

: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal



# JOURNAL

Speech Association of Minnesota

Volume VII

1980



## THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA JOURNAL

Published by  
The Speech Association of Minnesota

**1979-1980**

**Editor**

Richard J. Ilkka  
University of Minnesota, Morris

**Associate Editor**

Stephen T. Olsen  
St. Olaf College

**Editorial Advisory Board**

Jerry Frye  
University of Minnesota, Duluth

Jeff Phillips  
Cooper High School

George Polates  
College of St. Catherine

Larry Schnoor  
Mankato State University

**Student Assistants**

Kris Anderson  
Tami Wiese  
University of Minnesota, Morris



## EDITOR'S PAGE

*The Speech Association of Minnesota Journal* is an annual publication of the Speech Association of Minnesota. Manuscripts dealing with a wide variety of issues and ideas related to Speech Communication and Dramatic Arts are encouraged. The editor, associate editor, and editorial board members sincerely wish to help interested individuals publish in the *Journal* thus, no submission will be refused publication without an accompanying and detailed critique which will recommend to the author(s) how successful revision might be accomplished. Indeed, we intend to encourage and help everyone who sends us a paper, and in turn, we plan to publish as many articles as quality and finances allow as it is our conviction that anyone willing to contribute to the production of a journal in his/her profession deserves at least private support if not also public recognition.

To facilitate contributions we are encouraging authors to write either (1) an *article* of 1000 to 4000 words, written in an informal style, and ranging in content from the theoretical/speculative to the pedagogical/pragmatic, or (2) a *broadside*, in effect, a brief essay of about 500 to 700 words, written in an informal style and discussing or outlining such diverse matters as teaching tips, classroom exercises, observations about our profession, the state organization, or any other developed statements relevant to Speech/Theatre policies, programs, and practices in secondary schools and colleges.

Persons interested in publishing in the *Journal* should submit to the editor three copies of their article or broadside for consideration by the editorial staff. The author(s) should be identified on a separate title page but not in any subsequent part of the paper. Copies of the paper less the title page will then be sent to members of the editorial staff for review and recommendation. Articles and broadsides may be sent to the new editor at any time, however, the deadline for inclusion in Volume VIII is January 31, 1981. The editor elect is: Stephen T. Olsen, St. Olaf College, Northfield, MN. 55057.

Permission from the author constitutes permission to reproduce any article in Volume VII of the *Journal*. Reproduction must be credited to the author and to *The Speech Association of Minnesota Journal* by bibliographical reference.



**THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA JOURNAL**

**Volume VII**

**1980**

**CONTENTS**

<b>Editor's Page</b> .....	i
<b>Senator Kennedy's Remarks on The Shah of Iran: A Case Study in Inappropriate Timing</b> Leslie Dent .....	1
<b>The State of Speech in Australia and New Zealand: A Report on The Communication Association of the Pacific Tour</b> Carlene E. McDowell and Earl E. McDowell .....	6
<b>Spanish Public Speaking: An Example of Confrontation</b> Donald E. Sikkink .....	10
<b>Communication as Dialogical Interpretation</b> Ronald C. Arnett .....	14



: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal  
**SENATOR KENNEDY'S REMARKS ON THE SHAH OF IRAN:  
A CASE STUDY IN INAPPROPRIATE TIMING**

*Leslie Dent*

The study of rhetorical criticism is a dynamic one with new ideas constantly being formulated and applied. Carroll Arnold, in his book *Criticism of Oral Rhetoric*, raises new insights into rhetorical criticism that all serious speech theorists should consider. Mr. Arnold's discussion of what he called non-consecutive discourse sheds new light on the established notion that only formal podium speeches are open to rhetorical criticism. He says, "non-consecutive speech of significance occurs in interviews, news conferences, panel discussions and informal conversation. It occurs in places we do not always think of as habitats of speech amenable to rhetorical criticism." (1) A conscientious critic should not ignore these "units" of discourse in his definition and application of critical theory. More importantly, Arnold notes, "...influential rhetoric does not exist only in formal public speaking and a speech critic ought to be prepared to comment on oral rhetoric wherever it occurs." (2) Within the context of any non-consecutive discourse there are "internal units." Mr. Arnold says, "The play, the conversation, the interview is not always open to rhetorical criticism as a whole, but its 'internal units' of rhetoric are." (3) Consequently, statements made in the course of these informal settings can have rhetorical significance for the rhetorical critic.

