination (or whether or not to support the Kennedy campaign in the presidential primaries of 1968). As argued in *Chapter Four: The Visceral*, a phenomenological approach uncovers often unrecognized presumptions embedded in the social world (for example, if one is African American, then one is violent and/or irrational) which ultimately heightened the risk of the immediate claim. Furthermore, this part of the project was interested in how the body communicates subjectivity which contributes to and/or interrupts dialogic understanding despite racialized difference. The vulnerability of Kennedy’s body, along with the physical reactions of the audience member’s bodies as they responded to the giving/receiving of the argument, is the work of the visceral. Such reasoning embodies feelings directive of the “emotional-volitional tone” of the immediate experience.⁴³

Bakhtin’s notion of answerability is an essential element of ethical behavior. “Our speech, that is, all our utterances (including creative works),” Bakhtin has written, “is filled with others’ words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of “our-

own-ness,” varying degrees of awareness and detachment.”⁴⁴ For Bakhtin, any utterance—in this case Robert Kennedy’s speech—is made to emphasize the immediacy of the kind of meaning the rhetor is after. Illustrating the connection of an utterance and dialogism, Bakhtin writes:

The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it – it does not approach the object from the sidelines.⁴⁵

In addressing the African American audience in Indianapolis, Kennedy was aware of his own accountability. With Bakhtin, one comes into being only through one’s own unique place. “It is not the content of an obligation that obligates me, but my signature below it—the fact that at one time I acknowledged or undersigned the given acknowledgment,” writes Bakhtin. “This content could not by itself, in isolation, have prompted me to perform the act or deed—to undersign-acknowledge it, but only in correlation with my decision to undertake an obligation—by performing the act of undersigning-acknowledging.”⁴⁶ Thus, in considering Bakhtin’s notion of dialogue, Kennedy’s obligation was grounded in *his* decision to continue on with his responsibility to address the Indianapolis African American audience in person and tell them that the great civil rights leader, Dr. King, had been assassinated.

“People... actually listen[ed] to him,” recalls Mankiewicz. “They [took]... a step back and wait[ed] for him to speak.”⁴⁷ It was the subjective *Kennedy* body that set the tone of the event. Mankiewicz continues, “It’s quite possible that another white political

figure in front of that crowd, standing up to speak would have been whooted at or shouted down. You just don't know.”⁴⁸ Sites of dialogic connectivity, despite difference, reside in specific moments of argumentation and the vulnerability of Kennedy’s body was crucial to the success of this particular case. The fact that “He could come to a majority African American community, stand there with true honesty, try to put himself in and understand our feelings,” made a difference, reflects audience member Edelman. Kennedy, by physically facing his crowd, was able to renegotiate his power through visceral reasoning and give his announcement the hopeful energy it needed to have.⁴⁹ Edelman continues and pointedly acknowledges that Kennedy’s presence is reflective of its rhetorical effect of nonviolence:

[Kennedy] calm[ed] us and equate[d] what he had gone through in his life to let us know he did not hate, so therefore, we should not hate and we should not go into violence. It just says so much about him.⁵⁰

In considering the overall gesture of appearing in the impoverished neighborhood after Kennedy himself heard and was warned not to go by family, campaign staff, and law officials is connected to Levinasian ethics. He responded to the crowd with “non-indifference” and sought to connect with individuals, for a moment, in a sincere, compassionate, compelling, responsible-self-for-other way.⁵¹ In considering the notion of dialogic rhetoric and possible sites for rhetorical investigation, objects that are materialistically grounded while open to symbolic evaluation via ideological frames are appropriate.

Furthermore, the situational context of the event is key in determining the dialogic nature of the communicative act. For example, if Kennedy had gone forward in a

political rallying mood then the speech would likely not have had dialogic overtones. However, because of the interruption of King's assassination in the midst of Kennedy's campaign route, the rhetorical situation was altered. Kennedy, by turning towards the Other—in this case, the predominantly African American crowd—and answering the call of responsibility, viscerally, a better, ever-evolving understanding of justice and equality revealed itself through shared intersubjective connective experience. Thus, this rhetorical event is a fine example of a potential object of study to further the understanding of role of visceral reasoning in dialogic rhetoric.

Dialogic Connectivity and Sentimental Embodied Rhetoric: The Emotional

Kennedy's physical presence generated crowd recognition and the impact shifted their emotional state towards peacefulness. Thus, as found in *Chapter Five: The Emotional*, while Kennedy looked out into the crowd of faces, carefully maintaining eye contact, delivering eloquent words, the tone, his voice, the pauses, and gestures began to emerge as fundamental components of this ethical address. Emotional outbursts, such as the simultaneous gasp exuded by the crowd upon the initial disclosure of King's death, mark the emotional energy exchanged in the dialogic moment.

In that instant, Kennedy did not know what he was going to say next nor did he know how the crowd would respond. However, he did not stop answering the call (and run from the podium, so to speak). Alphonso Lingis (translator of Levinas) reminds, "What is said is inessential; what is essential is that I be there and speak."⁵² In this brief second, amongst the gasps of disbelief and cries of "No!" time was suspended and Kennedy was, for a moment, in connection with his audience. Such a connection of pure

human emotion amidst the shock of death is reflective of the modes of reasoning discussed in *Chapter Five: The Emotional* and *Chapter Six: The Kisceral*. How Kennedy responded with sincerity and authenticity, in the face-to-face encounter, further highlights how Levinasian ethics appear and operate in and through public address.

The changing mood is visible through Kennedy's body as well as through his initial words and can be further explored through Bakhtin's notion of "emotional-volitional tone". It was revealed in *Chapter Five: The Emotional* that the reasoning of the Kennedy announcement worked politically to constitute an act of mourning that ultimately calmed the Indianapolis crowd. Audience member Lloyd Milliken remembers,

...it was an absolutely incredible speech. The calmness it was delivered. To my way of thinking, it calmed the crowd. It was an amazing thing, because you heard at the beginning that they were excited when Senator Kennedy rose before them, and he made his announcement. He immediately with the tone of his voice seemed to me, calmed the crowd.⁵³

From the language that is chosen to the variation in one's vocal and nonverbal delivery, the tone, or feeling derived from the presentation, is experienced by both Kennedy and the individual audience members. As discussed in *Chapter Five: The Emotional*, "The kinds of words you choose communicate a tone."⁵⁴ Furthermore, performance through a variation in vocal and physical delivery via volume, rate, pitch, fluency, eye contact, facial expressions, posture, gestures, and appearance, "...well-chosen words [are converted] into the sounds and sights that reach your audience."⁵⁵ The individuals gathered in Kennedy's audience used the discourse, reflected in Kennedy's delivery and attitude, to gauge the "...the tone of a message" and then used those components to decide what the most appropriate response to the message should be.⁵⁶

“You recall at the beginning of the speech, Bobby signs were being held up, and he told them to lower those signs.” At that moment it became clear, at least to one audience member that “This was not a campaigned speech”.⁵⁷ From the moment that Kennedy requested the audience to lower the signs it became evident to the audience that the mood was shifting. Furthermore, the extemporaneous expressivity indicates the emotional reasoning that occurred in the moment.

Emotional messages are committed to value, expressed through physicality, exist in the situational moment, and hold opportunities for judgment regarding feelings of sincerity and authenticity. Consider the moment in which Kennedy realized that a group of individuals were waiting for him to arrive and announce the assassination of King. This moment of disruption in which Kennedy, showing no small degree of courage, decided to turn toward the Other despite warnings to cancel his trip begins to highlight the ways in which one responds to the call of the Other. Thus, the gesture alone, along with sentimental feelings, which were exposed in the delivery and receipt of the news, factors into the emotional mood of the argument. To illustrate the power of response, it is necessary to acknowledge that it was likely that Kennedy did not know what he was going to do or say once he arrived at the site. Nor did Kennedy know how his audience was going to respond to his news of King’s death, which heightened the physical risk creating space for an emotional moment. Kennedy’s response allowed the audience *and* Kennedy to enter into the face-to-face interaction in which the Levinasian *saying* and *trace* become more relevant.

Rozelle Boyd directs attention towards the extemporaneous nature of Kennedy's speech act:

As it was, it was not inflammatory or oratory by any means, nor would you have expected that but it was very subdued. It was very sober oratory, very thoughtful, as a matter of fact it was very hard for me to believe, after hearing that, that he had only heard about the assassination moments before because the speech had a structure to it. It has sensitivity to it. It had thoughtfulness to it. That most people would not be able to come up with on the spur of the moment but he was able to and again to the benefit of the community and the nation, that was good.⁵⁸

Such immediacy of his delivery not only calls attention to that facet of that particular situational experience but also brings forth emotional evidence hidden in the physical delivery of Kennedy's message.⁵⁹ Further insight into the emotional reasoning operating in this speech act can be found in the physical delivery of Kennedy's nonverbal gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, and vocal quality which was explored in *Chapter Five: The Emotional*

A shift in the situational context, coupled with the weight of a martyred leader, brought emotional reasoning to the forefront of the rhetorical situation through the gasps and groans of the Indianapolis audience. In an instant, emotion superseded the occasion, and the collective individuals responded to the tragic news of King's death with groans, tears, and silence. With logic suspended in the emotional moment, feelings stepped in and played a role in guiding one's response to the overall experience. Sentimental guardrails, evaluating trustworthiness and sincerity, appear to guide true feelings and strong emotions which, in some cases, prove to be more convincing than clear, informed, logical lines of argument. However, more important than the oppositional pulls of

emotion versus logic is the recognition that the emotional does, in fact, stand alongside other modes of reasoning. The recollections of the 1968 audience members clearly support such a claim.

Silence, considered the most prominent representation of what was felt following Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination, provides evidence to support the presence of emotional reasoning that was operating in its overall rhetorical effect of nonviolence. "I know that their reaction was one of stun and silence," reports Jim Tolan, Kennedy advance man. Tolan continues:

I don't know whether or not they fully got the impact right then of the death of Martin Luther King...but I do know that they were peaceful, they were respectful. That they, at the end when the candidate turned and said to them, "Let's go home tonight, say a prayer. Say a prayer for our country, say a prayer for Martin Luther King." They did. They turned and started to leave, very quietly...there was no hate coming out of them. There was no feeling of getting even. There was no feeling of why am I listening to you a white man. None of that...But they certainly were deserving of all of the praise one can heap upon people who having that acted so human with such humanity.⁶⁰

Robert Jackson, audience member, remembers feeling relieved in the crowd's overwhelming peaceful reaction:

It was a load off my shoulders at that time that people behaved as they did. On the very street out here below this building, we were wondering what was going to happen that evening. Nothing happened. We went home like we were supposed to.⁶¹

Here we see another example of how individual members in Kennedy's audience felt that the most appropriate response to the news of King's death was to go home calmly.

Jackson, like several others in the audience, was moved by the moment and felt the release of tension by turning homeward. "A part of sort of extracting yourself from that

was getting home and seeing what the news media or the news coverage was,” Boyd points out. “Wanting to get more detailed information was also a reason for wanting to get out of that situation.”⁶²

The emotional is concerned with feelings and involves the description of one’s visceral and non-sensory experiences along with consideration of the words delivered. If working to understand the underlying ethics of a communication interaction, particularly through the lens of Levinasian ethics, one must concentrate on the emotional component of human communication. The Levinasian *saying*, the pre-discursive, move to respond to the Other is hard to capture and realize. Therefore a focus on the trace begins quickly.

Levinas explains:

But the saying is the fact that before the face I do not simply remain there contemplating it, I respond to it. The saying is a way of greeting the other, but to greet the Other is already to answer for him. It is difficult to be silent in someone’s presence; this difficulty has its ultimate foundation in this signification proper to the saying, whatever is the said.⁶³

Thus, it is essential to recognize the importance of the turning moment in which they—Kennedy and his audience—realized the shift in context. The *saying* can be seen through the trace in which Kennedy evoked when he continued to respond on April 4, 1968.

A Trace of Ethics in Dialogic Rhetoric: The Kisceral

“That’s the eerie part of all of that. That’s the foreshadowing,” Cochran claims,⁶⁴ speaking of a final interaction Kennedy had during the question and answer session before leaving the university event scheduled prior to his appearance in Indianapolis. Cochran reports that a “discussion between the African American student and Kennedy was this sort of interesting moment of real dialogue.”⁶⁵ Right before Kennedy found out

about King's assassination, he was confronted by a student challenging the trust of black and white relationships "...and Kennedy answered it," Cochran explains, "[I]t was...a very special moment that this happened in front of people."⁶⁶ He continues:

What made it eerie then, or what raises it to only a level that history can sort of provide that prospective is that it was about that time when MLK was being assassinated and it was later that day that Bobby Kennedy would grapple with that side of the question in reality on the streets of Indianapolis. At the moment that the conversation was occurring there was a charge in the air and it was very special just for itself.⁶⁷

The trace, or another piece of Levinasian phenomenology, used here to better understand the import of the relationship built in and through response, can be conceived as a metaphorically lingering gift. It is something that can be detected through tone or the sense from the infinite other. Through the tone, one is better able to measure if the move to capture that infinity was successful or not. The trace is where you see the call of responsibility through an "unheard question."⁶⁸ The self experiences the *saying* through the trace, as seen in the communication of the face. This could be done verbally through language, including voice and tone. Or the trace can reveal the saying nonverbally or through non-discursive communication such as facial expressions or gestures. The trace beckons an interruption "...and arouses a desire to move toward the other, not knowing what may come."⁶⁹

With the trace, Levinas evokes infinity and "...signifies presence in absence."⁷⁰ The trace itself challenges rational thought and is ambiguous.⁷¹ Thus, the trace is nonsensical and often belongs to a peripheral mode of communication. The trace of the *saying* is what compels Kennedy to illustrate his sincerity through the words he speaks as

well as points to the intuitiveness of Kennedy's response. The extra-sensory elements, such as the contextual immediacy or visceral impact, also become important features in assessing the trace. And, as argued in *Chapter Six: The Kisceral*, the connectivity of this event lies in King's legacy. This extra-sensory call redefines our political space to exist in dialogic conversation with each other.

Audience member Darlene Howard reflects on the trace of legacy that comes forth through assassination. She recognizes the impact left by fallen heroes and connects that energy to Kennedy's announcement:

Everybody had a sense of that tragedy which was after all the most significant event in the US for years and years and echoed for decades into the... so there's no question that on the basic emotional level. On the level of felt sympathy, and on the level of whatever logic was then involved. That he was uniquely able to speak to that audience that night.⁷²

The persuasive force of Kennedy's announcement is driven by the presence of King's nonviolent legacy. And, as evidenced in *Chapter Six: The Kisceral*, by exploring the kisceral nature of argument we discover the importance of energy and connectivity as integral features of the constitutive account. "When you left there, even though you were in disbelief that Martin Luther King was no longer alive, you didn't have that feeling that you wanted to go out and do harm to anybody," reflects Rev. Thomas Brown, "you just wanted to get to a quiet place and sit down and say what is this world coming to?"⁷³

In some respects, dialogue allows us to feel things and rhetoric allows us to know things. Jeanine Czubaroff, in her presentation of a dialogical rhetoric, contrasts instrumental and dialogical conceptions of the rhetorical situation, the rhetor, the rhetor's purposes and modes of influence. Dialogical relations serve human beings by

overcoming separateness, by presenting experiences based in reality and meaning of human life, enabling transcendence of limitations, and presenting individuals with the possibility to realize their full humanity.⁷⁴ With Buber's philosophy of dialogue as the foundation to dialogical/ontological rhetoric, this work offers that "Instrumental, 'observation and use' (or I-It) relations are essential for human survival, dialogical or personal relations, are essential to being fully human."⁷⁵

Dialogic rhetoric could be considered as a frame of mind that views the audience not as an It but as a gift to their being. Dialogic rhetoric recognizes the worth of the audience and alters modes of influence illustrative in the unique ways the rhetor chooses to deliver the message. Because feelings are, in a sense, meta-communication and experienced outside of discursive limitations, an attempt to situate a phenomenological methodology is needed. One way to do this is to elevate the role of contextual immediacy by measuring rhetorical effectivity. "The dialogical rhetor realizes that what is true or right for her in her unique situation is unlikely to be exactly appropriate for the other in his unique situation."⁷⁶ However, both instrumental and dialogical rhetoric recognize the relevance of situational context in which they respond. The difference lies in how that response comes to be. Czubaroff explains:

For the instrumental rhetor the call is pragmatic—to define situations, to resolve problems, to achieve specific goals. For the dialogical rhetor the call is ontological – to acknowledge and respond to the address of the other in the light of [his or] her own experienced truth.⁷⁷

Continuing, Czubaroff acknowledges Buber's "out-going movement" of dialogue in contrast to the "reflexive" movement of instrumental rhetoric. Buber, not unlike

Levinas and Bakhtin, asserts that the appropriate response is to make the other present in the moment rather than "...being reflexively turned toward the self and attempting to control the person, event, or situation."⁷⁸ Buber's emphasis on presence aligns with Bakhtin's elevation of the once-occurrent act of being as well as Levinas' notion of the *saying*. The dialogical rhetor, in converging with an Other while remaining true to his or her own lived experience, presents and re-presents an "unreserved" or "authentic" personal response to the other "in thought, speech, and action."⁷⁹ The convergence of spoken language and pre-discursive, ontological responses presents an opportunity to orient human interaction phenomenologically through the concept of dialogic rhetoric.

However, not every audience member felt that enough homage was paid to King's legacy. "I still wish he [Kennedy] had tied more of the peaceful message to actually King and his spirit," offers Ron Haldeman. "He only made reference to that very abstractly. If I were a speech writer I would have put a few specifics about King but it still was a good speech for that occasion and as you could hear it really was a rally for Kennedy."⁸⁰

A Strategic vs. Tactical Rhetoric

Not everyone thought Kennedy's gesture was completely genuine. "What his agenda is? He come here. You know what he come here for. He needed our vote so he come here."⁸¹ Vechel Rhodes, Sr., a neighbor to the rally location and member of the audience, acknowledges Kennedy's political goals present on April 4, 1968 and indicates an unconventional memory of the night that Kennedy announced the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. Rather than acknowledging Kennedy's rhetorical invention and

persuasiveness to maintain social order, Rhodes highlights the political gains Kennedy could receive by appearing in the African American neighborhood. This memory presents a reflexive call to investigate further the visceral implications of this historical moment. As such, this section will return to explore the significance of race as a potential obstruction to dialogue.⁸² The context will be expanded to include Kennedy's whiteness in a racialized space. An investigation that more fully explores the implications of bodily gestures in racialized spaces is made through returning to Mills' *Racial Contract*, and research on whiteness as a cultural construct.

While some saw Kennedy's rhetoric as a means of identification with the crowd regardless of racial or class differences, it is important to consider the implications put forth by those differences. A contribution to the reflexive examination of the Indianapolis event is made by examining whiteness as a strategic rhetoric.⁸³ The larger question is: Was Kennedy's performance strategic or tactical?

Scholars interested in strategic rhetoric are concerned with "...the ways that the territory of whiteness is able to mask and resecure its space through a movement between universality and invisibility."⁸⁴ The crucial power of strategic rhetoric is its persuasive power. Nakayama and Krizek put forth that whiteness "...garners its representational power through its ability to be many things at once, to be universal and particular, to be a source of identity and difference."⁸⁵ If Kennedy only continued on with his appearance to lock in the African American vote, questions concerning Kennedy's ethics and moral responsibility would arise. This would also negate the notion of dialogue in its truest

form as well as draw skepticism towards the notion of Kennedy's willingness to suspend the Racial Contract.⁸⁶

Unlike scholars who use a strategic rhetoric, those interested in tactical rhetoric "...are geared toward exposing and questioning the spaces that exist between various groups and whiteness."⁸⁷ A tactical rhetoric is a calculated action that operates in the space of the other; thus, it must operate hegemonically in the foresight, and under the rules, of the dominant power.⁸⁸ As Anatol and Bittner state,

One may speculate concerning the spirit in which Kennedy went to the ghetto that night. He may have been driven by political opportunism or by a sincere humanitarian concern. The fact is that Martin Luther King, Jr. was dead and violence seemed inevitable. But there was no violence.⁸⁹

Following the work on strategic and tactical rhetoric there is cause to speculate whether or not Kennedy's appearance was a "passing" performance or if he was sincere in his delivery of the news of King's death. To get at these questions raised by the strategies of whiteness a closer look into how the news was received becomes fundamental to the analysis. Furthermore, how the decision to move forward was made, along with the changing mood present in real visceral emotions, deserves attention. All of these contextual details will help discern Kennedy's response as an opportunity to forward his political gains or as a temporary suspension of the terms of the Racial Contract.

In this particular historical context, the Racial Contract can be seen as influential in determining who gets certain kinds political representation, by whom and how. As the

events of April 4, 1968 are reflexively played out, issues of morality and epistemological understanding will step to the forefront.