The nature of non-consecutive discourse as Mr. Arnold establishes, creates new problems for the critic and the speaker. Given a specific situation, a speaker has more choices in terms of speaking format than he ever had before. Certainly this is evident in the area of political rhetoric. Candidates are forced to reach as many voters as possible, and consequently, must select the modes of communication that will most favorably present them to the voting electorates. They must determine whether they wish to divulge political statements through formalized discourse or through non-consecutive discourse. I will maintain that this choice is critical to the success of any speaker's candidacy. The critical nature of this decision is witnessed by remarks made by Senator Edward Kennedy. Kennedy, early in his campaign, criticized Administration decisions pertaining to the Shah of Iran. Rather than formally announcing his disagreement with Administration policy, Kennedy chose to disclose his remarks through non-consecutive discourse. On December 3, 1979, at the end of a long campaign day, Senator Kennedy was being interviewed in the San Francisco International Airport by reporter Rollin Post. Post asked Kennedy what he felt about Ronald Reagan's statement that the Shah should be allowed to stay in the U.S. because he had been a loyal friend. Kennedy answered,

The Shah had the reins of power and ran one of the most violent regimes in the history of mankind—in the form of terrorism and the basic and fundamental violations of human rights, and in most cruel circumstances to his own people. How can we justify, in the United States, on the one hand of accepting the individual because he would like to come here and stay with his umpteen billions of dollars that he had stolen from Iran, and at the same time say to the Hispanics, who are here legally, that they have to wait nine years to bring their wives and children to the country. (4)

As a result of his emotional attack on the Shah in the Post interview, the Senator found his campaign plunged into turmoil. The remarks consequently have rhetorical significance, not only for Kennedy, but also for any student of political campaign rhetoric. Kennedy, finding himself losing ground in the

*Leslie Dent* is a student in Speech Communications at Moorhead State University.



seven points in a late November poll—as a result of Carter's handling of the Iranian crisis, felt forced by the situation to change his previous decision to remain silent on the issue of Iran. Kennedy felt compelled to speak out. He needed to penetrate the silent screen that had descended on his presidential campaign as a result of Iran. Thus, because of this rhetorical situation, discourse occurred. Lloyd F. Bitzer, in his essay, "The Rhetorical Situation" defines the rhetorical situation as a "complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse introduced into the situation can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence."<sup>5</sup> Kennedy chose to speak because of the situation surrounding him (Carter's increasing popularity), and therefore, Bitzer's perspective is the appropriate one with which to measure Kennedy's non-consecutive discourse. The rhetoric of Kennedy is situational because it, according to Bitzer, "needs and invites discourse capable of participating with the situation and thereby altering reality."<sup>6</sup> The reality was Carter's increasing popularity and Kennedy's decreasing popularity. Mr. Bitzer established three areas for examination in situational rhetoric: 1) the exigencies—"an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be;" 2) the constraints—"persons, events, objects, and relations, which are part of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigencies;" and 3) The audience, which is "made up of those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and of being moderators of change."<sup>7</sup> Because Kennedy's remarks were of rhetorical significance, there is a necessity to examine these three areas, and then draw out possible conclusions as to what a candidate should do in a similar situation. Hopefully, through the examination of Kennedy's non-consecutive discourse from the framework of Bitzer's situational rhetoric, several things will become evident:

- 1) That non-consecutive discourse provides the critic with a legitimate and fruitful area of study.
- 2) That the increasing use and importance of non-consecutive discourse forces a speaker to make decisions regarding the appropriateness of this discourse for his purpose.
- 3) That decisions regarding the mode of communication of major political stands are critical to the favorable reception of those ideas.
- 4) That Senator Kennedy's remarks about the Shah would have been more favorably received had they not been in the form of non-consecutive discourse.