Kennedy is His Whiteness

Beyond the constant reminder of the racial divide in his words, Kennedy as a white body (or a white *Kennedy* body) highlights the importance of visceral reasoning in argumentation. Because he was a Kennedy, to suggest that he was dissociating himself from his whiteness, is unrealistic, but considering whiteness as a cultural construct presents a reflexive view of Kennedy's gesture.⁹⁰ Kennedy's announcement, under a critical cultural framework, could be considered a move to capitalize on his whiteness to gain votes for his political campaign. Such a claim would benefit from a materialism and race analysis and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of Kennedy's speech act. Going against the dominant public memory of Kennedy as a passionate, authentic, and courageous politician, this portion of the project offers that Kennedy's rhetorical persona could have "passed" as one who mourns King's death. Furthermore, an analysis of Kennedy's racialized body will provide a more balanced argument of whether or not Kennedy was able to temporarily suspend the terms of the Racial Contract (as discussed in *Chapter Four: The Visceral*) by reflecting on this event as strategic political action.

In the products it consumes, in the spaces it assumes, in the postures it incarnates, in the gestures it assimilates, in the powers it learns and the structures it confirms, the body is a moral substance. It both marks an ethical placement and means an ethical predisposition. It is innocent of neither its history nor its destiny. Quite apart from its own intentionality, it is already the presupposition of a politics, the metabolism of an economics, the status of a social mobility. The

body does not just carry these things; in an important sense, it *is* them.⁹¹

Thus, Kennedy *is* his whiteness at one level and to assume otherwise would be to dismiss one side of the speaker/audience interaction. Considering whiteness as a cultural construct, Kennedy's gesture could be considered a move to capitalize on his whiteness to gain votes for his political campaign. Consider Kennedy's plea toward equality and what it would really mean for an African American audience physically, emotionally, and socially aware of real life materialistic *un*-equality. Kennedy claimed:

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black.⁹²

African Americans in 1968 were living in a dramatically different materialistic reality than the one presented by Kennedy in Indianapolis. Toward the end of the 1960s, for the first time, incomes rose for African American middle-class families. But for most African Americans, incomes still fell significantly behind those of white families. Though improvements may seemingly have been underway, the equality of African American life was still lacking momentum. Thus, at a time when the aspirations of the African American community were high, the actual conditions of employment, education, and housing were worsening.⁹³ As a dramatic and destructive spectacle, the riots that erupted across the country after King's assassination could be considered an act of empowerment and a form of social protest toward such issues as materialistic *un*-equality. Only by turning attention to the negated voice, or what is typically left out of

academic discussion, will we be able to gain a more encompassed understanding of Kennedy's announcement of King's assassination.⁹⁴

"I was a part of some of the formal and informal conversations that occurred in the city when folk were saying, people in leadership positions were saying "how do we keep the lid on?", reflects William Crawford, both a leader in the community and present in the audience on April 4, 1968. Crawford continues,

People in the religious community, the political community, people in neighborhood associations [were] coming together and saying "yeah, we probably have a real right to be angry."⁹⁵

With the political campaign mood in standstill and as attention toward King's death rose to the forefront, the situational context of the evening of April 4, 1968 shifted. People were no longer interested in hearing typical political banter. Rather, the exigency of King's death interrupted Kennedy on the campaign trail and created an urgent, practically immediate, state of mourning. Kennedy responded to the news of King's death appropriately by honoring and paying tribute to the fallen leader.

Kennedy illustrated two fundamental elements of a eulogy, which involves honoring the person who has just passed as well as offering condolences to those who mourn the loss. How one eulogizes offers insight into how one mourns, and as according to many in the audience, Kennedy was a leader who passed as a mourner. It is therefore relevant to the evaluation of the ethical implications of the historic speech act to analyze whether or not Kennedy passed as a mourner to solidify political votes or if he, in the moment, reacted in true form, although it is likely this will remain unanswered.

It is possible to consider that Kennedy passed as a mourner to present the most appropriate rhetorical persona for the circumstances. In light of a tragedy as momentous as King's death, it is fair to assume that the other individuals present at the announcement would be surprised, saddened, and/or enraged. Kennedy, in attempt to align or identify with such feelings, could have presented a message that "passed" as one delivered by a mourner.⁹⁶ The political campaign energy would be ruptured immediately upon the news of the assassination. With consideration of whiteness as a critical construct, however, Kennedy could have been concerned with convincing audiences of an acceptable persona (one who mourns King) while leaving out other "hidden" layers (one who seeks political votes).

What is not captured in the various recordings of speech, nor in the public memory, are the remarks Kennedy made later that night. In his analysis, which traces the complexities of Kennedy's personality and behaviors, Thomas recounts a scene following his Indianapolis appearance:

At the hotel, some of Kennedy's staffers were weeping. Kennedy himself was dry-eyed. "After all," he said sharply to Walinsky [his speechwriter], "it's not the greatest tragedy in the history of the Republic." Especially after such an affecting speech, Kennedy's remark seemed a little heartless. He did call King's widow, Coretta, and offered to help (the Kennedy organization arranged to fly King's body back to Atlanta), but he did not appear to mourn. "I didn't get any clear feeling of deep emotion on his part. I really didn't, and it surprised me," said Don Wilson, a former *Life* magazine bureau chief and JFK administration official who was coordinating the campaign's advertising.⁹⁷

The juxtaposition of the speech, which honors and evokes King's legacy, with Kennedy's comment to Walinsky illustrates that the rhetorical persona is typically quite

different from “the ‘real’ author or speaker.”⁹⁸ Ware & Linkugel, similar to Hart, illustrate the distinction between the rhetorical persona and rhetor as person.⁹⁹ However, these authors, considering the rhetorical persona of Marcus Garvey, offer the concept of persona as one to help explain the persuasive power of speakers when the speaker resembles an archetypal hero.¹⁰⁰ This notion aligns with the romanticized legacy of the Kennedy’s and highlights that:

When a speaker’s rhetorical self becomes so closely associated with some set of human experiences or ideas that it becomes virtually impossible for auditors to think of one without the other, then that individual stands in a symbolic relationship to those ideas or experiences. The speaker, in such cases, assumes the role of the rhetorical *persona*.¹⁰¹

This claim is especially relevant when considering the role of speaker in the construction of its rhetorical effect. A problem arises, however, and is pointed out in the work of Ware & Linkugel: “The character of the archetypal mask, because of its peculiar importance to the audience, will normally possess far greater ethos than that of the actor wearing the mask.”¹⁰² Thus, the ethos or persuasive character that the persona may present may be mistaken for the character or ethos of the person who produced the text. The ambiguity of the presentation of persona also raises concern regarding the power of discourse and how it can effect the production of knowledge.

Considering who has the power (and resources) to determine what layer of human presence is available for public inspection becomes relevant. In addition, the space between the persona and the person offers opportunities for unethical deception.¹⁰³ Individuals may present one rhetorical persona and misdirect others for personal, political, and/or economic gain. For example, heroic Kennedy, a man who single-

handedly halted violence in Indianapolis after King's assassination, may be memorialized while the Attorney General Kennedy, one who had requested FBI wiretaps on the civil rights leader, is forgotten.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, it is fair to assume that public memory (as well as audience perceptions of Kennedy in 1968) may very well be directed by a persuasive rhetorical persona that illuminates certain layers of human presence over others. Here the notion of power and who gets to participate in the construction of meaning, knowledge, and social response is raised.

In an attempt to explain the man behind the man who made the announcement of King's assassination, we can turn to how actual participants of the event viewed Senator Kennedy. Kennedy is recounted as a passionate, authentic, and courageous politician, and those memories heighten the positive persona that was created and circulated through Indianapolis communities. Participants acknowledged him, not as a typical politician, but as one who connected with the downtrodden. Through these initial remembrances we begin to understand how the audience viewed the man they had gathered to see in 1968 and how that differs from prior perceptions of Kennedy during his initial years of political service. Of interest is whether or not the authenticity of the experience can reside outside of the speaker and, if so, does it truly affect the rhetorical outcome when the public memory witnesses and recalls such a positive persona?

RFK: Not a Typical Politician

Kennedy was known for wanting to relate to the people he was speaking to and "...he wanted to convince them that he cared, and he was exceptional at doing that...he was unbelievable."¹⁰⁵ Thomas also acknowledges the authenticity of Kennedy and offers

that “Bobby in all his vulnerability and inarticulateness was the real thing. He was able to touch a chord because he seemed so genuine and because he was brave.”¹⁰⁶

Thomas, recounting the juxtaposition of Kennedy’s emotions during and after the speech, continues by describing the details of what happened at the hotel post-Kennedy’s announcement:

Despite this marvelous speech, when it was over, Bobby went back to the hotel; he was oddly unemotional about it. He told his aides “this is not the worst thing that ever happened.” He was kind of strangely affectless. I think he was still wrestling with what it all meant. For the first time, he actually mentioned the name of his brother's assassin. He got it wrong, he called him Harvey Lee Oswald instead of Lee Harvey Oswald, but the very fact that the assassins name was mentioned at all suggests how much he was thinking about [it]. Then very late at night he saw an old friend named Joan Braiden and he confessed to her, at least as she recalled, that he said “I was thinking about my brother, I was worried about me.”¹⁰⁷

In this second-hand account, we see that the emotional twist was a result of Kennedy’s reflection of his embodied risk as compared with two recent assassinated leaders. This possible explanation is similar to the dominant public memory of Kennedy as a compassionate, authentic, and caring politician.

Kennedy was not an ordinary leader. John Lewis, an African American leader and a member of the organizing committee of the Indianapolis event, contends, as well as acknowledges Kennedy’s visceral magnetism, when he says, “I grew to admire Robert Kennedy. I was deeply inspired by his sense of mission and calling. It was something about him that grabbed me.”¹⁰⁸ Community members, students, and Kennedy campaign staffers alike found his enthusiasm, attitude, and energy compelling.

Ultimately, for many of those who surrounded him during his campaign and otherwise, Kennedy embodied a message of hope. “He was trying to get people to work together to care about the good values.”¹⁰⁹ Bill Gigerich, Kennedy volunteer and driver of the car that picked up Kennedy’s wife Ethel at the airport, remembers the discussions that took place immediately prior to Kennedy’s departure to the African American neighborhood. He acknowledges the political pull in which the campaign could have used to persuade Kennedy to continue forward but ultimately rejects the idea that the trip was made to gain votes:

I think it helped him going to calm everybody. I think if he wouldn't have went, he would have been attacked, probably from our own people. I think the black community would have taken it as an affront to them if he didn't come and that he was afraid to come. I don't know if that played in his mind. I never heard any of that conversation. He went over almost everything and I think he thought he had to go. I don't think he calculated... there's always this thing about how calculating these people were and all that. They were tough and they were organized and they knew what they were doing, but the conversations I heard that night... I never heard if we don't go there will be a problem with the black community, we're going to lose this 5th ward, we're going to get beat here, this guy's going to attack us... there was none of that.¹¹⁰

Walinsky, like Gigerich, summarizes that “Robert Kennedy saw his success as secondary to the benefit and success of the country, and the people in it.”¹¹¹ Walinsky agrees that Kennedy was not about gaining political votes. Rather, from his perspective as someone who worked closely with Kennedy for many years, he offers, adamantly, that the leader was disinterested in polls and more attuned to the truth of democratic dialogue:

The fact is...that was immaterial to him. It was his view of the political leaders function. His function, to tell them the truth even though it made them uncomfortable, even though it may have made

them dislike him, and even though it may have cost him in that audience. He wasn't calculating. I spent almost four years working in his Senate office, turning out speeches on critical issues and positions at a rate of two or three every week throughout that time. That's literally hundreds of these. I can tell you for not a single one of those speech's positions, bills introduced and so forth, before not a single one did we take or look at poll. Never! The only issue that was on the table with any of those speeches, was what's the right thing to say? Of course he didn't want to look stupid, and of course he didn't want to needlessly antagonize people. So we phrased often difficult thoughts in ways that understood the other person's position. Understood fears, understood concerns. That you weren't trying to just blow at people and say, "I'm gonna lay down the law and you don't count." That's not what a democratic dialogue is. [He] never took a poll to find out what's the right position. What's the most advantageous position. What's going to get me the most votes.¹¹²

Considering Kennedy's rejection of whiteness as evidenced in his choice to continue forward with his speech in Indianapolis despite warnings, acknowledges his willingness to break down stereotypical underpinnings of equating violence with African Americans. Furthermore, Kennedy's pursuit for understanding and compassion for all individuals who reside in the U.S., as put forth by the testimony rejecting his desire for political benefits, presents another reason to believe that there was a temporary suspension of the terms of the Racial Contract and, in turn, an opportunity for dialogic rhetoric. However, this connectivity was not Kennedy's doing alone. The Indianapolis African American community also played a significant role in the racial reconciliation that happened that night. After all, the individuals in the audience were the ones charged with the judgment to respond nonviolently or not.

17th & Broadway: Not a Typical Audience

In considering the multidimensionality of Kennedy's announcement, Bakhtin is useful to consult. He suggests these kinds of utterances are combined with a social dialogue that emerges and becomes apparent in the crowd's response. These voices create the background necessary for one's own voice.¹¹³ Kennedy seemingly realized what was happening, and through his own appearance and the tone in his voice eventually settled the audience and got the horrific news across.¹¹⁴ By recognizing that other factors beyond Kennedy's words contributed to a discourse, which affected the production of knowledge, meaning, and social action, alternative perspectives emerge. For example, one must consider that Kennedy's body alone could not halt the eruption of violence the night King was killed. The audience (actual, implied, and other), which has typically been silenced in rhetorical criticism, also contributed to the overall rhetorical effect of peace over violence in Indianapolis.

Abie Robinson, audience and Indianapolis community member, reflects on why this city remained nonviolent when so many others did not:

I don't think that people were moved to be that violent then. You know maybe that was just here in Indianapolis. I used to call Indianapolis "nap town"...because it said we were asleep. You know you were mad, but mad and do what? You were upset but upset and do what?...Maybe if there had been someone with a microphone that as soon as he [Kennedy] left that stood up there and said, "We're all upset, now let's go do this." Maybe it would have been different but then to me it just [would have] hurt.¹¹⁵

In his reflection, Boyd acknowledges the role of the community in creating its rhetorical effect of nonviolence. Similar to Pierce's work in *Polite Protest*, in Indianapolis, Boyd alludes to the fact that Indianapolis did not, in fact, have the same terms and conditions as other U.S. cities.¹¹⁶ Rather, unlike other northern cities,

Indianapolis had an African American presence beginning with the city's inception "...and this distinction is crucial, for because of their early presence they possessed a historical memory of the city's promise and direction"¹¹⁷ Thus, the African American community there developed differently. "In a sense of the word, Indianapolis was a unique city [not] just about the King assassination, but through the whole Civil Rights Era," reflects Boyd. Throughout the "...the whole Civil Rights Movement Indianapolis was never really involved in violent reaction."¹¹⁸ Boyd continues:

I do not know whether that is a compliment, comment, or whether it says something about the population here, particularly in the black community. But we never had some of the situations that you had in Los Angeles or Cleveland or even Chicago. We were very fortunate in this city.¹¹⁹

Along with Kennedy's appearance, another factor that may have contributed to the peaceful resolution were the existing attitudes, in the face of racial prejudice, of the African American audience. Contributing to their worldview was the fact that "...despite rising separatism, blacks still felt they could regain lost rights through adherence to public decorum and civil protest."¹²⁰ Groups and organizations were formed that allowed other ways for the community to join together and create an atmosphere for progress and change. Pierce further explains this notion of "polite protest" that was operating in Indianapolis:

Fully cognizant of their history in the city, they devised their method of protest: protracted negotiations, interracial coalitions, petitions, and legal challenge. Such polite protests, they believed, would allow them greater civil and personal freedoms while not antagonizing whites and thereby ensuring additional deprivations.¹²¹

Though rivalry existed among the Indianapolis African American organizations and some held different missions and goals than others, all leaders and groups “cooperated with white city officials and civic leaders to control urban tensions that might lead to riots and disorder.”¹²² “As a result, perhaps,” Thornbrough has written, “no serious riots such as those that erupted in many northern cities in the sixties and seventies occurred in Indiana.”¹²³

However, the absence of race riots should not be confused with good race relations, African American leaders, along with Thornbrough, cautioned.¹²⁴ Excluded from white society in many ways African Americans lacked the opportunity to express their beliefs and concerns. Audience member Billie Breaux reflects on the dialectical tensions operating in Indianapolis at the time of Kennedy’s announcement:

I think that in the mid [to] late 1960s, the state of race relations here in Indianapolis [was] probably better than [in] most places. Now when I say better that's an advised better. I mean better in the sense that there was not the overt conflict but certainly there was a lot going on in Indianapolis at the time. Perhaps a little bit more submerged that it would be in other cities. You know we were not a Chicago at the time. We were not a Cleveland. We were not a Los Angeles. We were not a Detroit but that does not mean that we were having some of the same kinds of problems. I think it was a case of citizens, particularly the black community, not responding to them in the same kind of way. This does not mean that we did not have some major issues and some major concerns and some major problems but for the most part Indianapolis escaped the physical manifestation of those problems or issues and concerns so that we had some racial problems at the time and indeed as we do now. They were just not being expressed in the same kind of way.¹²⁵

Such silent dissent that moves toward progressive justice while working within a system of exclusivity is apparent in how the Indianapolis African American militant and radical groups worked with the Kennedy campaign in order hold the original political

rally. Donald Janson of *The New York Times* reported that the Kennedy organization had “engaged John Lewis, former chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee to stimulate black interest in the Kennedy candidacy and push a voter registration drive among potential Kennedy voters in the slums”¹²⁶ City leaders also collaborated with Kennedy’s staff in an attempt to involve the African American community in the presidential race. “We had Dick Lugar and we had Sam Jones in the community and Urban League,” reflects Boyd. “Leaders from the NAACP, leaders from the religious community, all of whom I think contributed to the atmosphere which got us through a potential for a local disaster.”¹²⁷

African American churches, newspapers, community organizations, visible African American leadership and the existing attitudes among Indianapolis citizens all had a role in the peaceful resolution following King’s assassination. To solidify the suggested notion that other aspects contributed to the peaceful outcome on April 4, 1968, a letter published in *The Indianapolis Recorder* is included as evidence. Flash Laurence, an African American man, expressed his feelings about the peaceful resolution of April 4, 1968:

Just as President Johnson proved himself by stepping down and keeping his cool to keep the peace...and the Indianapolis Negroes proved themselves by keeping their cool last night (during Mr. Kennedy’s visit here) when they heard that one of their leaders had been struck down by an assassin while waiting for Bobby Kennedy to show up. I believe if it had been anywhere else it would have been hell to pay—so I think it’s about time for our white brothers to start giving us our due and quit shucking and come on down front. By our conduct last night (when Mr. Kennedy announced that Dr. King had been shot) we proved that we half way to prove we are for

peace and non-violence in order to achieve what we want and deserve.¹²⁸

Similar to Laurence, audience member Boyd offers "...that the speech was a contributing factor, but not by any means "the" thing that established [peace in Indianapolis]." ¹²⁹ Boyd continues and connects this line of reasoning to "...the character of the population in Indianapolis, particularly the black population." ¹³⁰ Boyd summarizes:

I just don't think that that's where we were at the time and I'm glad that we were not at that point. I think that over the long haul much more has been and is being accomplished by having people talk with each other rather than confronting each other in the streets.¹³¹

In realizing that there could be multiple community influences on rhetorical effectivity, more analysis of the black public sphere and the social construction of the black urban struggle would be beneficial. "In a sense, black settlement space is the location from which urban blacks construct alternative experiences of time, space, and interpersonal relationships or community, an alternative culture to that of white supremacist capitalist patriarchy"¹³² Thus, when considering the role of the African American audience/community had in keeping the peace in Indianapolis, such cultural perspective is of importance. Fogelson, in his work concerning riots in racialized spaces, believes that moderates like Kennedy make little difference. "Their appeal will be eloquent," Fogelson argues, "their reasoning persuasive, and their behavior courageous; and the white community will praise their commitment and responsibility." But, he contends, "...the moderates do not command enough loyalty among the rank-and-file to confine protest to nonviolent channels or to restrain violent protest." Rather, Fogelson

claims that community members, specifically those active in militant roles, are the people who stop racial violence.¹³³ Thus, other voices coming from Indianapolis community leaders, African American organizations, churches, political arenas, and student groups which made up the rhetorical dialectic in Indianapolis that evening, should be considered further.