I am not saying that one should shun the interview; on the contrary, the interview is often an effective and necessary political tool but may at times be inappropriate for the speaker and the subject matter. Through examination of Kennedy's situation and Bitzer's applications, it will be evident that Kennedy committed a politically fatal error in expounding on the Shah in the interview setting.

In examining the first area of concern—the exigencies—it is evident that Kennedy had several. The controlling exigence was the desire to become president and the more immediate exigence was to become the nominee for the Democratic Party. Several minor exigencies also existed. One of these was the need to counter Carter's mounting popularity. Kennedy obviously could not have altered the controlling exigence if current trends continued. According to the December 17, 1979 issue of *Newsweek*, an ABC-Harris poll revealed that Kennedy's lead over Carter among Democrats had deteriorated from 30 points in mid-November to a mere seven points in a late November poll.<sup>8</sup> Afterward, Carter surged to a record high 61% favorable rating in the



: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal  
*Newsweek* poll.(9) A recent poll disclosed that 77% of Americans approved of Carter's handling of the Iranian situation.(10) This increasing popularity of Carter was a kink in Kennedy's campaign armor. As an analyst in *Newsweek* put it, "...he was frustrated as well, sitting by in patriotic silence while Iran neutralized his trump issue—leadership..."(11) Carter was demonstrating that he could be a leader as evidenced by approval in the polls, and it was this leadership edge that Kennedy was losing. Thus this exigency or imperfection in Kennedy's plan demanded that Kennedy involve himself in rhetorical discourse. Another exigence was the incumbency edge that Carter had over Kennedy particularly in terms of the use of the media. Carter, whether jogging, dining with his wife, or greeting foreign statesmen, had constant command of the media's focus. With the Iranian takeover of the embassy, Carter received even more media coverage. Carter, through the hostage situation, was receiving extensive daily coverage by the media, while campaign issues for the moment fell by the wayside. Thus, to overcome this exigence, Kennedy needed to gain the media attention through rhetorical discourse. A fourth exigency was the charge leveled against him by Edwardo Sandoval, the president of the Mexican-American Political Association, saying that Kennedy was guilty of "benign neglect" of the nation's Hispanic people.(12) *The New York Times* remarked that Kennedy had, on the day of the interview cancelled a scheduled meeting with the non-partisan Hispanic group and subsequently incurred Mr. Sandoval's criticism.(13) The Hispanic represented a more traditionally liberal populous group whose support would be a big boost for Kennedy's slumping campaign. It was this exigence that needed to be changed and it is likely that Kennedy sought to dissipate it by favorably contrasting them to the Shah in his answer to Rollin Post's question. Essentially then it was a simple answer to a question, but rhetorically, Kennedy sought to alleviate several complex exigencies.

In order to solve the exigencies present in the situation, Kennedy needed to address a rhetorical audience of those persons who were capable of being influenced by discourse and of being moderators of change. The primary audience was the American people, for it was these individuals who would actually cast the votes and fund his campaign. Other secondary audiences were the press, his political opponents, and the Mexican American Political Association. The audience Kennedy wanted to attract was the American public. However, Kennedy's remarks were not well received by this audience. One-third in a Harris Poll of voters aware of Kennedy's slip thought less of him.(14) Another audience capable of altering the exigencies was the press. It was the media that would print and televise Kennedy's remarks, and they would doubtlessly be capable of either favorably or unfavorably representing the remarks. Kennedy was ill-advised in not realizing how quickly and harmfully the media would pick up on his remarks. *The Washington Post* commented, "It wasn't right, it wasn't responsible and it wasn't smart."(15) *The Atlantic Constitution* accused Kennedy of "publicly siding with the Shah."(16) *The New York Post* headlines declared "Teddy the toast of Tehran."(17) If Kennedy was to attain the nomination, he needed to be presented by the media in a favorable light, and the remarks made during the interview allowed his critics in the press to come down very hard upon him. Of significance also was a particular sub-audience that Kennedy did not consider—his opponents. They were capable of altering the exigence of nomination in a negative manner because of his remarks and Kennedy did not appear to realize this. *The New York Times* wrote, "It was clear that his Republican and Democratic critics saw his remarks as a major campaign gaffe and an opportunity to attack him while still professing support for President Carter's handling of the situation."(18) John Connally in a news release said, "I am sure the Ayattullah Khomeini is pleased to hear Senator Kennedy's remarks."(19) Similarly, George Bush said, "...Kennedy's remarks might endanger the lives of the hostages and raise serious