Conclusion

While the phenomenology of Kennedy's announcement opens doors for multiple extensions to the research presented here, looking at how Kennedy, on April 4, 1968, created a new perspective through the pursuit of dialogue demonstrates why rhetoric is an important and often overlooked element of historical interpretation.¹³⁴ The realization of new insights and the importance of forming dialogic relationships were revealed by identifying the ways in which Kennedy raised moral concern enough to offer the crowd a better, truer message that inhibited the eruption of racial violence. The audience, in turn, responded to the message with emotionally embodied and extra-sensory reasoning. Investigating the symbolic action of Kennedy's speech on April 4, 1968 allows for a better understanding of how dialogue can gain and maintain order, as well as construct identity and perpetuate a greater moral scheme.

Bakhtin offers that interpretation is a continuous struggle between one's own word or internal persuasive discourse and the authoritative discourse or what is discursively produced and conveyed. However, there is a moment or turning point in this struggle in which the authoritative discourse becomes internalized. That is, individuals interpret other's words as, in part, their own, and then eventually develop their own perceptions by way of the authoritative spoken words. This speaks to Bakhtin's

discussion of centrifugal (forces of difference) and centripetal (forces of unity) tendencies. The fusion of centrifugal forces with another allows for the validation of certain claims as well as legitimizes the overall self. As summarized by Baxter & Montgomery, “In other words, the self is constructed out of two contradictory necessities—the need to connect with another (the centripetal force) and the simultaneous need to separate from the other (the centrifugal force).”¹³⁵ With this centrifugal/centripetal dichotomy, Bakhtin allows space for investigation of both sides of a communicative act as well as the moment of potential convergence between the two.

Examining dialogic rhetoric as one reasonable way to examine real lived experience offers a significant contribution to the study of human communication. Such an undertaking moves forward the necessity and relevance of a convergent perspective of rhetoric and philosophy and expands the understanding of the communicative patterns of the rhetor, the audience, *and* the relationship between the two. In turn, this project offers the concept of dialogic rhetoric as a piece of scholarship that moves beyond traditional rhetorical analysis in pursuit of a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity. In the moment of real lived experience lies opportunity to ethically respond, and how one responds is the significance of dialogic rhetoric.

Those in power can maintain order when members of a society agree on a shared sense of justice and responsible behavior. “While the instrumental [or rhetorical] rhetor sees influence as a means to a specific goal the dialogical rhetor recognizes, at times, a *responsibility* to influence the other.”¹³⁶ Kennedy, taking on the position of a dialogical rhetor recognized his obligation to speak of justice and equality. Michael O. Hardimon

holds the view that role obligations are central to morality. Similar to the notion that the dialogic rhetor holds a responsibility to effect the other, role obligations can be understood here as the kind of obligations we have as occupants of the social realm: as citizens, as family members, teachers, and so forth.¹³⁷ Kennedy fits Hardimon's explanation of role obligations and Czubaroff's notion of a dialogical rhetor. Kennedy, a political leader and defender of democracy, held a moral obligation and dialogic responsibility to speak out in favor of compassion, wisdom, and justice.

Kennedy, by turning towards the Other—the predominantly African American crowd--and answering the call of responsibility, a better, ever-evolving understanding of justice and equality revealed itself through shared understanding on April 4, 1968. As the country continued to fall deeper into patterns of violence and protests, Kennedy searched for remedies and learned the value of gesture and understanding especially in regard to the individuality of concerned citizens. He responded to the alterity or uniqueness of the Indianapolis urban crowd by not assuming that they would react violently to the news of King's assassination.

Dialogue is fundamental in that it is relational, but it is also rhetorical. The concept of dialogic rhetoric presents the opportunity to take into consideration both the philosophical and rhetorical insight of a communicative interaction as well as acknowledges themes of openness, truth, connectedness, convergence, and the self/other relationship. This project, in effort to extend the conception of dialogical rhetoric, offers a turn to phenomenology as one reasonable way to begin forming a methodological approach to recognize, describe, and understand dialogic rhetoric. Further, the ethical

dimension of communicative interaction is carefully considered by drawing upon the philosophical insight of Bakhtin and Levinas in addition to Buber's foundational work. And finally, and perhaps, most importantly, the application of dialogic rhetoric, with all of its theoretical import, was applied to a real life, historical event that carries with it great political, social, and cultural implications.

According to the reactions of the members of Kennedy's audience, the embodied discourse that was there prior to and following Kennedy's speech is significant. Other factors, such as the African American religious and civic groups in Indianapolis and the honor accorded to King and his vision of non-violent activism may have also contributed to the greater spirit of goodwill that seemed to prevail in Indianapolis on the night that King was killed. By capturing the oral histories of those individuals present in Indianapolis for Kennedy's speech, a fragment of potentially forgotten history is saved. Furthermore, by studying the audience perspective of Kennedy's address, a dialogical version emerged. What audience members remember about that night and the surrounding events contributes to the understanding of how audience members add to the creation of rhetorical effectivity. In any moment of lived experience ethics is present.

Notes for Chapter One: The Introduction

¹ Speaking of the Ball State event, the speech that was directly previous to the announcement in Indianapolis, Tom Cochran stated, “I was impressed by the crush of the crowd, sort of the size of the crowd, the warmth, as I recall, and the humidity in the gym at that time. I’m not a person who really likes big crowds, but I was really struck by that and I thought this is very fitting and very appropriate for a Kennedy to, we’re getting some noise, right? All of this crush of humanity and this mass of people sort of packed into this gym, I thought was probably representative of how big of an event it was on campus and he was truly one of the stars of American politics. So I was struck by all that as a young reporter, lucky guy to be doing this.” Tom Cochran, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 18: 6:22:21 PM-6:23:50 PM.

² Ray E. Boomhower, *Robert F. Kennedy and the 1968 Indiana Primary* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2008), 62.

³ D. Janson, “Rivals in Indiana Woo Negro Vote: Kennedy Goes into Slums and Is Hailed by Militants,” *New York Times*, April 4, 1968.

⁴ Jim Tolan, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 32: 9:12:12 AM- 9:13:39 AM. Tolan states, “I believe that we were there earlier for the formal filing of the declaration and [to] announce candidacy to be able to participate in the primary. But April fourth was the real kick off. The plan for that day had the Senator in South Bend giving a speech at Notre Dame. From there he was going to Muncie, Indiana to visit Ball State, which was another great Indiana college. And from there he made a few other stops in and around the university and then it was to fly into Indianapolis that night. There was going to be an opening of the campaign headquarters in downtown Indianapolis. And from there he was going to Seventeenth and Broadway for this outdoor rally. And that is [in essence] that day, that campaign day.” For more details on the events leading up to Kennedy’s campaign in Indianapolis see Boomhower, *Robert F. Kennedy*; Jules Witcover, *The Year the Dream Died: Revisiting 1968 in America* (New York: Warner Books, 1997); Janson, “Rivals in Indiana.”; “Branigin’s ‘Favorite Son’ Race Backed by Indiana Youth Group,” *Indianapolis Star*, April 5, 1968; Evan Thomas, *Robert Kennedy: His Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000); Jules Witcover, *85 Days: The Last Campaign of Robert Kennedy* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1969).

⁵ Witcover, *The Year the Dream Died: Revisiting 1968 in America*, 153.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 157.

⁷ This proposal offers an overall summary of the reports of violence in several U.S. cities, provided by *The Indianapolis Star*, in the days following King’s assassination. For a more detailed account please see the original news article, Ap and Up!, “Troops Patrol in Downtown Washington,” *Indianapolis Star*, April 6, 1968.

⁸ Witcover, *85 Days*, 139.

⁹ Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 366. Schlesinger (1978) reports that it was Pierre Salinger who called in the news of King’s shooting as he boarded the plane for Indianapolis. See Arthur M. Schlesinger, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978), 874.

¹⁰ Joe Klein, *Politics Lost: From Rfk to W: How Politicians Have Become Less Courageous and More Interested in Keeping Power Than in Doing What's Right for America* (New York: Broadway Books, 2006), 3.

¹¹ Witcover, *85 Days*, 139.

¹² Tolan, "Tolan Interview." Disc 32: 9:15:48 AM-9:21:21 AM.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Bill Gigerich, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 26: 3:09:18 AM-3:25:03 AM.

¹⁵ Witcover, *85 Days*, 139.

¹⁶ "Kennedy Calls for Unity in Troubled U.S.," *Indianapolis News*, April 5, 1968.

¹⁷ Gigerich (2008) continues, "We took her back up to her room and left her. At that point in time, there were police everywhere. It was the first time in all the times that I had been moving her back and forth that there were like police in the halls and outside the doors. Up until that point in time, anyone could go into any of those hotels and you could walk down the halls and look into a room and you'd see Ted Kennedy in here and you'd see Rose over there and so on and so forth and no one would stop you. There wasn't any security except for Bill Berry and Rosie Greer and Lamar Lundy and those guys. They were impressive and Robert would, Kennedy would come out of the shower with a towel around him and run down the hallway. I remember one time he ran to take a phone call from Dick Daley. Another time, there was trouble with, I don't know how many of the kids were there, but the Kennedy children kept coming out and asking for padded butter. Mrs. Kennedy finally went in and found out what they had done. They had opened one of the windows and they had plastic forks and they had padded butter and were shooting it at people on the sidewalks. That's the way it was kind of up until that night, even in the caravans downtown where they'd steal his shoes and they'd steal his cufflinks. He ended up wearing plastic cufflinks because he had so many shirts getting torn where people just grabbing him wanting to touch him, but there wasn't any security. On the circle, I believe, he was pulled out of his car and chipped a tooth. That night, it was almost lockdown. It seemed to me like the people that were not involved in the campaign were a lot more concerned about how safe he was and how safe Ethel was than they were." See "Gigerich Interview 2008." Disc 26: 3:09:18 AM-3:25:03 AM. Gigerich continues, "Ethel that night, I think she did all the time I was with her, was prayed. All the time we go up to the speech and all the time we'd left the speech and the time when I'd take her back to the hotel she was just in the backseat with her head down and I believe she was praying. I don't know that for a fact, she didn't have a rosary out or anything like that, but that was the first time we hadn't talked all the way back about something. She never asked how the campaign was going, how things were going. She expressed initially when we got in the car sorrow for Dr. King. I think it was, she was always replaying the president situation and I'm sure in her mind, she was worried about him. She never said it, but they were inseparable." Disc 26: 3:09:18 AM-3:25:03 AM.

¹⁹ Tolan, "Tolan Interview 2008." Disc 32: 9:21:31 AM - 9:22:35 AM.

²⁰ Lloyd Milliken, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 16: 4:14:29 PM-4:15:04 PM.

²¹ There were three Democrats on the Council, the County Commissioner, and a State Senator. See Jerome Forestal, "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience

Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis,” conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: August 16, 2006. Forestal reports, “I was the youngest Democrat City Councilman to get elected.” Tape recording and transcript available from author.

²² Milliken, “Milliken Interview 2008.” Disc 16: 4:15:10 PM-4:16:56 PM.

²³ Forestal, “Forestal Interview 2006.”

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Tolan, “Tolan Interview 2008 .” Disc 32: 9:15:48 AM - 9:21:21 AM.

²⁸ Forestal, “Forestal Interview 2006.”

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Breaux, “Breaux Interview 2008.” Disc 17: 5:31:27 PM-5:33:36 PM.

³¹ Ibid., Disc 17: 5:29:20 PM-5:31:17 PM.

³² Forestal.

³³ Jerome Forestal, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 22: 10:02:03 PM- 10:13:54 PM. Forestal was one of the first Democratic representatives to arrive on the scene. He continues, “[W]e arrived there and when I got out of the car the first person that came up was Ben Bell and then he and Snookie Hendricks and there were a couple of other black ministers who were waiting. This was the entrance that they were going to bring the senator in. There were a couple of steps up to the truck. We just went up on the stage. I don't know who the person was; I'll say the MC or whatever. I don't know who it was addressing the crowd but he introduced us and asked if we had anything to say. We had very little to say because the crowd was restless and they wanted to see the senator. We just waited there until the senator arrived and the little combo was playing and they introduced somebody from the black community and they still weren't interested in listening. We were getting anxious too we wanted the senator.”

³⁴ James Trulock, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 25: 2:24:36 AM- 2:30:40 AM.

³⁵ Forestal, “Forestal Interview 2008.” Disc 22: 10:35:33 PM-10:36:29 PM. Bob Gigerich, Kennedy volunteer, and driver of Ethel Kennedy that night remembers how the Kennedy route fell behind schedule: “I think we were probably 3 or 4 hours late getting to the speech. A lot of that, not a lot of it, he was always running late because he hung around. The airport delay was long. I don't know what that means. It seems like a long long time that we sat there waiting. That made it longer, because I remember some of the people that were at the speech beforehand, because they left from downtown and went directly to the speech. They were there like 3 or 4 hours I believe because some of them told me they kept thinking geemane, get here, because they were standing up there.” Gigerich, “Gigerich Interview 2008.” Disc 26: 3:54:37 AM-3:58:47 AM.

³⁶ Trulock, “Trulock Interview 2008.” Disc 25: 2:24:36 AM- 2:30:40 AM.

³⁷ Milliken, “Milliken Interview 2008.” Disc 16: 4:24:45 PM-4:25:33 PM.

³⁸ John Lewis, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 30: 7:07:05 AM- 7:09:22 AM. Lewis continues, “I remember some staff person saying that Dr. King had been shot. Some staff person of Robert Kennedy telling me, informing some of us that were doing the advance work, effort to organize this rally that Dr. King had been shot. We didn't know anything about his condition. We were there. We had a job to do. We wanted to make the rally successful. I know I did. It was the first effort to organize for Robert Kennedy and we wanted Robert Kennedy to be there. There was some real debate whether he should come but some of us insisted that he had to come and speak. The staff person that informed us maybe knew, I don't know, that Dr. King had been assassinated and just didn't tell us. I don't know. I probably never will know. I do know one thing. It was a very sad and dark time. It was a very dark hour for the movement. A dark hour for many of us that had grown to know Dr. King to be inspired by him. We loved the man and he loved us.” Disc 30: 7:28:57 AM-7:30:32 AM.

³⁹ Witcover, *85 Days*, 140.

⁴⁰ Adam Walinsky, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

⁴¹ Rozelle Boyd, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 15: 3:13:18 PM-3:16:35 PM.

⁴² Trulock, “Trulock Interview 2008.” Disc 25: 2:30:47 AM- 2:38:34 AM.

⁴³ Tolan, “Tolan Interview 2008.” Disc 32: 9:22:54 AM - 9:25:05 AM.

⁴⁴ Evan Thomas, “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 10: 10:22:07 AM-10:22:32 AM.

⁴⁵ Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 366.

⁴⁶ Walinsky, “Walinsky Interview 2008.” Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

⁴⁷ Tolan, “Tolan Interview 2008.” Disc 32: 9:22:54 AM- 9:25:05 AM. Forestal (2008) contends and offers, “So he finally arrived and when he did, he came up on the I'll call it a stage but it was a flatbed truck. He came up on the truck and handed each of us a copy of his speech. He thanked us for being there and said we'll gather later at the Marott Hotel and then he turned and addressed the crowd. He asked them to please, be quiet you know. Cause they had signs, Kennedy for President. He asked them to put their signs down. He had something to tell them and he went into his speech and certain things just jumped out at you.” See Forestal, “Forestal Interview 2008.” Disc 22: 10:02:03 PM- 10:13:54 PM.

⁴⁸ Trulock, “Trulock Interview 2008.” Disc 25: 2:24:36 AM- 2:30:40 AM.

⁴⁹ Video and audio recordings of Robert Kennedy's Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in Indianapolis, Indiana, April 4, 1968, are available for review in the video series *Great Speeches* or on the video *The Greatest Speeches of All-Time* and online from the archives of the JFK library

or from americanrhetoric.com. Video footage of Kennedy's address from *Great Speeches* is cut short and two paragraphs near the beginning and end of the text is lost in their rendition. However, the video footage that is provided allows for visual reference to Kennedy's non-verbal indicators such as gestures and facial expressions. The video also provides a brief glimpse of the audience. The online recordings of Kennedy's April 4, 1968 speech, though lacking visual reference, gives a clearer, more complete audio version of the address. Several renditions are taken into account in this analysis. See Lloyd Rohler, educational consultant, The Educational Video Group, (1989), *Great Speeches: Volume V* and The Nostalgia Company, (1998), *The Greatest Speeches of All-Time*, Rolling Bay, WA: SoundWorks, USA, Inc. For online audio renditions see Robert Kennedy, *Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, April 4, 1968, <http://www.cs.umb.edu/jfklibrary/r040468.htm> (accessed November 10, 2003) or visit americanrhetoric.com.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Karl W. Anatol and John R. Bittner, "Kennedy on King: The Rhetoric of Control," *Today's Speech* 16, no. 3 (1968): 32. Anatol later reflects, "I was struck by the fact that her sense of the moment occurred while she was driving. She was not there, she was a distance away and driving and yet was taken, stunned by this explosion, this crowd reaction to the situation. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, she said that she had never heard anything like that at all. This wasn't thunder, this wasn't... this was a collective "ooh" from the crowd that led her to wonder what happened. See Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:58:23 PM - 7:59:28 PM.

⁵² Abie Robinson, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 34: 11:10:55 AM-11:13:15 AM.

⁵³ Representative Bill Crawford, "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis, " conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: April 4, 2007. Tape recording and transcript available from author.

⁵⁴ Rozelle Boyd, "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis," conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: April 8, 2007. Tape recording and transcript available from author.

⁵⁵ Sr. Rhodes, Vechel L., "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 21: 9:17:30 PM-9:18:03 PM.

⁵⁶ Trulock, "Trulock Interview 2008." Disc 25: 2:24:36 AM- 2:30:40 AM.

⁵⁷ Robert F. Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.," April 4, 1968, <http://www.americanrhetoric.com> (accessed July 10, 2009).

⁵⁸ Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King," 32.

⁵⁹ Abie Robinson, "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis, " conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: August 8, 2006. Tape recording and transcript available from author.

⁶⁰ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2006." Forestal was 74 years old at the time of the interview.

⁶¹ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

-
- ⁶² Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:10:55 AM-11:13:15 AM.
- ⁶³ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:19:44 AM - 7:20:29 AM.
- ⁶⁴ Tolan, "Tolan Interview 2008." Disc 32: 9:26:04 AM - 9:27:58 AM.
- ⁶⁵ Frank Mankiewicz, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 8: 8:06:29 AM-8:09:30 AM.
- ⁶⁶ Thomas, "Thomas Interview 2008." Disc 10: 10:22:40 AM-10:23:27 AM.
- ⁶⁷ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:36:49 PM-4:37:29 PM.
- ⁶⁸ Peter Edelman, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 11: 11:11:31 AM-11:14:11 AM.
- ⁶⁹ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.
- ⁷¹ Boomhower, *Robert F. Kennedy*, 67. Boomhower also reports that this is, in fact, the first time since November 22, 1963 that Bobby Kennedy spoke publicly about his brother's death.
- ⁷² Ronald Steel, *In Love with Night: The American Romance with Robert Kennedy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 20.
- ⁷³ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.
- ⁷⁴ Darlene Howard, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 23: 11:42:55 PM- 11:43:37 PM.
- ⁷⁵ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination, 1968" available to view on americanrhetoric.com.
- ⁷⁶ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2008." Disc 23: 11:09:04 PM-11:10:49 PM.
- ⁷⁷ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:39:25 PM-3:40:57 PM.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁷⁹ "Branigin's Favorite Son."
- ⁸⁰ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination, 1968" available to view on americanrhetoric.com.
- ⁸¹ Karl W. E. Anatol, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 19: 7:52:49 PM-7:55:00 PM; See Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King."
- ⁸² Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:37:53 PM-4:39:18 PM.

⁸³ First hand accounts from individuals who were at this speech or had significant involvement in creating this event were interviewed in effort to recover the primary accounts of this historical night. The interviews used in this project were collected by me, Kristine Warrenburg, for a research project entitled *Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis*. Individuals were invited to participate in a study that researched audience participation in the event of April 4, 1968. I used a snowball methodology to request that individuals participate in a casual interview, which lasted approximately last 30-60 minutes. Participants were asked to describe their memories of Robert Kennedy's speech as well as the events that occurred surrounding April 4, 1968. Recorded answers contributed to further analysis of previously collected research. Participation in this study was strictly voluntary and no risk or discomfort was reported. Interviews were also collected and generously passed on to me by Donald Boggs and David Baird of Covenant Productions, Anderson University, for a project entitled "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Much appreciation is lent to the work of Boggs and Baird as this project would not have been the same without their contribution. Additional thanks is given to those who participated in the sharing of personal memories - by providing your personal accounts and stories we are better able to explain how audience members participate in a dialogic rhetoric. Most importantly, because historical evidence of this event is scarce, any supplementation via personal interviews is beneficial to the overall understanding of Kennedy's appearance in an Indianapolis as well as contributes to retention of primary sourced 1960s U.S. history overall.

⁸⁴ Robert H. Jackson, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 13: 1:44:18 PM-1:45:06 PM.

⁸⁵ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:19:48 AM-8:20:36 AM.

⁸⁶ Higgins, "A Tribute to Peace," *Indianapolis News*, April 4, 2006.

⁸⁷ "Keep MLK's Message of Peace Alive," *Indianapolis Star*, April 9, 2006.

⁸⁸ John Lewis, "Interview by PBS Home Video featured in *RFK*, a film for American Experience in Association with the BBC," A David Grubin Productions, Inc., 2004.

⁸⁹ Representative Julia Carson, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 11: 11:55:04 AM-12:03:56 PM.

⁹⁰ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:09:52 AM- 7:13:08 AM.

⁹¹ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:08:38 AM-11:10:52 AM.

⁹² *Ibid.*, Disc 34: 11:15:41 AM-11:16:34 AM.

⁹³ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:33:58 PM- 7:35:43 PM.

⁹⁴ According to AmericanRhetoric.com, "The Top 100 Speeches is an index to and substantial database of full text transcriptions of the 100 most significant American political speeches of the 20th century, according to a list compiled by Professors Stephen E. Lucas and Martin J. Medhurst. Dr. Lucas is Evjue-Bascom Professor in the Humanities and Professor of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Dr. Medhurst is Distinguished Professor of Rhetoric and Communication at Baylor University (Texas). 137 leading scholars of American public address were asked to recommend speeches

on the basis of social and political impact, and rhetorical artistry.” See AmericanRhetoric.com, “The Top 100 Speeches,” <http://americanrhetoric.com/newtop100speeches.htm> (accessed August 3, 2007).

Notes for Chapter Two: The Problem

¹ Ronald Walter Greene, “Constitutive Rhetoric and the Idea of Performance,” in *The Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association* (San Diego, CA: 1996), 2.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., 7.

⁴ Maurice Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of *Peuple Quebecois*,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1987): 133.

⁵ Ibid., 138.

⁶ Ronald Walter Greene, “The Aesthetic Turn and the Rhetorical Perspective on Argumentation,” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 35,1 (1998): 7.

⁷ Darrin Hicks, “Darkness on the Edge of Town: On the Interface between Communicational and Racial Ideologies,” in Tracy, K & J. McDaniels (Eds.), *Rhetoric, Discourse and Ordinary Democracy*. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008): 4.

⁸ Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric,” 133.

⁹ Michael A. Gilbert. *Coalescent Argumentation*. (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1997).

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ “Branigin's Favorite Son.”

¹² “Kennedy Calls.”

¹³ Schlesinger, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*.

¹⁴ Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 28.

¹⁵ David Halberstam, *The Unfinished Odyssey of Robert Kennedy* (New York: Random House, 1968).

¹⁶ Witcover, *85 Days*.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ *A Landmark for Peace* memorial is located on the south end of an urban park near 17th & Broadway in Indianapolis that was once the site of Kennedy’s announcement of King’s assassination.

Indiana artist Greg Perry used melted down guns retrieved from a gun-amnesty program and molded the material into an extraordinary sculpture that captures both fallen civil rights leaders, Kennedy and King, facing each other with an outstretched arm. Shadows are cast down, during the most opportune hours, reflecting the lingering message of hope, peace, and nonviolence that both leaders sought after through a bridge of racial and economic equality. For more see Boomhower, *Robert F. Kennedy*, 1-2.

²⁰ Ibid., 132.

²¹ George Plimpton, ed. (1970) provides a unique oral narrative that tells the life story of Robert Kennedy straight from the original sources. Consisting of oral accounts of Kennedy's funeral-train trip from New York to Washington, from both those people aboard the train along with those individuals that stood along the railroad tracks, this historical piece provides real-life, lived perspectives from multiple individuals. Over the course of two years, 347 interviews were conducted, edited, and then put together in a chronological fashion to provide organization of the piece. See George Plimpton and J. (interviews) Stein, eds., *American Journey: The Times of Robert Kennedy* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970).; Lester and Irene David David, *Bobby Kennedy: The Making of a Folk Hero* (Toronto: PaperJacks, LTD, 1986).; C. David Heymann, *Rfk: A Candid Biography of Robert F. Kennedy* (New York: A Dutton Book, 1998).; and Steel, *In Love with Night*.

²² Schlesinger, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 874.

²³ Ibid., 874-77.

²⁴ Ibid., 877.

²⁵ Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 367.

²⁶ Ibid., 369.

²⁷ Halberstam, *Unfinished Odyssey*, 85.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid., 86-87.

³⁰ Ibid., 87-89.

³¹ Boomhower, *Robert F. Kennedy*, 53-57.

³² Ibid., 68.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ These are the opening words to Anatol & Bittner's (1968) article. See Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King," 31.

³⁶ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19:7:21:53 PM-7:23:09 PM.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King," 31.

⁴⁰ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:35:51 PM-7:38:15 PM.

⁴¹ Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King," 32.

⁴² Ibid., 33.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ This is the name of the article. See Ibid.

⁴⁹ Andrew Levy, "The Big Nap: Indianapolis as City of the Future," *Dissent* Fall (1994): 488-96.

⁵⁰ John M. Murphy, "Renewing the National Covenant: The Presidential Campaign Rhetoric of Robert F. Kennedy" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1985).

⁵¹ ———, "'A Time of Shame and Sorrow:' Robert F. Kennedy and the American Jeremiad," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 406.

⁵² Similar to Murphy (1985), other graduate students have embraced Kennedy and his rhetoric as useful artifacts for analysis. With public memory paying particular attention to the influences of the Kennedy legacy, references to John F. Kennedy readily appear in academic research of the rhetoric of Robert Kennedy. Diane Lynn Dalton (1984), in her research of mythic themes contained in civil rights rhetoric, finds the Kennedy legacy in full swing. Dalton (1984) suggests that each brother had been instilled with the belief that he had a commitment to pick up where the fallen brothers had left off. Dalton's (1984) research also points to the significance of identification in the Kennedy rhetoric. Dalton (1984) offers that the public expressed a need to identify with the Kennedy's to see them as having risen above the average citizen, yet maintaining a measure of commonness. This opposing tension, Dalton (1984) offers, is what contributed to the growth of the Kennedy legend and influence. See Diane Lynn Dalton, "Mythic Themes in the Civil Rights Rhetoric of John and Edward Kennedy," (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1984), 10. Differing from Dalton's view, Rebecca Lynn Carlton finds that Robert Kennedy's rhetoric and rhetorical vision act as an entity separate from John Kennedy's, with unique goals and a different focus. In her Masters Thesis, Carlton (1992) examines the 1960 presidential campaign of John F. Kennedy and the 1968 presidential campaign of Robert F. Kennedy to analyze the similarities and differences that exist in their campaigns and their rhetoric. Utilizing Ernest Bormann's fantasy theme analysis, Carlton (1992) determines the rhetorical vision and fantasy themes that are created in three speeches from each campaign. Carlton (1992) finds that Robert Kennedy's rhetoric uses graphic, specific examples, which helps the audience to visualize his message. Carlton (1992) also adds that Robert Kennedy's rhetoric is "more personal, with frequent use of inclusive words such as "we" and "us." See Rebecca Lynn Carlton, "Was the Torch Passed? A Fantasy Theme Analysis of the Presidential Campaign Rhetoric of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Robert Francis Kennedy" (Masters, Ball State University, 1992),

47. The work done by graduate students provides consideration of Robert Kennedy's rhetoric in conjunction to his role as John F. Kennedy's brother, and as a member of the Kennedy empire. The particularities of Robert Kennedy's rhetoric and his use of identification strategies are relevant to his April 4, 1968 Indianapolis appearance and emerge as insightful pieces in which to expand upon in this particular research project.

⁵³ Maurice Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy," in *Philosophy Rhetoric and Argumentation*, ed. Maurice Natanson and Jr. Johnstone, Henry W. (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1965), 11.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* It is important to note however that Natanson (1965) is not suggesting that all arguments involve risk. He writes, "Arguments, then, do not automatically involve the risking of the self. Indeed, they rarely do," 12.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁵⁸ Abie Robinson, "Handout from the Rededication Celebration of The "Landmark for Peace Memorial" (Indianapolis: 2006). Copy available through author.

Notes for Chapter 3: The Method

¹ Michael A. Gilbert's (1997) work illustrates that "...the kind of evidence, its amount, and its authority and, shall we say, technicality are highly variable according to the context and needs of the disputants." See Michael A. Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation* (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997), 98.

² Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy," 14.

³ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁹ Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1979), 347.

¹⁰ Brice Wachterhauser, "Getting It Right: Relativism, Realism and Truth," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*, ed. Robert J. Dostal (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 74.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

-
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Jean Grondin, *The Philosophy of Gadamer*, trans. Kathryn Plant (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 42.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷ Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy," 10.
- ¹⁸ Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 393.
- ¹⁹ Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy," 15.
- ²⁰ Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968).
- ²¹ Richard E. Vatz, "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973).
- ²² Barbara A. Biesecker, "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from within the Thematic of Difference," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 22 (1989): 110.
- ²³ Michael A. Gilbert, "Emotion, Argumentation, and Informal Logic," in *Royal Institute of Philosophy Conference on Emotions* (2001).
- ²⁴ Ibid., 1.
- ²⁵ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 76.
- ²⁶ Michael A. Gilbert, "Effing the Ineffable: The Logocentric Fallacy in Argumentation," *Argumentation* 16 (2002): 26.
- ²⁷ Ibid.: 25.
- ²⁸ Ibid.: 30.
- ²⁹ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 76.
- ³⁰ ———, "Effing the Ineffable," 30.
- ³¹ Lenore Langsdorf, "Refusing Individuality: How Human Beings Are Made into Subjects," *Communication Theory* 7, no. 4 (1997): 326. Working through a critique of Habermas' theory of communication Langsdorf sets out to incorporate outlying features of traditional argumentation.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Ibid., 326-27.
- ³⁴ Ibid., 329.

³⁵ Hicks, "Darkness on the Edge of Town," 26.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Greene, "The Aesthetic Turn," 2.

⁴⁰ Hicks, "Darkness on the Edge of Town," 26.

⁴¹ Darrin Hicks and Lenore Langsdorf, "Regulating Disagreement, Constituting Participants: A Critique of Proceduralist Theories of Democracy," *Argumentation* 13 (1999): 157.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Lenore Langsdorf, "Why Phenomenology in Communication Research?," *Human Studies* 17 (1994).

⁴⁴ Hyde (2001) summarizes such a methodology by suggesting that "...the phenomenologist must bracket out and set aside preconceptions of the phenomenon so to be as open as possible to the phenomenon's own disclosure, to how it in fact is actually (truthfully) happening. Remaining open to the disclosure allows the phenomenon to be what it is and to speak for itself. Phenomenology is a way of "listening" attentively and being receptive to the "saying" (logos), the disclosing or unconcealing of truth that is going on here." See Michael J. Hyde, *The Call of Conscience: Heidegger and Levinas, Rhetoric and the Euthansia Debate* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 59.

⁴⁵ "How social reality forms in human interaction with the environment, and in particular, in communicative interaction with other communicating beings situated within an environment is," Langsdorf (1994) puts forth, "the central concern" of phenomenology. See Langsdorf, "Why Phenomenology," 7.

⁴⁶ Lenore Langsdorf, "On the Uses of Language in Working and Idealized Logic," *Argumentation* 4 (1990): 259-68.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 261. From this Langsdorf (1990), considers context-dependent, context-independent, and decontextualized uses of language in conjunction with idealized logic (language is context-invariant) and working logic (language is context-dependent). See Langsdorf, "On the Uses of Language," 260, 64.

⁴⁸ Other repressed elements, or outlying features of rhetorical effectivity, such as the visual, could also be a beneficial addition to Gilbert's (1997) model in certain cases. For example, if one was to consider a historical account via a documentary or newspaper photographs or if one was interested in memorials -- consideration of the visual, logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral could be helpful to a multifaceted rhetorical analysis.

⁴⁹ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 80.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 80-81.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid., 84.

⁵³ These are excerpts pulled from the full transcript of Kennedy's April 4, 1968 address in Indianapolis. See Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available for review on americanrhetoric.com.

⁵⁴ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 80.

⁵⁵ See Stephen Howard Browne, "'The Circle of Our Felicities': Thomas Jefferson's First Inaugural Address and the Rhetoric of Nationhood," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 3 (2002).; Forbes Hill, "Conventional Wisdom - Traditional Form - the President's Message of November 3, 1969," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58, no. 4 (1972).; Michael Leff, "Lincoln at Cooper Union: Neo-Classical Criticism Revisited," *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001).

⁵⁶ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 79.

⁵⁷ Underline added. Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available for review on americanrhetoric.com.

⁵⁸ Mikhail Bakhtin presents the concept of the "emotional-volitional tone" in Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, ed. V.; Holquist Liapunov, M., trans. V. Liapunov (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993).

⁵⁹ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

⁶⁰ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:08:38 AM-11:10:52 AM.

⁶¹ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available for review on americanrhetoric.com.

⁶² "These include such elements as degree of commitment, depth, and extent of feeling, sincerity, and degree of resistance." See Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 84.

⁶³ Joe Klein, "Pssst! Who's Behind the Decline of Politics?," *Time*, April 9 2006.

⁶⁴ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 84.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 79, 86. Gilbert takes "...the liberty of introducing a new term here in order to afford sufficient breadth without at the same time using terminology generally in disrepute. That is, the kisceral covers not only the intuitive but also, for those who indulge, the mystical, religious, supernatural and extrasensory. 'Kisceral' is chosen in order to have a descriptive term that does not carry with it normative baggage, like, for example, 'mystical' or 'extra-sensory.'" See Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 79.

⁶⁶ I will turn to the philosophical insight of Mikhail Bakhtin (1993, 1986, 1981), Emmanuel Levinas (1998, 1995, 1982), and Martin Buber (1996) in effort to expand on Gilbert's (1997) kisceral mode of argumentation.

⁶⁷ Gigerich, "Gigerich Interview 2008." Disc 26: 4:17:45 AM-4:23:34 AM.

⁶⁸ Rev. Thomas L. Brown, "Interviews done for the documentary 'A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968'", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 24: 1:16:51 AM-1:18:03 AM.

⁶⁹ Langsdorf, "Why Phenomenology," 7.

Notes for Chapter Four: The Visceral

¹ Reverend Lewis Deer. "Interview in Indianapolis, April 1968," found in Karl W. Anatol and John R. Bittner's "Kennedy on King: The Rhetoric of Control." *Today's Speech* 16, no. 3 (1968): 31-34. Anatol later remembers, "This woman that he had known, you know she sort of confronts him with her arm up. Meaning you've come to a dead stop, say nothing more to me, Dr. King is dead. [A] white man did it. Why does he [Kennedy] have to come here? [Deer seemed] to be completely taken back by a friend, now becoming a foe." See Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008."

² Deer, "Deer Interview 1968."

³ See Carrie Crenshaw, "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence," *Western Journal of Communication* 61 (1997).; D. J. Goodman, "About Privileged Groups," in *Promoting Diversity and Social Justice: Educating People Form Privileged Groups* (Sage Publications, 2001).; A. E. Lewis, "What Group?" Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era Of "Color Blindness," *Sociological Theory* 22 (2004).; J.N. Martin et al., "Exploring Whiteness: A Study of Self Labels for White Americans," *Communication Quarterly* 44 (1996).; James W. Perkinson, *White Theology: Outing Supremacy in Modernity* (New York: Palgrave macmillan, 2004).; Shome, "Outing Whiteness," *Review and Criticism* (2000).

⁴ See Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction* (New York: New York University Press, 2001).; L.A. Flores and D.G. Moon, "Rethinking Race, Revealing Dilemmas: Imagining a New Racial Subject in Race Traitor," *Western Journal of Communication* 66 (2002).; Lewis, "What Group?"; L. Lipari, "Fearful of the Written Word:" White Fear, Black Writing, and Lorraine Hansbery's *a Raisin in the Sun* Screenplay," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004).

⁵ See R. Avant-Mier and Jr. Hasian, M. , "In Search of the Power of Whiteness: A Genealogical Exploration of Negotiated Racial Identities in America's Ethnic Past," *Communication Quarterly* 50 (2002).; Crenshaw, "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence."

⁶ See Avant-Mier and Hasian, "In Search of the Power of Whiteness."; M. Houston, "When Black Women Talk with White Women: Why Dialogues Are Difficult," in *Our Voices: Essays in Culture, Ethnicity, and Communication*, ed. A. Gonzalez, M. Houston, and V. Chen (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997).; II. Jackson, R.L., "White Space, White Privilege: Mapping Discursive Inquiry into the Self," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85 (2000).; D. Roediger, "Whiteness and Ethnicity in the History of "White Ethnics" in the United States.," in *Race Critical Theories* ed. P. Essed and D. Goldberg (Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2002).

⁷ See Perkinson, *White Theology*.

⁸ Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 3.

⁹ In keeping with traditional contract theoreticians – Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and Kant – the Racial Contract proposes to outline the social structure, government functions, and the people's moral psychology that agrees to the Racial Contract. Mills outlines each of these theorists' contribution and/or their lack of acknowledgment of the role of race.

¹⁰ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 3.

¹¹ Ibid., 15.

¹² Ibid., 18.

¹³ T.K. Nakayama and R.L. Krizek, "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric," in *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* ed. C.R. Burgchardt (State College, Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, Inc., 2005), 629.

¹⁴ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 107.

¹⁵ Nakayama and Krizek, "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric," 631.

¹⁶ Perkinson, *White Theology*, 89.

¹⁷ Quoted in Nakayama and Krizek, "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric," 631.

¹⁸ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 127.

¹⁹ Crenshaw, "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence," 268. See Goodman, "About Privileged Groups.,"; Lewis, "What Group?."

²⁰ See Goodman, "About Privileged Groups.,"; Lewis, "What Group?"

²¹ Mark Lawrence McPhail, "A Question of Character: Re(-)Signing the Racial Contract," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7, no. 3 (2004): 391-405.

²² Ibid., 396.

²³ James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States 1945-1974* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 693.

²⁴ Edelman, "Edelman Interview 2008." Disc 10: 10:51:39 AM-11:05:40 AM.

²⁵ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:18:48 PM-4:19:32 PM. Another memory that speaks to the visceral attraction of Kennedy is revealed as one of Milliken's greatest memories of the political leader: "My great impression to this day is over here at the State House. I don't know why he had come there, maybe it was to file or something, but there was a huge crowd outside. As he worked his way in to the building and people were reaching out to touch him and to greet him, and he stopped and responded frequently and you could just tell as he touch these people and looked in to his eyes that he really cared about these people and was moved by their support for him. That's my great memory of Bobby." Disc 16: 4:21:50 PM-4:22:39 PM.

²⁶ See Robert F. Kennedy, *Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (The Educational Video Group, 1968).; *Great Speeches: Volume Vi* (The Educational Video Group).; The Nostalgia Company, *The Greatest Speeches of All-Time* (Rolling Bay: SoundWorks USA, Inc., 1998), DVD.; "RFK," in *American Experience*, ed. PBS Home Video (USA: BBC, 2004).

²⁷ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 84. The visceral mode of communication includes a vast array of features "...including, but not limited to, physical circumstance, physical events, body language, and other forms of nonverbal communication," Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 92.

²⁸ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 85.

²⁹ Ibid., 92.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ See Raymie E. McKerrow, "Corporeality and Cultural Rhetoric: A Site for Rhetoric's Future," *The Southern Communication Journal* 63, no. 4 (1998).

³² Beginning by discussing the disciplinary history of the production and reception of rhetoric, Mailioux (2002) works to illustrate rhetorical hermeneutics as an alternative to fragmentation among rhetorical scholarship (namely as one of production vs. one as reception of rhetoric). Linking rhetorical hermeneutics to "cultural rhetoric" "...encourages a practical and theoretical preoccupation with making sense of the political dynamics of cultural conversations at specific historical moments. It places power/knowledge relations near the center of any proposed rhetorical rethinking of the human sciences," See Steven Mailioux, "Re-Marking Slave Bodies: Rhetoric as Production and Reception," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 35, no. 2 (2002): 98. Rather than isolating study to a traditionally production focused outlook, Mailioux (2002) suggests that hermeneutical study should be more about "finding" the available means of persuasion and not merely the production of the available means of persuasion. This expands the scope of what can be gained by rhetorical hermeneutics. In application, Mailioux (2002) turns to Frederick Douglass and how his body and words constituted his abolitionist rhetoric. "The elocutionary focus on delivery, on the aural and visible, on voice and gesture, thematized the body in rhetorical theory and emphasized it in practice as it was simultaneously being figured as central to the intersectional debates over abolition," Mailioux, "Re-Marking Slave Bodies," 103. Douglass' performance of eloquent oratory (a performance renowned with whiteness) marked by body rhetoric (as it was performed by a black man), illustrates the polysemic nature of the rhetorical enterprise.

³³ In an article investigating the body rhetoric of three 'new' or postmodern social movements (Earth First!, Act Up and Queer Nation), DeLuca (1999) highlights the ways formal modes of argument are replaced with the performance of "...unorthodox political tactics that highlight bodies as resources for argumentation and advocacy." See Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, Act up, and Queer Nation," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36, no. Summer (1999): 9. The DeLuca (1999) article contributes to our understanding of body rhetoric by speaking to multiple ideas including public image as spectacle, bodies at risk, the presence of the body *is* the argument, body rhetoric as manipulation (via advertising), and bodies as a voice for silenced people. DeLuca (1999) argues that these social movement groups, "...are practicing a form of argumentation that is an important manifestation of what has become known as constitutive rhetoric: the mobilization of signs, images, and discourses for the articulation of identities, ideologies, consciousnesses, communities, publics, and cultures." See DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments," 10. Unable to buy time on air, these groups 'buy' airtime through their image events. Their bodies are used not only to gain attention but are also the argument itself. For these particular groups, formal argumentation, or operating solely in the logical mode of reasoning, is unheard of. Rather, these groups seek and use alternative activist politics by way of image events, performance, body rhetoric, and/or visceral argumentation. DeLuca (1999) writes, "...the force of these groups' protests...have challenged and changed the meanings of the world not through good reasons but through vulnerable bodies, not through rational arguments but through bodies at risk." See DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments," 11. See also Christine Harold and Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Behold the Corpse: Violent Images and the Case of Emmett Till," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 2 (2005).

³⁴ Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy," 14.

³⁵ Ibid., 15. Some examples presented in the DeLuca (1999) article include how the EarthFirst!ers "become nature" by sitting in trees (even when they are cut down), blockading roads with their bodies (often their entire body is buried with only their head showing), and chaining themselves to logging

equipment, as well as, dressing in animal costumes for public hearings. See DeLuca, “Unruly Arguments,” 12. Act Up/Queer Nation use their bodies as arguments by hosting ‘die-ins’ in Catholic Churches in protest of condemnation of homosexuality, they have ‘kiss-ins’ in shopping malls to challenge the default notion of heterosexuality, and they wear “the most fabulous gay regalia” to disrupt the normativity of the heterosexual positionality. See DeLuca, “Unruly Arguments,” 19.

³⁶ DeLuca, “Unruly Arguments,” 20.

³⁷ “The body is front and center in their (ACT UP and Queer Nation) arguments for it is the body that is at stake – its meanings, its possibilities, its care, and its freedoms. In their protest actions, the activists use their bodies to rewrite the homosexual body as already constructed by dominant mainstream discourses – diseased, contagious, deviant, invisible.” Ibid., 17.

³⁸ Ibid., 20.

³⁹ Ibid., 12.

⁴⁰ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 86.

⁴¹ Crenshaw, “Resisting Whiteness’ Rhetorical Silence,” 265.

⁴² Ibid.: 265.

⁴³ Crawford, “Crawford Interview 2007”.

⁴⁴ LaVerne Steward, “Interviews done for the research project “Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy’s Speech in Indianapolis,” conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: April 4, 2007. Tape recording and transcript available from author.

⁴⁵ Crenshaw, “Resisting Whiteness’ Rhetorical Silence,” 270.

⁴⁶ Rhodes, “Rhodes Sr. Interview.” Disc 21: 9:21:14 PM-9:22:17 PM.

⁴⁷ Natanson, “The Claims of Immediacy,” 15-16.

⁴⁸ Boyd, “Boyd Interview 2008.” Disc 15: 3:06:24 PM-3:09:23 PM.

⁴⁹ Milliken, “Milliken Interview 2008.” Disc 16: 4:10:11 PM-4:11:53 PM.

⁵⁰ Of equal importance, is Milliken’s (2008) notation of the lack of confrontation that was exuded by the Indianapolis African American community. Such a turn to acknowledge the power of polite protest will be taken up later in the project when the peaceful resolution following Kennedy’s announcement is more fully examined.

⁵¹ Darlene Howard (2008), resident of Indianapolis and audience member, makes clear that the Hoosier capital was ripe with racism: “Well actually my home is Mississippi and my parents came here [to Indianapolis] hoping for a better life. It was not that way. There were no homes for black people with children. They wouldn’t rent to you. You know, there was nothing. Even though my dad worked hard... They did a lot of lay offs and whatever so we did a lot of back and forth. My grandparents, they were in the South, and the first time I ever experienced any racial prejudice was when we came here [to Indianapolis] presently to stay. I was eleven years old. We never entertained that in the South like people think. It was never a black and white situation. It was country and city. The whites lived next to the

blacks and they helped during the harvests and the killing of the animals for winter. It was never like that and I never knew racial prejudice until I came here to live permanently. I had an old drunk white man in front of Sears, my sister and I had shopped for school clothes because it was a time you could ride the bus and shop as children, young children and nobody would bother you and he walked back and forth with a fifth of wine and we were standing on the corner with a gentleman in a suit and another black lady. He was screeching and screaming that the one thing he couldn't stand was a "God damn nigger," and I was like who is this man? That's the first noticeable thing that I experienced as a growing up here and it escalated at that point. Then I began to really look at what my surroundings were and realize[d] the neighborhood we was in was minority and it was different. It was different. It was not a good as it should have been. There were not opportunities. We were [the] first 15% of the black children sent to Shortridge [High School] and that was an amazing thing. The teachers weren't ready for us and I wasn't ready for them. I experienced racial prejudice right there in Shortridge High School. I was in an all white class with three black children and it was a physical science class and this man, Mr. Skyels, you could just smell the hatred from him. I remember these two girls was sitting in front of me, these are things you don't forget and they were talking. Well, I didn't know anybody in that class. I'm black. I'm from a black neighborhood. He told me to shut up and I'm sitting in the back row and I'm like who are you talking to and he ran back with a book in his hand, raised, standing in front of me. He said "I said shut-up." I was like sir I ain't talking to anybody I don't know them. Those are these to ladies right here, these two girls right here. He cursed me out and told me I was a "God damn lying nigger." Right there in Shortridge High School. I got up. I was so humiliated and he put his hands on me. He put his hands on me. He grabbed me and at that point all I saw was self-defense even as a young girl. Believe me it was ugly. So these are the things that stick out in my mind. I could remember watching TV and watching children. Doors being blocked so they couldn't go into school. I lived two blocks from an amusement park and we couldn't go in. Riverside Park, we could not go in. These are the things that stick out in my mind. A lot hasn't changed. People dress different. A lot not even on jobs, it hasn't changed that much. They cover up. I think everybody is entitled to respect and dignity. If you don't like me, respect me and I'll respect you but life has not been kind being a minority in this city. The statements of last hired, first fired. That's still true. That's true were I work. I was the first black woman to work for Natural Resources. It was awful. They came out of offices to stare and gawk and I'm like what are they looking at? It was because I was black. There are the things I grew up with. The prejudices, the little ladies clutching the purses when they see you on elevator and you probably had more money in your pocket than they had in theirs. These are the things I grew up with. We had a lot of fun though. My mom always made sure we had fun and she used to tell us "if you don't like a person and you think it's because the color of their skin, she said, color them the same color you are and see if you like them any better and it always worked. Some of them I liked better, some of them I still didn't like. These are the values she gave me and I want to give to my children." Howard, "Howard Interview 2008." Disc 23: 11:11:05 PM- 11:18:08 PM.

⁵² Jackson, "Jackson Interview 2008." Disc 13: 1:05:23 PM-1:05:52 PM.

⁵³ Ron Haldeman, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 14: 2:00:58 PM-2:04:02 PM.

⁵⁴ Ibid., Disc 14: 2:04:18 PM-2:08:29 PM. Robert Jackson also describes the state of neighborhood as predominately African American and subject to urban decay: "This is an area that was being redone. Physically they were tearing down old buildings, putting in apartments and whatnot. Getting that area of town fixed up. So it was definitely an area where most black people lived and it was mostly attended by blacks, but there where whites there [at the speech]." Jackson, "Jackson Interview 2008." Disc 13: 1:16:53 PM-1:22:19 PM.

⁵⁵ Haldeman, "Haldeman Interview 2008." Disc 14: 2:04:18 PM-2:08:29 PM.

⁵⁶ Ibid., Disc 14: 2:27:36 PM-2:32:50 PM.

⁵⁷ Ibid., Disc 14: 2:08:41 PM-2:09:37 PM.

⁵⁸ Ibid., Disc 14: 2:55:21 PM-2:59:21 PM.

⁵⁹ Raymie E. McKerrow, "Space and Time in the Postmodern Polity," *Western Journal of Communication* 63, no. 3 (1999): 273.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 271-72.

⁶¹ Ibid., 287.

⁶² Ibid., 276-83. See also H. Lefebvre, "Reflections on the Politics of Space," *Antipode* 8 (1976).; H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. D.N. Smith, [Original French edition published in 1974] ed. (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991).

⁶³ McKerrow, "Space and Time," 276. *Spatial Practices* are "...separated from one another by clear lines of demarcation, yet adjacent to one another such that one can move easily from one space to another," similar to zoning, McKerrow, "Space and Time," 277. *Representations of Space* or "mapping" defines the relationship to each other and tends to be overlaid with notions of power; these said representations lock us into categorizations that are humanly created and can be redrawn, McKerrow, "Space and Time," 279-80. *Spaces of Representation* are the "imaginary spaces" overcome with fantasy and non-materiality. In this space, you can posit radical movement via re-territorialization and through sites of resistance, McKerrow, "Space and Time," 281-83.

⁶⁴ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:09:33 AM-8:11:40 AM. Trulock, who was also present at the speech, recalls the make up of the non-black audience members: "I got the impression that many of the white people there were Democratic Party people, precinct committee people or just supporters of Robert Kennedy who heard he was going to make a speech. In a way that's what I was doing there but I knew this speech had to be about social justice. He couldn't talk about anything else that night but social justice. As it turns out you know, he did, but in a context none of us could have predicted." Trulock, "Trulock Interview 2008." Disc 25: 2:46:39 AM-2:48:03 AM.

⁶⁵ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 48.

⁶⁶ Breaux, "Breaux Interview 2008." Disc 17: 5:31:27 PM-5:33:36 PM.

⁶⁷ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 42.

⁶⁸ S. N. Haymes, *Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy for Black Urban Struggle* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1995), 4.

⁶⁹ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 13.

⁷⁰ See Janson, "Rivals in Indiana."

⁷¹ Perkinson, *White Theology*, 84.

⁷² Crenshaw, "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence," 264. Crenshaw (1997) warns, this strategy "...has dangerous material results because the way we discuss race shapes both our perceptions and responses to racial issues."

⁷³ See Iris Marion Young, "Throwing Like a Girl: A Phenomenology of Feminine Body Comportment, Motility, and Spatiality," *Human Studies* 3 (1980).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 142.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 144.

⁷⁸ ———, "Introduction," in *On Female Body Experience: "Throwing Like a Girl" And Other Essays*, ed. Iris Marion Young (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 8.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ ———, *Inclusion and Democracy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁸¹ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:17:15 PM-3:19:53 PM.

⁸² Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 51.

⁸³ Haldeman, "Haldeman Interview 2008." Disc 14: 2:14:09 PM-2:19:20 PM. "Obviously the head of the safety board [was present]. The paid staff director of the safety board which over [saw] the police and the fire department...was calling the shots."

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, Disc 14: 2:27:36 PM-2:32:50 PM.

⁸⁵ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:09:33 AM-8:11:40 AM.

⁸⁶ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

⁸⁷ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2008." Disc 22: 10:41:36 PM-10:43:50 PM. Forestal continues, "The only place with a uniformed presence was at the Marott Hotel and that's where the Kennedy's were staying. That's where Ethel was, I don't know about Robert. There was a heavy presence there are the hotel. A couple of them were very unhappy that we brought those outside agitators in. You'd just look at them and shake your head like you redneck. A lot of the police, the new administration, they weren't too happy. They felt that Kennedy being here was going to create a problem."

⁸⁸ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:16:35 AM-11:18:00 AM.

⁸⁹ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2006."

⁹⁰ Trulock, "Trulock Interview 2008." Disc 25: 2:18:05 AM-2:22:13 AM.

⁹¹ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 20: 8:06:18 PM-8:09:25 PM. See also Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King."

⁹² Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:47:34 PM-7:50:20 PM. Also see Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King."

⁹³ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:08:38 AM-11:10:52 AM.

⁹⁴ R.P. Mooney. "Welsh, McDonald Rally to Branigin," (*The Indianapolis Star*, April 4, 1968).

⁹⁵ Donald Janson. "Rivals in Indiana Woo Negro Vote: Kennedy Goes Into Slums and Is Hailed by Militants," (*New York Times*, April 4, 1968).

⁹⁶ Janson, "Rival in Indiana Woo Negro Vote".

⁹⁷ Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King," 31.

⁹⁸ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:41:11 PM- 7:43:02 PM. Reflecting on why individuals remained at the location even though the possibility for violence was emerging, Anatol says, "They stayed for the simple reason that there was no place to go. They were really surrounded. It was backed in tight and stand there and submit to whatever there was at that spot in that place or try to walk through the crowd and subject yourself to a lot of abuse as you left. So they decided, I don't know how much logic they applied in the situation but they remained where they were and awaited the tide so to speak." .Disc 19: 7:43:04 PM-7:43:48 PM.

⁹⁹ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2008." Disc 22: 10:39:44 PM-10:41:31 PM.

¹⁰⁰ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:38:45 PM- 7:40:28 PM.

¹⁰¹ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 92.

¹⁰² Further, the slow pace of Kennedy's physical delivery also illustrates this hesitation. Watching Kennedy pull at the envelope in which the hastily outlined speech was written is indicative of the nervousness embedded in Kennedy's body. This will be discussed in more detail in the upcoming chapter.

¹⁰³ Gigerich, "Gigerich Interview 2008." Disc 26: 4:17:45 AM-4:23:34 AM).

¹⁰⁴ Howard, "Howard Interview 2008." Disc 23: 11:54:55 PM- 11:56:03 PM. It is noted that certainly there must have been some individuals who were not fearful of the situation. As Riley puts forth, "Quite frankly no I didn't. Let's say at that point in my life that I was a much less cynical, more trusting, seen the good in everybody versus throughout my career seeing bad people. No, I had no fear." Michael Riley, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 6: 6:12:44 AM-6:27:02 AM.

¹⁰⁵ Anatol and Bittner, "Kennedy on King," 32.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 34.

¹⁰⁷ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 119.

¹⁰⁸ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available for review on americanrhetoric.com.

¹⁰⁹ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2006."

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available for review on americanrhetoric.com.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Research on whiteness as a critical construct will be used to briefly examine Kennedy's public persona as a white male political candidate in 1968 in the upcoming conclusion of this project. Understanding the audience's perception of the man who delivered the news of King's death will prove to be a foundational piece of the story as it provides insight into the relationship between Kennedy and his audience. We will hear how members of the audience described Kennedy as a caring, passionate, and courageous politician. These memories will be met with a critical reflexive view of Kennedy as an individual out to gain political compensation.

¹¹⁴ Rhodes, "Rhodes Sr. Interview 2008." Disc 21: 9:19:34 PM-9:20:16 PM. "I lived at 1640 N College and he set up right on the corner of 16 you know, at 16, 17th on this side of 16th street. So I was down the alley then. All I had to do was walk out my back door come down the alley and there was the crowd. There he was set up on a platform. It was a truck with a bed on it. That's where he come and all the crowd there was a lot of excitement, you know. I just walked out my back door and went over there to hear his speech." Rhodes, "Rhodes Sr. Interview 2008," Disc 21: 9:16:23-9:17:01.

¹¹⁵ Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 59.

¹¹⁶ See Michael Eric Dyson, *I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).; Richard L. Deats, *Martin Luther King, Jr., Spirit-Led Prophet: A Biography* (New York: New City Press, 2000).

¹¹⁷ It is noted that each area of discussion – Kennedy's recognition of the power of the African American community; how Kennedy evoked the political and moral contract via his rhetorical invention and message delivered; Whiteness as a cultural construct; the role of the audience in creating a peaceful vision; racialized spaces and the stereotypical implications therein; and potential sites for racial convergence – all could be expanded into full analyses. Space and time does not allow for such detail here. However, thus far, this chapter sought to utilize a critical cultural framework to broaden the possibilities for how we can understand political actors and messages delivered in light of race and discourse.

Notes for Chapter Five: The Emotional

¹ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:38:00 PM-3:39:18 PM.

² Carson, "Carson Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:45:47 AM-11:51:35 AM.

³ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:44:25 AM-7:45:25 AM.

⁴ Steward, "Steward Interview 2007."

⁵ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008" Disc 15: 3:13:18 PM-3:16:35 PM.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., Disc 15: 3:34:27 PM-3:37:51 PM.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:07:05 AM- 7:09:22 AM.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 96.

¹³ Ibid., 84.

¹⁴ For an overview of the psychological study of emotion see Leda Cosmides and John Tooby, "Evolutionary Psychology and the Emotions," in *Handbook of Emotions*, ed. Michael Lewis and Jeannette Haviland-Jones (New York, NY: The Guilford Press).; and Nico H. Frijda, "The Psychologists' Point of View," in *Handbook of Emotions*, ed. Michael Lewis and Jeannette Haviland-Jones (New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2000).

¹⁵ Solomon (1993), bringing a philosophical perspective to emotion, presents the theory that "emotions are judgments." (p. viii). He goes on to suggest that "It is our passions, not our reason (and surely not "nature"), that constitute our world, our relationships with other people and, consequently, our Selves." (p. 15). See Robert C. Solomon, *The Passions: Emotions and the Meaning of Life* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1993). Insert Research regarding cultural studies of emotion, appropriateness, and occasion. Bodiker & Jameson (2001) offer a relative guide to emotional components of a conflict experience, particularly within the argument culture of an organization. See Andrea M. Bodtker and Jessica Katz Jameson, "Emotion in Conflict Formation and Its Transformation: Application to Organizational Conflict Management," *The International Journal of Conflict Management* 12, no. 3 (2001).

¹⁶ Arguing that the "emotional experience" is essential in explaining how arguments work in the interpersonal context one study used a "cued-recall procedure" along with self-reported feelings of study participants to explore how arguers bring forth "the moment-to-moment emotionality of arguing." See Dale Hample et al., "Face-to-Face Arguing Is an Emotional Experience: Triangulating Methodologies and Early Findings," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 42, no. Fall (2005): 74.

¹⁷ See Jeremy Engels, "Disciplining Jefferson: The Man within the Breast and the Rhetorical Norms of Producing Order," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 3 (2006). Engels (2006) explores the "dialogue between Jefferson's head and heart" through a close-reading of the rhetorical styles brought forth in a letter written to Maria Cosway of October 12, 1786. Zulick (1998) also argues for a closer look at "figurative and emotive language whose combination yields sublime effects in the poetry of the Hebrew prophets as well as in examples of modern discourse." See Margaret D. Zulick, "The Normative, the Proper, and the Sublime: Notes on the Use of Figure and Emotion in Prophetic Argumentation," *Argumentation* 12 (1998). According to Griffin (2006), "Appeals to emotion are necessary parts of persuasive speeches. If you can avoid overly graphic, frightening, or manipulative appeals, you can tap into powerful emotions. By staying audience centered, paying careful attention to your language, and balancing reason and emotion, you will be able to craft persuasive arguments that encourage your audience to think differently about issues." (p. 392). See Cindy L. Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," in *Chapter Eighteen: Persuasion and Reasoning* (Belmont, CA: Thomson and Wadsworth, 2006).

¹⁸ Walton (1992) argues that "appeals to emotion have a legitimate, even important, place as arguments in persuasion dialogue, but that they need to be treated with caution because they can also be used fallaciously," Douglas Walton, *The Place of Emotion in Argument* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 1.

¹⁹ Michael A. Gilbert, "Emotional Messages," *Argumentation* 15 (2001): 239.

²⁰ Ibid., 240.

²¹ Ibid., 242.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., 248.

²⁵ Robert C. Solomon, "Emotions in Phenomenology and Existentialism," in *A Companion to Phenomenology and Existentialism*, ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus, Wrathall, Mark A. (Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 299-300.

²⁶ Ibid., 294.

²⁷ Ibid., 295. Solomon (2006) also acknowledges Kierkegaard and Nietzsche "for their sometimes profound if unsystematic observations on both the nature of emotion and on specific emotions (for instance, *ressentiment* and *angst*), and by the time we approach genuinely phenomenological territory a good deal of the terrain has already been mapped out." (p. 295). He also brings forth the work of Brentano, Husserl and Scheler and "the idea that emotions are essentially sensations." (p. 295). Noting the role of experience and situational occurrence, Solomon (2006), highlights William James and acknowledges that emotion is sometimes treated as an "...unthinking instinct...[a] more general analysis of sensation and perception." (p. 296). Freud and his scientific approach to emotion, and Heidegger's move to be "tuned" to the world comes prior to calling forth Sartre's take on emotion as political.

²⁸ Solomon (2006) adds, "What we "see" and describe in our experience (even our allegedly "immediate" experience) is mediated by historically conditioned concepts and categories." (p. 291).

²⁹ Solomon, "Emotions in Phenomenology," 300-01.

³⁰ "Appeals to emotions ask an audience to recall some of their most profound experiences," offers Griffin. Furthermore, speakers "...can use vivid descriptions and examples to help [the] audience connect with those experiences." Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 391.

³¹ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available to view at americanrhetoric.com. Underline added.

³² Gilbert, "Emotional Messages," 246.

³³ Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 392.

³⁴ Kennedy, "Remarks on the Assassination," available to view at americanrhetoric.com.

³⁵ Thomas, "Thomas Interview 2008." Disc 10: 10:23:37 AM-10:24:15 AM.

³⁶ Isa Engleberg and John Daly, *Presentations in Everyday Life: Strategies for Effective Speaking*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005), 277. "In fact, the richness of your vocabulary can enhance the audience's opinion of your credibility. Even when audience members don't understand every word or concept in your presentation, they may be impressed with your ability to engage language and speak eloquently."

³⁷ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:06:29 AM-8:09:30 AM.

³⁸ Breaux, "Breaux Interview 2008" Disc 17: 5:31:27 PM-5:33:36 PM.

³⁹ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:36:02 PM-4:36:38 PM.

⁴⁰ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 20: 8:16:31 PM-8:19:26 PM. Anatol reflects on a comment that he published (1968) regarding Kennedy's use of Greek poetry in the Indianapolis announcement: "In my article I said something that over the years I came to regret, and it was that reflecting on his use of the poetry by Aeschylus. I said that that might have been very well wasted on an illiterate audience. Well I don't know whether the audience was illiterate, I have no way of knowing that but the fact of the matter is that it was not wasted. Good poetry, good art in any context can elevate and Kennedy really had an opportunity, not an opportunity, but the outcome was that he really elevated the emotion of an audience and elevated the response of an audience. He was a simple sounding man with some rich resources on which to draw and he gets into that audience and he plucks a flower out of Greek literature and hands it to an audience and it had a wonderfully calming effect." Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:31:24 PM- 7:33:09 PM.

⁴¹ Engleberg and Daly, *Presentations in Everyday Life*, 281. "Your choice of words can captivate an audience through the use of repetition (sounds and words), resemblances (similes and metaphors), or other rhetorical devices (antithesis, personification, rhyme) to "capture" and hold your audience's attention while making your ideas appealing and memorable."

⁴² Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:24:16 PM-3:34:11 PM.

⁴³ Edelman, "Edelman Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:14:27 AM-11:15:52 AM.

⁴⁴ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:23:58 AM-8:24:34 AM.

⁴⁵ Rhodes, "Rhodes Sr. Interview 2008." Disc 21: 9:33:01 PM-9:39:53 PM. "I lived at 1640 N College and he set up right on the corner of 16 you know, at 16, 17th on this side of 16th street. So I was down the alley then. All I had to do was walk out my back door come down the alley and there was the crowd. There he was set up on a platform. It was a truck with a bed on it. That's where he come and all the crowd there was a lot of excitement, you know. I just walked out my back door and went over there to hear his speech." Disc 21: 9:16:23 PM-9:17:01 PM.

⁴⁶ Edelman, "Edelman Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:11:31 AM-11:14:11 AM.

⁴⁷ Gary Genard, "Leveraging the Power of Nonverbal Communication," *Harvard Management Communication Letter* 1, no. 2 (2004): 3. Decisions regarding credibility and professionalism can be made by audience members "...by just watching how [the speaker] carries himself and how [they] relate to their presence in purely physical terms." Genard, "Leveraging the Power," 3. In other words, Kennedy's visual performance would include the occasion, the setting, the participants, and overall delivery (both verbal and nonverbal) of the emotional message. "Leaders know how to move boldly and decisively. There is nothing tentative about their movements and gestures -- instead, they literally command the space through which they move." Genard, "Leveraging the Power," 4. Kennedy moved through the crowd, onto the platform stage, and delivered his address with physical ease and confidence. His courage and confidence was marked immediately "...by a fluidity of movement, rather than stiffness, jerkiness, or statue-like immobility." Genard, "Leveraging the Power," 4. Instead of using physical expressions that could send hostile messages, such as "nodding repeatedly," "taking a hunched-over or defensive posture," or "using overly large and abrupt movements," Genard, "Leveraging the Power," 4. Kennedy maintained eye contact with his audience and smoothly guided his arm back and forth (pointing to himself and then back at the

audience). Appearing genuine and rejecting hostility, Kennedy was able to create a sense of relationship with his audience. And as recalled by Mankiewicz (2008), “This is all coming right out of his head and his heart. That’s the kind of person he was that could say those things on his own.” Mankiewicz, “Mankiewicz Interview 2008.” Disc 8: 8:32:31 AM-8:33:40 AM.

⁴⁸ Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” 392.

⁴⁹ Walinsky, “Walinsky Interview 2008.” Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

⁵⁰ Gilbert, “Emotional Messages,” 246.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 247.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” 387. Also see Richard E. Porter and Larry A. Samovar, “Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression: Implications for Intercultural Communication.”⁶⁶ in *Handbook of Communication and Emotion: Research, Theory, Applications, and Contexts*, ed. Peter A. Andersen and Laura K. Guerrero (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998), 452.

⁵⁴ Walinsky, “Walinsky Interview 2008.” Disc 31: 8:33:06 AM-8:47:27 AM.

⁵⁵ Rhodes, “Rhodes Sr. Interview 2008.” Disc 21: 9:33:01 PM-9:39:53 PM.

⁵⁶ Anatol, “Anatol Interview 2008.” Disc 20: 8:12:45 PM-8:14:13 PM.

⁵⁷ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 83-84.

⁵⁸ Boyd, “Boyd Interview 2008.” Disc 15: 3:34:27 PM-3:37:51 PM.

⁵⁹ Breaux, “Breaux Interview 2008.” Disc 17: 5:47:58 PM-5:48:21 PM.

⁶⁰ “Emotions are “internal mental states” that focus primarily on feelings. Research distinguishes emotions (internal states such as fear, anger, sadness) from three other states: bodily states (tiredness, hunger), cognitive states (confusion, uncertainty), and behavioral states (timidity, aggressiveness).” Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” 389. See also James B. Stiff, *Persuasive Communication* (New York: Guilford Press, 1994), 102-04. “Communication research has identified six primary emotions that tend to be expressed similarly across cultures and three secondary emotions that are expressed differently depending on age, gender, and culture.” Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” 389. See also Richard M. Perloff, *The Dynamics of Persuasion* (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1993), 170-79. Griffin identifies five out six primary emotions that are useful for this analysis: anger, sadness, surprise, fear, and disgust. Secondary emotions, such as pride, guilt, shame, reverence, and mourning, can also find their way into this emotional argument. The sixth primary emotion that Griffin (2006) identifies is happiness, which for obvious circumstantial reasons, does not serve as much relevant purpose as the other five emotions. Though it is noted that happiness, as the complete opposite of sadness, as a feeling of pleasure, contentment, or joy the tragedy could be part of the experience via complete lack thereof or as a cultural evocation of community celebration of loss as “homecoming”. This experience of grieving, particularly in the culture of African Americans, is not uncommon and can contribute to the solidification of community sentiment and collective action.

⁶¹ Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” 389.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ *Pride* can be considered “exhibiting an appropriate level of respect for a person, character trait, accomplishment, experience, or value; feeling pleased or delighted”; *Guilt* is defined as “an awareness of having done wrong, accompanied by feelings of shame and regret”; and *Shame* is “a feeling of dishonor, unworthiness, and embarrassment”. Another emotion common to persuasive speeches but not identified among the primary or secondary emotions is *Reverence* or “feelings of deep respect, awe, or devotion”. See Ibid., 389.

⁶⁶ See Jacques Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*, ed. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael MNaas (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001). And Jacques Derrida, *The Gift of Death*, trans. David Wills (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995). The concept of mourning will be taken up and explored further in the next chapter alongside kisceral reasoning.

⁶⁷ According to Lucas, “Posture, facial expressions, gestures, eye contact -- all affect the way listeners respond to a speaker.” Stephen E. Lucas, “The Art of Public Speaking,” in *Chapter Twelve: Delivery* (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2007), 313.

⁶⁸ Ibid. “Researchers suggest that between 65 and 93 percent of the total meaning of a message comes to us through nonverbal signals.” See Cindy L. Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” in *Chapter Thirteen: Delivering Your Speech* (Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2006), 276. Also see Ray Birdwhistell, *Kinesics and Context* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970).; Albert Mehrabian, *Silent Messages: Implicit Communication of Emotion and Attitudes*, 2nd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1981).

⁶⁹ Griffin, “Invitation to Public Speaking,” 279.

⁷⁰ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 96.

⁷¹ Kennedy, “Remarks on the Assassination,” available to view at americanrhetoric.com.

⁷² Philip N. Douglass, “Capturing Feelings on Film: Natural Gestures Work Best,” *Communication World* (2000): 40.

⁷³ Breaux, “Breaux Interview 2008.” Disc 17: 5:29:20 PM-5:31:17 PM.

⁷⁴ The Nostalgia Company, *The Greatest Speeches of All-Time*. Rolling Bay: Soundworks USA, Inc., 1998. DVD.

⁷⁵ Lucas, “The Art of Public Speaking,” 315.

⁷⁶ Breaux. “Breaux Interview 2008.” Disc 17: 5:20:52 PM-5:22:01 PM.

⁷⁷ Anatol and Bittner, “Kennedy on King,” 32. Anatol (2008) reflects back, “One of the black gentlemen that I spoke to said there he was on the platform and the man had tears in his eyes. No sooner had he said that then another black individual said “Yeah man I really saw it, the man had tears in his eyes.” Referring to Kennedy.” See Anatol, “Anatol Interview 2008.” Disc 20: 8:05:54 PM- 8:06:15 PM.

-
- ⁷⁸ Steward, "Steward Interview 2007."
- ⁷⁹ Genard, "Leveraging the Power," 4.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid.
- ⁸¹ Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 278. "Your face expresses these things through the manipulation of your eyes, eyebrows, and mouth." Griffin (2006) continues, "You can use your facial expressions to communicate your own interest in your topic, your agreement or disagreement with a point, your openness to an idea, and even your feeling about an issue."
- ⁸² Genard, "Leveraging the Power," 3.
- ⁸³ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:30:47 AM-8:32:23 AM.
- ⁸⁴ Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 272. As Lucas (2007) notes, "A fast rate helps create feelings of happiness, fear, anger, and surprise, while a slow rate is better for expressing sadness or disgust. A slower tempo is called for when you explain complex information, a faster tempo when the information is already familiar to the audience." See Lucas, "The Art of Public Speaking," 306.
- ⁸⁵ Lucas, "The Art of Public Speaking," 307. "Pauses give us time to breathe fully and to collect our thoughts during a speech or before we answer a question from the audience. Pauses also give audiences time to absorb and process information -- they're like a rest stop, giving the audience a breather before continuing. Finally, pauses before or after a climactic word or an important point reinforce that word or point." Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 273.
- ⁸⁶ Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 272.
- ⁸⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸⁸ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:59:33 PM-8:00:33 PM.
- ⁸⁹ Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. C.; Holquist Emerson, M., trans. V.W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 94.
- ⁹⁰ Carson, "Carson Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:45:47 AM-11:51:35 AM.
- ⁹¹ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2006."
- ⁹² Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. M. Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 278.
- ⁹³ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 7.
- ⁹⁴ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:22:16 AM-8:23:55 AM.
- ⁹⁵ Griffin, "Invitation to Public Speaking," 390.
- ⁹⁶ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 8: 8:19:48 AM-8:20:36 AM.
- ⁹⁷ Rhodes, "Rhodes Sr. Interview 2008." Disc 21: 9:20:20 PM-9:21:07 PM.

-
- ⁹⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹⁹ Carson, "Carson Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:55:04 AM-12:03:56 PM.
- ¹⁰⁰ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 84.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid., 92.
- ¹⁰² Breaux, "Breux Interview 2008." Disc 17: 5:49:23 PM-5:51:55 PM.
- ¹⁰³ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:09:52 AM- 7:13:08 AM.
- ¹⁰⁴ Breaux, "Breux Interview 2008." Disc 17: 5:37:49 PM-5:45:07 PM.
- ¹⁰⁵ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:38:00 PM-3:39:18 PM.
- ¹⁰⁶ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:13:40 AM-11:14:35 AM.
- ¹⁰⁷ Breaux, "Breux Interview 2008." Disc 17: 5:29:20 PM-5:31:17 PM.
- ¹⁰⁸ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:07:05 AM- 7:09:22 AM.
- ¹⁰⁹ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2008 ." Disc 23: 11:09:04 PM-11:10:49 PM.
- ¹¹⁰ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:39:25 PM-3:40:57 PM.
- ¹¹¹ Carson, "Carson Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:55:04 AM-12:03:56 PM.
- ¹¹² Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:24:16 PM-3:34:11 PM.
- ¹¹³ Ibid., Disc 15: 3:34:27 PM-3:37:51 PM.
- ¹¹⁴ Crawford, "Crawford Interview 2007."
- ¹¹⁵ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*.
- ¹¹⁶ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:08:38 AM-11:10:52 AM.

Notes for Chapter Six: The Kisceral

- ¹ Trulock, "Trulock Interview 2008." Disc 25: 2:24:36 AM- 2:30:40 AM.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Ibid. Trulock continues, "I never hope to hear another speech like it. I'm not sure there have been many in; I don't [think] there are any in my life time I would rank with it. I would rank it with one of the great American speeches and I don't think that anyone else could have given it. He was the right guy to be in the presence of on that rainy evening when we all felt lost."

⁵ As Greene (1998) suggests, this aesthetic turn relies on a constitutive model of rhetorical effect "...which focus[es] on the process of identification made possible by the political and aesthetic nature of the rhetorical dynamics of language." See Greene, "The Aesthetic Turn," 7. For more on multi-modal argumentation see Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*.

⁶ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*.

⁷ Ibid., 79, 86. Gilbert takes "...the liberty of introducing a new term here in order to afford sufficient breadth without at the same time using terminology generally in disrepute. That is, the kisceral covers not only the intuitive but also, for those who indulge, the mystical, religious, supernatural and extrasensory. 'Kisceral' is chosen in order to have a descriptive term that does not carry with it normative baggage, like, for example, 'mystical' or 'extra-sensory.'" See Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 79.

⁸ George Kennedy, *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

⁹ Ibid., 3-4.

¹⁰ In a review of Kennedy's work, Zulick notes, "Of course this theory makes rhetoric co-extensive not only with all human utterance but with any kind of communicative form found in nature. There seems no reason to stop with social animals when many plants, insects and other invertebrates also generate patterns of color, scent and sound that send sexual messages or warn off intruders. Without a distinction between rhetoric and social behavior there is no heuristic model around which to build a cross-cultural comparison." See Margaret D. Zulick, "Book Review of George Kennedy's *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 522.

¹¹ Gigerich, "Gigerich Interview 2008." Disc 26: 4:17:45 AM-4:23:34 AM.

¹² Jackson, "Jackson Interview 2008." Disc 24: 1:26:48 AM-1:31:21 AM.

¹³ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 87. Gilbert continues, "The category, kisceral, carries with it no metaphysical, and certainly no spiritual, baggage. It refers to a category of communication recognizable to most people." Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 87.

¹⁴ Ibid., 110.

¹⁵ Robinson, "Handout from the Rededication Celebration of The "Landmark for Peace Memorial"."

¹⁶ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 87.

¹⁷ Ibid., 88.

¹⁸ Thomas, "Thomas Interview 2008." Disc 10: 10:36:18 AM-10:36:39 AM.

¹⁹ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 88.

²⁰ Bettina Bergo, "Levinas and Phenomenology." <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/> (accessed April 2009).

²¹ Emmanuel Levinas, *Time and the Other*, trans. Richard A. Cohen (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1987), 109-10.

²² Richard A. Cohen, "Translator's Introduction," in *Time and the Other by Emmanuel Levinas* (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1987), 1.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 93.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Levinas draws his phenomenology from the work of Husserl and Heidegger. See Michael D. Barber, *Equality and Diversity: Phenomenological Investigations of Prejudice and Discrimination* (Amherst, New York: Humanity Books, 2001), Bettina Bergo, "What Is Levinas Doing? Phenomenology and the Rhetoric of an Ethical Un-Conscious," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 38, no. 2 (2005), Bergo, "Levinas and Phenomenology.,"; Cohen, "Translator's Introduction.," Alexander Kozin, "The Sign of the Other: On the Semiotic of Emmanuel Levinas's *Phenomenology*," *Semiotica* 152, no. 1/4 (2004).

²⁸ Bergo, "Levinas and Phenomenology." <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/> (accessed April 2009).

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Emmanuel Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, trans. R. Cohen (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1982), 86-87.

³¹ Bergo, "Levinas and Phenomenology." <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/> (accessed April 2009).

³² Michael Gardiner, "Alterity and Ethics: A Dialogical Perspective," *Theory, Culture & Society* 13, no. 2 (1996): 131-32.

³³ Emmanuel Levinas, *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*, trans. A. Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998), 44.

³⁴ Levinas (1985), quote taken from Spoma Jovanovic and Roy Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 37, no. 4 (2004): 319.

³⁵ Ibid., 318-19.

³⁶ Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, 106.

³⁷ Hyde, *The Call of Conscience*, 153.

³⁸ Jovanovic and Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," 319.

³⁹ Bergo, "Levinas and Phenomenology." <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/> (accessed April 2009).

⁴⁰ Jovanovic & Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," 317.

⁴¹ Emmanuel Levinas. *Alterity & Transcendence*. Trans. by M. B. Smith. New York, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, (1995): 93.

⁴² Levinas, *Alterity & Transcendence*, 93-94.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁴⁴ Such a move is also illustrative of Bakhtin's notion of answerability which will be taken up further in the concluding chapter.

⁴⁵ See Chapter 4.

⁴⁶ Perkinson, *White Theology*, 85.

⁴⁷ The risk involved in subjective embodiment of the moment was discussed with more detail in Chapter 4 using Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy."

⁴⁸ Bergo, "Levinas and Phenomenology." <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/> (accessed April 2009).

⁴⁹ Levinas, *Time and the Other*, 110.

⁵⁰ ———, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, 3.

⁵¹ Jovanovic and Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," 318.

⁵² Jeffery T. Nealon, "The Ethics of Dialogue: Bakhtin and Levinas," *College English* 59, no. 2 (1997): 129-148.

⁵³ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 93.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:09:52 AM- 7:13:08 AM.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Tolan, "Tolan Interview 2008." Disc 32: 9:05:06 AM-9:06:24 AM.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 93.

⁶⁰ Forestal, "Forestal Interview 2008." Disc22: 10:50:13 PM-10:57:08 PM.

⁶¹ Anatol, "Anatol Interview 2008." Disc 19: 7:50:43 PM-7:52:39 PM. Anatol continues, "Earlier on I said that he had one opportunity, it was not a campaign speech, he didn't have to be there delivering that speech that he delivered. He could have gone elsewhere and everybody would have understood. So there was some tide of events that sort of led him from the airport to that place, to stand there in that spot and to very bravely confront an audience. Remember, a speech was being written for him to deal with that situation, and he said no, I am going to do this my way, the way I think I ought to do it. He went there, without any prior study at all of the situation, went there, stood there, naked to the world and literally

pacified the audience. Folks have asked me to explain how this happened and there is no way I could explain. He left all, he forsook all of the kinds of rhetoric and stood there on his platform and invented his own, and it worked. It worked.”

⁶² Howard, “Howard Interview 2008.” Disc 30: 7:20:37 AM-7:20:37 AM.

⁶³ Robert Kennedy was assassinated on June 4, 1968, only two months following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., by Sirhan Sirhan at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles, after announcing his win of the California primary.

⁶⁴ Cohen, “Translator's Introduction,” 9.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶⁷ Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1961), 56.

⁶⁸ Cohen, “Translator's Introduction,” 9.

⁶⁹ Levinas, *Time and the Other*, 74.

⁷⁰ Cohen, “Translator's Introduction,” 9.

⁷¹ Edelman, “Edelman Interview 2008.” Disc 10: 10:47:37 AM-10:51:19 AM.

⁷² Milliken, “Milliken Interview 2008.” Disc 16: 4:07:25 PM-4:08:00 PM.

⁷³ Dyson, *I May Not Get There with You*.

⁷⁴ Breaux, “Breaux Interview 2008” Disc 17: 5:22:12 PM-5:23:12 PM.

⁷⁵ Lewis, “Lewis Interview 2008.” Disc 30: 7:20:37 AM-7:20:37 AM.

⁷⁶ Edelman, “Edelman Interview 2008.” Disc 10: 10:47:37 AM-10:51:19 AM.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ Lewis, “Lewis Interview 2008.” Disc 30: 7:44:25 AM-7:45:25 AM.

⁷⁹ Edwin Black, “The Second Persona,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970).

⁸⁰ Kennedy, “Remarks on the Assassination,” available to view at americanrhetoric.com.

⁸¹ Future research, with explication via the third and fourth persona, may want to consider why other cities chose to react violently, in opposition to King’s legacy. See Phillip Wander, “The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory,” in *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, ed. J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, and S. Caudill (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999), Charles E. Morris III, “Pink Herring & the Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 2 (2002).

⁸² Howard, "Howard Interview 2008." Disc 23: 11:53:30 PM- 11:54:51 PM. Howard continues, "If there could have been a Robert Kennedy in every state at that point, I really believe that it would have been just as peaceful. We were blessed. We were blessed that he was here. We were absolutely blessed. Had he been in Chicago or Boston or one of the other places where there was so much violence, I honestly believe it would not have happened. I mean there's always going to be that 10% with anything, but I actually believe that because he was such an honest man and such a good hearted soul that had the best intentions for everybody and black people knew this. If he could have been a clone and been in every state this never would have happened. I believe that because it didn't happen here and Dr. King would have been so proud. so proud."

⁸³ Brown, "Brown Interview 2008." Disc 24: 1:16:51 AM-1:18:03 AM.

⁸⁴ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:32:54 AM-11:35:14 AM. Robinson clarifies by saying, "I don't think most people realize that they have a life's purpose. And realizing that Martin Luther King...had a sense of awareness, he had a sense of purpose. I look at John F. Kennedy and I look at other great leaders. That to me says the doors [open] ...that awareness and then the drive to do it."

⁸⁵ Ibid., Disc 34: 11:39:31 AM-11:40:22 AM.

⁸⁶ Carson, "Carson Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:32:10 AM-11:45:47 AM.

⁸⁷ Haldeman, "Haldeman Interview 2008." Disc 14: 3:00:08 PM-3:03:20 PM. Haldeman continues, "I wish there were people I could point to now who had the same spirit. The times are different and part of the reason is the people don't have that spirit. There aren't a dozen Kings around and then there where people who'd begin to capture his spirit and who made his effort multiplied."

⁸⁸ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:09:32 PM-3:11:16 PM.

⁸⁹ Carson, "Carson Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:24:16 PM-3:34:11 PM.

⁹⁰ Haldeman, "Haldeman Interview 2008." Disc 11: 11:55:04 AM-12:03:56 PM.

⁹¹ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:27:45 AM-11:29:52 AM.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Jacques Derrida, *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 1-2. For more on Derrida's notion of mourning see Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*; and Derrida, *The Gift of Death*.

⁹⁴ Derrida, *Adieu*, 2.

⁹⁵ Derrida citing Levinas in Ibid., 3.

⁹⁶ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:26:04 AM-11:27:27 AM. Boyd continues, "As a matter of fact the guy that I came with, my best friend, that's what we said. We said, "I'm going home." And that's basically what we did. I don't think that there was anything, but there was some disturbance in Indianapolis, but fortunately for us, the majority of people, what they say, the cooler heads prevailed."

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., Disc 15: 3:38:00 PM-3:39:18 PM.

⁹⁹ Derrida, *Adieu*, 6.

¹⁰⁰ Crawford, "Crawford Interview 2007."

¹⁰¹ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 3:25:15 AM-3:39:09 AM.

¹⁰² Jovanovic and Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," 323.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 321.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 323.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, 87-88.

¹⁰⁷ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." (Disc 30: 7:04:50 AM - 7:41:55 AM).

¹⁰⁸ Emmanuel Levinas. *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*. Trans. by A. Lingis. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press, (1998): 143.

¹⁰⁹ Jovanovic & Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," 329.

Notes for Chapter Seven: The Conclusion

¹ Trulock, "Trulock Interview 2008." Disc 25: 2:24:36 AM- 2:30:40 AM.

² Speaking on the interconnectivity of the modes of argumentation, Gilbert notes, "...that no claim is being made for exclusivity. It is unlikely that any argument is *purely* in one mode, and it is practically certain that any argument can be twisted out of its natural shape and into some arbitrary mode." See Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 82.

³ I. Angus and Lenore Langsdorf, "Unsettled Borders: Envisioning Critique at the Postmodern Site," in *The Critical Turn: Rhetoric and Philosophy in Postmodern Discourse*, ed. I. Angus and Lenore Langsdorf (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993), 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁵ Lenore Langsdorf, "Words of Others and Sightings/Citings/Sitings of Self," in *The Critical Turn: Rhetoric and Philosophy in Postmodern Discourse*, ed. I. Angus and Lenore Langsdorf (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993), 30.

⁶ Hyde, *The Call of Conscience*, 13.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁸ See Bakhtin, *Toward a Philosophy*, 2, 33.

⁹ See *Ibid.*, 38-39.; and Leslie Baxter and Barbara Montgomery, *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1996), 25.

-
- ¹⁰ This discussion of Levinasian phenomenology was started in Chapter 6: The Kisceral.
- ¹¹ Martin Buber, *I and Thou* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).
- ¹² Jeanine Czubaroff, "Dialogical Rhetoric: An Application of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Dialogue," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 86, no. 2 (2000): 177.
- ¹³ Walter Kaufmann. "A New Translation with a Prologue "I and You" and Notes in Martin Buber, *I and Thou*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, (1996): 28.
- ¹⁴ Bruce Hyde and Jeffery L. Bineham, "From Debate to Dialogue: Toward a Pedagogy of Nonpolarized Public Discourse," *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 2 & 3, (2000): 212.
- ¹⁵ Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1996): 66.
- ¹⁶ For a more detailed reflection of the philosophical scholarship on dialogue and communications see Michael J. Hyde, "The Ontological Workings of Dialogue and Acknowledgement," in *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, ed. Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter, and Kenneth N. Cissna (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publication, 2004).; and Ronald C. Arnett, "A Dialogic Ethic: "Between" Buber and Levinas: A Responsive Ethical "I"," in *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, ed. Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter, and Kenneth N. Cissna (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2004).
- ¹⁷ Bakhtin, *Toward a Philosophy*, 33.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.
- ¹⁹ Czubaroff, "Dialogical Rhetoric," 170.
- ²⁰ Rob Anderson, Kenneth N. Cissna, and Ronald C. Arnett, *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice, and Community* (Cresskill, NJ Hampton Press, Inc., 1994), 2.
- ²¹ Shelia McNamee and John Shotter, "Dialogue, Creativity, and Change," in *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, ed. Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter, and Kenneth N. Cissna (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004), 104.
- ²² The work of Mikhail Bakhtin, Emmanuel Levinas, and Martin Buber will be discussed in further detail under the section in which a theoretical account of dialogic rhetoric is presented.
- ²³ Gilbert, *Coalescent Argumentation*, 25-26.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 77.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 37-38.
- ²⁶ Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," 281.
- ²⁷ Charles Tilly, *Why? What Happens When People Giver Reasons...And Why* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 9.

²⁸ Moira Gutteridge Kloster, "Comment on K. Warrenburg's "The Invisible Argument: Recognizing Race through Visceral Reasoning"" (paper presented at the Ontario Society of the Study of Argumentation: Argument Cultures, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, 2009).

²⁹ Tilly, *Why?*, 10.

³⁰ W. Barnett Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce, "Taking a Communication Perspective on Dialogue," in *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, ed. Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter, and Kenneth N. Cissna (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2004), 45.

³¹ Natanson, "The Claims of Immediacy," 19.

³² Tolan, "Tolan Interview 2008." Disc 32: 9:03:56 AM-9:04:57 AM.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:14:38 AM-7:15:45 AM. Lewis also illustrates the interconnectivity between race and class.

³⁵ David J. Klinkose, "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions. Disc 17: 5:03:17 PM-5:04:13 PM.

³⁶ Howard, "Howard Interview 2008." Disc 23: 11:39:07 PM- 11:42:07 PM.

³⁷ See Dana L. Cloud, "Hegemony or Concordance? The Rhetoric of Tokenism in 'Oprah' Winfrey's Rags-to-Riches Biography," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13, no. 2 (1996).

³⁸ Czubaroff, "Dialogical Rhetoric" 173.

³⁹ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 23: 11:42:11 PM- 11:42:51 PM.

⁴⁰ Jeffery T. Nealon, "The Ethics of Dialogue: Bakhtin and Levinas," *College English* 59, no. 2 (1997): 129-48.

⁴¹ Jeffery W. Murray, "Bakhtinian Answerability and Levinasian Responsibility: Forging a Fuller Dialogical Communicative Ethics," *Southern Communication Journal* 65, no. 2&3 (2000): 138.

⁴² Bakhtin, *Speech Genres*, 94.

⁴³ ———, *Toward a Philosophy*.

⁴⁴ ———, *Speech Genres*, 89.

⁴⁵ ———, "Discourse in the Novel," 276.

⁴⁶ Mikhail Bakhtin. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. ed. by V. Liapunov & M. Holquist. trans. by V. Liapunov, Austin: University of Texas Press, (1993): 38-39.

⁴⁷ Mankiewicz, "Mankiewicz Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:55:46 AM- 8:56:08 AM.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Kloster, "Comment on K. Warrenburg's "The Invisible Argument."

⁵⁰ Edelman, "Edelman Interview 2008." Disc 17: 5:37:49 PM-5:45:07 PM.

⁵¹ Levinas, *Time and the Other*, 108, 15, 16.

⁵² Jovanovic and Wood, "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics," 321.

⁵³ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:30:34 PM-4:32:05 PM.

⁵⁴ Engleberg and Daly, *Presentations in Everyday Life*, 286.

⁵⁵ Ibid. Speaking toward attitude, Engleberg & Daly (2005) further explain that, "After only a few seconds of listening, an audience will make decisions about your character. Are you friendly, sincere, and enthusiastic or brusque, impersonal, and condescending?" Engleberg and Daly, *Presentations in Everyday Life*, 286.

⁵⁶ Engleberg and Daly, *Presentations in Everyday Life*, 286.

⁵⁷ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:37:53 PM-4:39:18 PM.

⁵⁸ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:19:59 PM-3:21:58 PM.

⁵⁹ In most public speaking texts there are four main methods of delivery: reading from a manuscript, reciting from memory, speaking impromptu and speaking extemporaneously. While Kennedy's speech has been referred to as mainly one that was delivered impromptu, or in the moment with little or no immediate preparation, it is suggested here that we revisit the definition of extemporaneous speaking and consider Kennedy as one that, while responding to the immediate moment, worked from his personal repertoire of grand oratory. As noted by Lucas, often times impromptu and extemporaneous speaking is likened to the same definition but technically the two methods of delivery are different. "Unlike an impromptu speech, which is totally off-the-cuff, an extemporaneous speech is carefully prepared and practiced in advance." Lucas, "The Art of Public Speaking," 304. Though Kennedy did not have much time to develop, prepare, and practice his speech (roughly 15 minutes or so during a car ride from the airport), he did have time to make some notes on the back of an envelope. Furthermore, because Kennedy is a great orator and one who had been on the road politically campaigning, performing speeches (two already that day), he had already, prior to arriving on site in the Indianapolis African American neighborhood, developed a strong public speaking performance. Though the ultimate message was different, Kennedy as a great orator cannot be denied. Thus, as he eloquently delivered the news of King's death to an unknowing crowd, Kennedy is able to infuse vocal variety, effective pauses, unnerving eye contact, and natural gestures that typically take speaker's years to perfect. Kennedy's delivery is more attuned to the extemporaneous method of speaking over the other methods. Kennedy, as a grand orator, came across to his audience as spontaneous and sincere. As Lucas notes, "Developing a keen sense of timing is partly a matter of common sense, partly a matter of experience." "When you speak extemporaneously -- and have prepared properly -- you have full control over your ideas, yet you are not tied to a manuscript. You are free to establish strong eye contact, to gesture naturally, and to concentrate on talking *with* the audience rather than declaiming *to* them." Lucas, "The Art of Public Speaking," 304. Kennedy's years of speaking experience allowed the appearance of a conversational quality to his delivery as he infused quotes from memory with reflective pauses, sincere expressions with shocking news. No matter how many times Kennedy spoke in public, nor how new the information of King's death was. Furthermore, as Indianapolis Democratic Public Official, Jerry Forestal noted, time and time again, Kennedy reflected that he needed the Indianapolis political officials to "stall" the crowd so the he [Kennedy] had more time to re-write his speech. Forestal. Acknowledging that Kennedy did hold an

envelope that was reported to hold a few self-written notes, is to recognize that Kennedy had thought about what he was going to say beforehand and thus was operating in the extemporaneous speaking mode rather than speaking impromptu.” James H. Henning, “How to Deliver a Speech,” *Today's Speech* (1953): 4. As Herring notes, “Fixing in mind ideas, their sequence, and their approximate method of development is much more conducive to comfort and ease than the falsely appearing “easier” method of trying to remember words and their exact sequence.” While not underplaying the difficulty of the moment of Kennedy's speech, the uniqueness of the moment is not otherwise lost in the extemporaneous delivery. Rather, preparing beforehand but remaining open to altering the content and delivery upon actual deliverance is reflective of the emotional import of Kennedy's speech. As Mankiewicz acknowledges, “...the words that are on that low wall by Robert Kennedy's grave are probably the only words in the whole cemetery that were extemporaneous. It was clear that it came from his heart and his head and not from anybody else's.” Mankiewicz, “Mankiewicz Interview 2008.” Disc 8: 8:24:54 AM-8:28:06 AM.

⁶⁰ Tolan, “Tolan Interview 2008.” Disc 32: 9:28:14 AM- 9:30:29 AM.

⁶¹ Jackson, “Jackson Interview 2008.” Disc 13: 1:35:15 PM-1:43:49 PM.

⁶² Boyd, “Boyd Interview 2008.” Disc 15: 3:39:25 PM-3:40:57 PM.

⁶³ Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, 88.

⁶⁴ Cochran, “Cochran Interview 2008.” Disc 18: 6:38:20 PM-6:40:12 PM.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Jovanovic and Wood, “Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics,” 323.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 321.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 323.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Howard, “Howard Interview 2008.” Disc 31: 8:56:15 AM-8:58:14 AM.

⁷³ Brown, “Brown Interview 2008.” Disc 17: 5:29:20 PM-5:31:17 PM.

⁷⁴ Czubaroff, “Dialogical Rhetoric,” 172.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 171.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 174.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 178.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 179.

⁸⁰ Haldeman, “Haldeman Interview 2008.” Disc 14: 2:53:09 PM-2:55:15 PM.

⁸¹ Rhodes, “Rhodes Sr. Interview 2008.” Disc 21: 9:58:18 PM-9:59:26 PM.

⁸² For a reflective review of the literature on race and dialogue see McPhail, Mark Lawrence. “Race and the (Im)Possibility of Dialogue.” In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter and Kenneth N. Cissna, 209-24. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004.

⁸³ For a thoughtful reflection on whiteness as a strategic rhetoric see Crenshaw, “‘Resisting Whiteness’ Rhetorical Silence.”

⁸⁴ Nakayama and Krizek, “Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric,” 633.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 640.

⁸⁶ Further research in regard to Kennedy’s previous campaign speeches as well as other public moments encountering the African American community would be contributing to understanding Kennedy’s motives.

⁸⁷ Nakayama and Krizek, “Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric,” 633.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 632.

⁸⁹ Anatol and Bittner, “Kennedy on King,” 33.

⁹⁰ Such reflexivity is evidence of the effort in this work to embrace the phenomenological method whole-heartedly and not to contribute to the invisibility of privileged politics within my own academic work.

⁹¹ James W. Perkinson, “The Body of White Space: Beyond Stiff Voices, Flaccid Feelings, and Silent Cells,” in *Revealing Male Bodies*, ed. N. Tuana, et al. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 190-91.

⁹² Kennedy, “Remarks on the Assassination, 1968” available to view on americanrhetoric.com.

⁹³ Monroe H. Little, ed. *The State of Black Indianapolis, 1994*. Indianapolis: Indianapolis Urban League, Inc., (1994): 15.

⁹⁴ For Mills, “...the economic dimension of the *Racial Contract* is the *most* salient, foreground rather than background, since the *Racial Contract* is calculatedly aimed at economic exploitation.” See Mills, *The Racial Contract*. Thus, how Kennedy upholds his moral obligation to challenge systems that recreate racist sentiments needs to be investigated, as does his rhetoric that offers a direct challenge to the materialistic reality of white privilege. The role of economic exploitation in the *Racial Contract* indicates a necessity to consider the interconnectedness of race/class/gender in critical race studies.

⁹⁵ Crawford, “Crawford Interview 2008.” Disc 15: 3:34:27 PM-3:37:51 PM.

⁹⁶ For more on “passing,” see Morris III, “Pink Herring.”

⁹⁷ Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 367.

⁹⁸ James Jasinski, *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies* (London: Sage Publications, 2001), 429.

⁹⁹ See Roderick P. Hart, *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*, 2nd ed. (London: Allyn and Bacon, 1997); B.L. Ware and W.A. Linkugel, "The Rhetorical Persona: Marcus Garvey as Black Moses," *Communication Monographs* 49 (1982).

¹⁰⁰ Ware and Linkugel, "The Rhetorical Persona."

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 50.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 51. Similar to this work, other scholars work to illuminate complexities between the person and the rhetorical persona that is presented and open to public inspection. See Dyson, *I May Not Get There with You and April 4, 1968: Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Death and How it Changed America.*; Steel, *In Love with Night.*; Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*.

¹⁰³ George E. Yoos, "A Revision of the Concept of Ethical Appeal," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 12 (1979).

¹⁰⁴ Thomas, *Robert Kennedy and His Times*, 249-53.

¹⁰⁵ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:40:14 PM-4:41:03 PM.

¹⁰⁶ Thomas, "Thomas Interview 2008." Disc 10: 10:35:11 AM-10:36:01 AM.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, Disc 10: 10:29:05 AM-10:29:49 AM.

¹⁰⁸ Lewis, "Lewis Interview 2008." Disc 30: 7:00:41 AM-7:02:41 AM.

¹⁰⁹ Milliken, "Milliken Interview 2008." Disc 16: 4:41:26 PM-4:42:54 PM.

¹¹⁰ Gigerich, "Gigerich Interview 2008." Disc 26: 3:25:15 AM -3:39:09 AM.

¹¹¹ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 31: 8:24:49 AM-8:25:18 AM.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, Disc 31: 8:15:35 AM-8:20:49 AM.

¹¹³ Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," 278.

¹¹⁴ Witcover, *85 Days*, 140.

¹¹⁵ Robinson, "Robinson Interview 2008." Disc 34: 11:27:45 AM-11:29:52 AM.

¹¹⁶ Richard B. Pierce, *Polite Protest: The Political Economy of Race in Indianapolis 1920-1970* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005).

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹¹⁸ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2007."

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ Pierce, *Polite Protest*, 3.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Emma Lou Thornbrough, "African Americans," in *Peopling Indiana: The Ethnic Experience*, ed. Jr. Taylor, Robert M. and Connie A McBirney (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996), 27.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Breaux, "Breaux Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:04:59 PM-3:06:19 PM.

¹²⁶ Janson, "Rivals in Indiana," 34.

¹²⁷ Boyd, "Boyd Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:45:49 PM-3:46:51 PM.

¹²⁸ Flash Laurence. "A letter to the column," *The Indianapolis Recorder*, (April 13, 1968).

¹²⁹ Walinsky, "Walinsky Interview 2008." Disc 15: 3:41:02 PM-3:42:44 PM.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Haymes, *Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy for Black Urban Struggle*, 13-14.

¹³³ Robert M Fogelson, *Violence as Protest: A Study of Riots and Ghettos* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1971), 153.

¹³⁴ Additional research areas that would be beneficial include analyses of Robert Kennedy's campaign rhetoric, comparisons of Indianapolis to other U.S. cities during the late 1960s, and an expansion of the multiple modes of reasoning at work in the rhetorical effect of Kennedy's speech as it happened then and is replayed now for future generations. For example, one mode, in particular, that would be an interesting addition to this work is consideration of a visual mode of reasoning. If one were to consider a historical account via a documentary or newspaper photographs or if one was interested in memorials -- consideration of the visual, logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral could be helpful to a multifaceted rhetorical analysis. And, in this case, the memorial that marks the location of Kennedy's Indianapolis announcement is made out of recycled weapons. Also of interest, is the lingering inspirational impact that is reported and captured in the oral history accounts; the trace of the Kenned and King legacy reaches far past the day of April 4, 1968. Taking a closer look at public memory theory, in conjunction to how those memories were reported, would produce interesting reflections on the power of memory, recollection, and narrative. And finally, this notion of dialogic rhetoric -- via emotional embodied extra-sensory reasoning -- can be explored through alternative moments of argumentation and communication interaction.

¹³⁵ Leslie Baxter & Barbara Montgomery. *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics*. New York: The Guilford Press, (1996): 25.

¹³⁶ Czubaroff, "Dialogical Rhetoric," 174.

¹³⁷ Michael O. Hardiman, "Role Obligations," *Journal of Philosophy* 91, no. 7 (1994): 333.

Bibliography

- Anatol, Karl W., and John R. Bittner. "Kennedy on King: The Rhetoric of Control." *Today's Speech* 16, no. 3 (1968): 31-34.
- Anatol, Karl W. E. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Anderson, Rob, Kenneth N. Cissna, and Ronald C. Arnett. *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice, and Community*. Cresskill, NJ Hampton Press, Inc., 1994.
- Angus, I., and Lenore Langsdorf. "Unsettled Borders: Envisioning Critique at the Postmodern Site." In *The Critical Turn: Rhetoric and Philosophy in Postmodern Discourse*, edited by I. Angus and Lenore Langsdorf. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.
- Ap and Up! "Troops Patrol in Downtown Washington." *Indianapolis Star*, April 6, 1968.
- Arnett, Ronald C. "A Dialogic Ethic: "Between" Buber and Levinas: A Responsive Ethical "I"." In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter and Kenneth N. Cissna, 75-90. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004.
- Avant-Mier, R. , and Jr. Hasian, M. "In Search of the Power of Whiteness: A Genealogical Exploration of Negotiated Racial Identities in America's Ethnic Past." *Communication Quarterly* 50 (2002): 391-409.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Discourse in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Edited by M. Holquist, 259-422. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- . *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by V.W. McGee, edited by M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- . *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Translated by V. Liapunov. edited by M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993.
- Barber, Michael D. *Equality and Diversity: Phenomenological Investigations of Prejudice and Discrimination*. Amherst, New York: Humanity Books, 2001.
- Baxter, Leslie, and Barbara Montgomery. *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1996.
- Bergo, Bettina. "Levinas and Phenomenology." April, 2009, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/>.
- . "What Is Levinas Doing? Phenomenology and the Rhetoric of an Ethical Un-Conscious." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 38, no. 2 (2005): 122-44.
- Biesecker, Barbara A. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from within the Thematic of Difference." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 22 (1989): 110-30.
- Birdwhistell, Ray. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-19.

-
- Bodtker, Andrea M., and Jessica Katz Jameson. "Emotion in Conflict Formation and Its Transformation: Application to Organizational Conflict Management." *The International Journal of Conflict Management* 12, no. 3 (2001): 259-75.
- Boomhower, Ray E. *Robert F. Kennedy and the 1968 Indiana Primary*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Boyd, Rozelle. "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis," conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: April 8, 2007.
- . "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- "Branigin's 'Favorite Son' Race Backed by Indiana Youth Group." *Indianapolis Star*, April 5, 1968.
- Breaux, Billie "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Brown, Rev. Thomas L. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Browne, Stephen Howard. "'The Circle of Our Felicities': Thomas Jefferson's First Inaugural Address and the Rhetoric of Nationhood." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 3 (2002): 409-38.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Carlton, Rebecca Lynn. "Was the Torch Passed? A Fantasy Theme Analysis of the Presidential Campaign Rhetoric of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Robert Francis Kennedy." Masters, Ball State University, 1992.
- Carson, Representative Julia. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of *Peuple Quebecois*." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1987): 168-87.
- Cloud, Dana L. "Hegemony or Concordance? The Rhetoric of Tokenism in 'Oprah' Winfrey's Rags-to-Riches Biography." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13, no. 2 (1996): 115-37.
- Cochran, Tom. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Cohen, Richard A. "Translator's Introduction." In *Time and the Other by Emmanuel Levinas*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- Company, The Nostalgia. *The Greatest Speeches of All-Time*. Rolling Bay: SoundWorks USA, Inc., 1998. DVD.

-
- Cosmides, Leda, and John Tooby. "Evolutionary Psychology and the Emotions." In *Handbook of Emotions*, edited by Michael Lewis and Jeannette Haviland-Jones, 91-115. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Crawford, Representative Bill. "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis," conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: April 4, 2007.
- Crenshaw, Carrie. "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence." *Western Journal of Communication* 61 (1997): 253-78.
- Czubaroff, Jeanine. "Dialogical Rhetoric: An Application of Martin Buber's Philosophy of Dialogue." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 86, no. 2 (2000): 168-89.
- Dalton, Diane Lynn. "Mythic Themes in the Civil Rights Rhetoric of John and Edward Kennedy." Columbus: Ohio State University, 1984.
- David, Lester and Irene David. *Bobby Kennedy: The Making of a Folk Hero*. Toronto: PaperJacks, LTD, 1986.
- Deats, Richard L. *Martin Luther King, Jr., Spirit-Led Prophet : A Biography* New York: New City Press, 2000.
- Deer, Reverend Lewis. "Interview in Indianapolis, April 1968," found in Karl W. Anatol and John R. Bittner's "Kennedy on King: The Rhetoric of Control." *Today's Speech* 16, no. 3 (1968): 31-34.
- Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 2001.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. "Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, Act up, and Queer Nation." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36, no. Summer (1999): 9-21.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*. Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- . *The Gift of Death*. Translated by David Wills. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- . *The Work of Mourning*. Edited by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael MNaas. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Douglas, Philip N. "Capturing Feelings on Film: Natural Gestures Work Best." *Communication World* (2000): 40-41.
- . "Hand Gestures: Reflecting Spontaneous Feelings on Film." *Communication World* 14, no. 9 (1997): 43.
- Dyson, Michael Eric. *I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- . *April 4, 1968: Martin Luther King, Jr. 's Death and How it Changed America*. New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2008.
- Edelman, Peter. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Engels, Jeremy. "Disciplining Jefferson: The Man within the Breast and the Rhetorical Norms of Producing Order." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 3 (2006): 411-36.

-
- Engleberg, Isa, and John Daly. *Presentations in Everyday Life: Strategies for Effective Speaking*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005.
- Flores, L.A., and D.G. Moon. "Rethinking Race, Revealing Dilemmas: Imagining a New Racial Subject in Race Traitor." *Western Journal of Communication* 66 (2002): 181-207.
- Fogelson, Robert M. *Violence as Protest: A Study of Riots and Ghettos*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1971.
- Forestal, Jerome. "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis," conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: August 16, 2006.
- . "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Frijda, Nico H. "The Psychologists' Point of View." In *Handbook of Emotions*, edited by Michael Lewis and Jeannette Haviland-Jones, 59-74. New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2000.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1979.
- Gardiner, Michael. "Alterity and Ethics: A Dialogical Perspective." *Theory, Culture & Society* 13, no. 2 (1996): 121-43.
- Genard, Gary. "Leveraging the Power of Nonverbal Communication." *Harvard Management Communication Letter* 1, no. 2 (2004): 3-4.
- Gigerich, Bill. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Gilbert, Michael A. *Coalescent Argumentation*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.
- . "Effing the Ineffable: The Logocentric Fallacy in Argumentation." *Argumentation* 16 (2002).
- . "Emotion, Argumentation, and Informal Logic." In *Royal Institute of Philosophy Conference on Emotions*, 2001.
- . "Emotional Messages." *Argumentation* 15 (2001): 239-49.
- Goodman, D. J. . "About Privileged Groups." In *Promoting Diversity and Social Justice: Educating People Form Privileged Groups*: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Great Speeches: Volume VI*. The Educational Video Group.
- Greene, Ronald Walter. "The Aesthetic Turn and the Rhetorical Perspective on Argumentation." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 35, no. 1 (1998).
- . "Constitutive Rhetoric and the Idea of Performance." In *The Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association*. San Diego, CA, 1996.
- Griffin, Cindy L. "Invitation to Public Speaking." In *Chapter Eighteen: Persuasion and Reasoning*, 382-403. Belmont, CA: Thomson and Wadsworth, 2006.
- . "Invitation to Public Speaking." In *Chapter Thirteen: Delivering Your Speech*, 264-87. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2006.

-
- Grondin, Jean. *The Philosophy of Gadamer*. Translated by Kathryn Plant. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003.
- Halberstam, David. *The Unfinished Odyssey of Robert Kennedy*. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Haldeman, Ron. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Hample, Dale, Marceline Thompson-Hayes, Kelly Wallenfelsz, Paul Wallenfelsz, and Christina Knapp. "Face-to-Face Arguing Is an Emotional Experience: Triangulating Methodologies and Early Findings." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 42, no. Fall (2005): 74-93.
- Hardiman, Michael O. "Role Obligations." *Journal of Philosophy* 91, no. 7 (1994).
- Harold, Christine, and Kevin Michael DeLuca. "Behold the Corpse: Violent Images and the Case of Emmett Till." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 2 (2005): 263-86.
- Hart, Roderick P. *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. 2nd ed. London: Allyn and Bacon, 1997.
- Haymes, S. N. *Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy for Black Urban Struggle*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Henning, James H. "How to Deliver a Speech." *Today's Speech* (1953): 3-4, 21.
- Heymann, C. David. *RFK: A Candid Biography of Robert F. Kennedy*. New York: A Dutton Book, 1998.
- Hicks, Darrin. "Darkness on the Edge of Town: On the Interface between Communicational and Racial Ideologies." In *Rhetoric, Discourse and Ordinary Democracy*, edited by K. Tracy & J. McDaniels,. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008.
- Hicks, Darrin, and Lenore Langsdorf. "Regulating Disagreement, Constituting Participants: A Critique of Proceduralist Theories of Democracy." *Argumentation* 13 (1999).
- Higgins. "A Tribute to Peace." *Indianapolis News*, April 4, 2006.
- Hill, Forbes. "Conventional Wisdom - Traditional Form - the President's Message of November 3, 1969." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58, no. 4 (1972): 14.
- Houston, M. "When Black Women Talk with White Women: Why Dialogues Are Difficult." In *Our Voices: Essays in Culture, Ethnicity, and Communication*, edited by A. Gonzalez, M. Houston and V. Chen, 187-95. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997.
- Howard, Darlene. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Hyde, Michael J. *The Call of Conscience: Heidegger and Levinas, Rhetoric and the Euthanasia Debate*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- . "The Ontological Workings of Dialogue and Acknowledgement." In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter and Kenneth N. Cissna, 57-73. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, 2004.

-
- Jackson, II., R.L. "White Space, White Privilege: Mapping Discursive Inquiry into the Self." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85 (2000): 38-54.
- Jackson, Robert H. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Janson, D. "Rivals in Indiana Woo Negro Vote: Kennedy Goes into Slums and Is Hailed by Militants." *New York Times*, April 4, 1968.
- Jasinski, James. *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies*. London: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Jovanovic, Spoma, and Roy Wood. "Speaking from the Bedrock of Ethics." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 37, no. 4 (2004): 317-34.
- "Keep MLK's Message of Peace Alive." *Indianapolis Star*, April 9, 2006.
- "Kennedy Calls for Unity in Troubled U.S." *Indianapolis News*, April 5, 1968.
- Kennedy, George. *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Kennedy, Robert F. "Robert F. Kennedy: Remarks on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.," April 4, 1968 in Indianapolis, IN. AmericanRhetoric.com, July 1, 2009, <http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/rfkonmlkdeath.html>.
- . "Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., in *Great Speeches: Volume V*. The Educational Video Group, 1989. Video.
- . "Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.," April 4, 1968 in Indianapolis, IN. JFK Library, July 1, 2009, <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/RFK/Statement+on+the+Assassination+of+Martin+Luther+King.htm>
- Klein, Joe. *Politics Lost: From Rfk to W: How Politicians Have Become Less Courageous and More Interested in Keeping Power Than in Doing What's Right for America*. New York: Broadway Books, 2006.
- . "Pssst! Who's Behind the Decline of Politics?" *Time*, April 9, 2006.
- Klinkose, David J. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Kloster, Moira Gutteridge "Comment on K. Warrenburg's "The Invisible Argument: Recognizing Race through Visceral Reasoning"." Paper presented at the Ontario Society of the Study of Argumentation: Argument Cultures, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada 2009.
- Kozin, Alexander. "The Sign of the Other: On the Semiotic of Emmanuel Levinas's *Phenomenology*." *Semiotica* 152, no. 1/4 (2004): 235-49.
- Langsdorf, Lenore. "On the Uses of Language in Working and Idealized Logic." *Argumentation* 4 (1990): 259-68.
- . "Refusing Individuality: How Human Beings Are Made into Subjects." *Communication Theory* 7, no. 4 (1997): 321-42.
- . "Why Phenomenology in Communication Research?" *Human Studies* 17 (1994): 1-8.

-
- . “Words of Others and Sightings/Citings/Sitings of Self.” In *The Critical Turn: Rhetoric and Philosophy in Postmodern Discourse*, edited by I. Angus and Lenore Langsdorf. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.
- Lefebvre, H. *The Production of Space*. Translated by D.N. Smith. [Original French edition published in 1974] ed. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991.
- . “Reflections on the Politics of Space.” *Antipode* 8 (1976): 30-37.
- Leff, Michael. “Lincoln at Cooper Union: Neo-Classical Criticism Revisited.” *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001): 17.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*. Translated by R. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1982.
- . *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*. Translated by A. Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998.
- . *Time and the Other*. Translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- . *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1961.
- Levy, Andrew. “The Big Nap: Indianapolis as City of the Future.” *Dissent* Fall (1994): 488-96.
- Lewis, A. E. ““What Group?” Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era Of “Color Blindness.”” *Sociological Theory* 22 (2004): 623-46.
- Lewis, John. “Interview by PBS Home Video, in *RFK* a film for American Experience in association with the BBC,” A David Grubin Productions, Inc., 2004.
- . “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Lipari, L. “Fearful of the Written Word:” White Fear, Black Writing, and Lorraine Hansberry’s *a Raisin in the Sun* Screenplay.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004): 81-102.
- Lucas, Stephen E. “The Art of Public Speaking.” In *Chapter Twelve: Delivery*, 298-325. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2007.
- Lucas, Stephen E. and Martin J. Medhurst. “The Top 100 Speeches,” AmericanRhetoric.com., July 1, 2009, <http://americanrhetoric.com/newtop100speeches.htm>.
- Mailioux, Steven. “Re-Marking Slave Bodies: Rhetoric as Production and Reception.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 35, no. 2 (2002): 96-119.
- Mankiewicz, Frank. “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Martin, J.N. , R.L. Krizek, T.K. Nakayama, and L. Bradford. “Exploring Whiteness: A Study of Self Labels for White Americans.” *Communication Quarterly* 44 (1996): 125-44.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. “Corporeality and Cultural Rhetoric: A Site for Rhetoric’s Future.” *The Southern Communication Journal* 63, no. 4 (1998): 315-28.

-
- . “Space and Time in the Postmodern Polity.” *Western Journal of Communication* 63, no. 3 (1999): 271-90.
- McNamee, Shelia, and John Shotter. “Dialogue, Creativity, and Change.” In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter and Kenneth N. Cissna, 91-104. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004.
- McPhail, Mark Lawrence. “A Question of Character: Re(-)Signing the Racial Contract.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7, no. 3 (2004).
- Mehrabian, Albert. *Silent Messages: Implicit Communication of Emotion and Attitudes*. 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1981.
- Milliken, Lloyd. “Interviews done for the documentary “A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968”, conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Mills, Charles. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Morris III, Charles E. “Pink Herring & the Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 2 (2002): 228-44.
- Murphy, John M. “Renewing the National Covenant: The Presidential Campaign Rhetoric of Robert F. Kennedy.” Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1985.
- . ““A Time of Shame and Sorrow:” Robert F. Kennedy and the American Jeremiad.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 401-14.
- Murray, Jeffery W. “Bakhtinian Answerability and Levinasian Responsibility: Forging a Fuller Dialogical Communicative Ethics.” *Southern Communication Journal* 65, no. 2&3 (2000).
- Nakayama, T.K., and R.L. Krizek. “Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric.” In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* edited by C.R. Burgchardt, 628-47. State College, Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, Inc., 2005.
- Natanson, Maurice. “The Claims of Immediacy.” In *Philosophy Rhetoric and Argumentation*, edited by Maurice Natanson and Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., 10-19. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1965.
- Nealson, Jeffery T. “The Ethics of Dialogue: Bakhtin and Levinas.” *College English* 59, no. 2 (1997).
- Patterson, James T. *Grand Expectations: The United States 1945-1974*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Pearce, W. Barnett, and Kimberly A. Pearce. “Taking a Communication Perspective on Dialogue.” In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Rob Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter and Kenneth N. Cissna, 39-56. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004.
- Perkinson, James W. “The Body of White Space: Beyond Stiff Voices, Flaccid Feelings, and Silent Cells.” In *Revealing Male Bodies*, edited by N. Tuana, W. Cowling, M. Hamington, G. Johnson and T. MacMullen. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.

-
- . *White Theology: Outing Supremacy in Modernity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Perloff, Richard M. *The Dynamics of Persuasion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1993.
- Pierce, Richard B. *Polite Protest: The Political Economy of Race in Indianapolis 1920-1970*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Plimpton, George, and J. (interviews) Stein, eds. *American Journey: The Times of Robert Kennedy*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970.
- Porter, Richard E., and Larry A. Samovar. "Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression: Implications for Intercultural Communication." In *Handbook of Communication and Emotion: Research, Theory, Applications, and Contexts*, edited by Peter A. Andersen and Laura K. Guerrero, 452. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998.
- "RFK." In *American Experience*, edited by PBS Home Video. USA: BBC, 2004.
- Rhodes, Sr., Vechel L. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Riley, Michael. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Robinson, Abie. "Handout from the Rededication Celebration of The "Landmark for Peace Memorial"." Indianapolis, IN: 2006.
- . "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis," conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: August 8, 2006.
- . "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Roediger, D. "Whiteness and Ethnicity in the History of "White Ethnics" in the United States." In *Race Critical Theories* edited by P. Essed and D. Goldberg, 325-43: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2002.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. *Robert Kennedy and His Times*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Shome. "Outing Whiteness." *Review and Criticism* (2000): 366-70.
- Solomon, Robert C. "Emotions in Phenomenology and Existentialism." In *A Companion to Phenomenology and Existentialism*, edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus, Wrathall, Mark A., 291-309: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- . *The Passions: Emotions and the Meaning of Life*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1993.
- Steel, Ronald. *In Love with Night: The American Romance with Robert Kennedy*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Steward, LaVerne. "Interviews done for the research project "Remembering April 4, 1968: Audience Perspectives of Robert Kennedy's Speech in Indianapolis," conducted by Kristine Warrenburg, Indianapolis, IN: April 4, 2007.
- Stiff, James B. *Persuasive Communication*. New York: Guilford Press, 1994.

-
- Thomas, Evan. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- . *Robert Kennedy: His Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Thornbrough, Emma Lou. "African Americans." In *Peopling Indiana: The Ethnic Experience*, edited by Jr. Taylor, Robert M. and Connie A McBirney, 12-36. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996.
- Tilly, Charles. *Why? What Happens When People Giver Reasons...And Why*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Tolan, Jim. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Trulock, James. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Vatz, "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973): 154-61.
- Wachterhauser, Brice. "Getting It Right: Relativism, Realism and Truth." In *The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*, edited by Robert J. Dostal, 52-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Walinsky, Adam. "Interviews done for the documentary "A Ripple of Hope; Robert F. Kennedy in Indianapolis, 1968", conducted by Donald Boggs and David Baird. © 2008 Covenant Productions.
- Walton, Douglas. *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Wander, Phillip. "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory." In *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, edited by J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit and S. Caudill, 357-79. New York: The Guilford Press, 1999.
- Ware, B.L., and W.A. Linkugel. "The Rhetorical Persona: Marcus Garvey as Black Moses." *Communication Monographs* 49 (1982): 50-62.
- Warrenburg, K. "The Invisible Argument: Recognizing Race in Visceral Reasoning. Paper to be published in the *Proceedings of the Argumentation Cultures Conference sponsored by the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation*. Ontario, Canada, University of Windsor, 2009.
- . "Aesthetic argument: Moving beyond logic." In F.H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Argumentation*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Society for the Study of Argumentation, 2007.
- Witcover, Jules. *85 Days: The Last Campaign of Robert Kennedy*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.
- . *The Year the Dream Died: Revisiting 1968 in America*. New York: Warner Books, 1997.
- Yoos, George E. "A Revision of the Concept of Ethical Appeal." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 12 (1979): 41-58.

-
- Young, Iris Marion. *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Introduction.” In *On Female Body Experience: “Throwing Like a Girl” And Other Essays*, edited by Iris Marion Young, 3-11. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . “Throwing Like a Girl: A Phenomenology of Feminine Body Comportment, Motility, and Spatiality.” *Human Studies* 3 (1980): 137-56.
- Zulick, Margaret D. “Book Review of George Kennedy's *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 521-22.
- . “The Normative, the Proper, and the Sublime: Notes on the Use of Figure and Emotion in Prophetic Argumentation.” *Argumentation* 12 (1998): 481-92.