questions about his judgment of foreign policy." (20) Robert Dole and Howard Baker issued similar comments. These men negatively altered the exigence. In addressing this specialized audience, Kennedy failed to realize that he broke the ice and allowed his opponents to achieve attention while attacking him, and at the same time they would seem to be still supporting the President. The result was that they were all seen in a favorable light, and he was seen in a negative light. The third audience was the Hispanic group, who had accused Kennedy of "benign neglect." It was this audience that he addressed when he said,

How can we justify, in the United States, on the one hand, accepting the individual because he would like to come here and stay here with his umpteen billions of dollars that he's stolen, and at the same time say to Hispanics, who are here legally that they have to wait nine years to bring their wives and children to the country. (21)

I could find no measurement of this audience's reaction to Kennedy's comparison because no polls were done specifically with a Hispanic polling group. It remains to be seen how Kennedy does in primaries with large Hispanic populations. There were several audiences, none of whom Kennedy was effectively able to persuade to positively alter the exigence.

In any communicative act, there are within the situation certain restrictions. There were three such constraints which kept Kennedy from communicating his message. The constraints were the time of the remark, the setting of the remark, and the pre-established attitude of the American people. When we consider the constraint of time, it is clear that Kennedy made a crucial error. Kennedy raised it when an irate Iranian mob was holding fifty American hostages. Questions were raised by State Department officials and political opponents about the adverse effects Kennedy's remarks would have on the fate of the hostages. Doubts and questions such as these, undoubtedly, hampered the Senator's campaign effort. Not only did Kennedy fail to properly time his speech, but he also failed to conduct it in an appropriate setting. If Kennedy wanted to alter the exigencies, a longer, well-thought out podium speech would have been superior. Instead, Kennedy's words were blurted out in a careless manner, with no elaboration or justification. Kennedy spoke in an interview setting where no explanation was provided. It was also late at night. Kennedy would have been better advised to comment at a time of day when he could have more elaborately expressed his ideas—such as he did with his recent major policies speech at Georgetown University. A third constraint was the preconceived attitude of his audience. The majority of Americans favored Carter's handling of the Iranian situation. What chance did Kennedy have at that time of altering the majority attitude when Americans feared for the safety of the fifty hostages in Iran? The American people were drawn to the patriotic aura that Carter had created. Kennedy's failure to carefully analyze voter attitude may have lost him the nomination. All three of these constraints have the power to confine decision and must be eliminated; and if anything, created more exigencies than it solved.

It is obvious that Kennedy was not able to deal with the constraints in an appropriate manner. The best indication of Kennedy's effectiveness is to see if the exigencies are removed. Evidence, for Kennedy's failure to solve the exigencies, is abundant. Carter's popularity rose steadily. Although Kennedy did receive media coverage, it was harmful to his image as a political nominee. The coverage raised doubts of Kennedy's ability to carry himself with diplomatic tact, and if anything, created more exigencies than it solved. Not only did Kennedy lose most of the ensuing crucial primaries and caucuses, he also was forced to deal with two new exigencies. The loss of support as a result of the remarks created financial as well as morale problems within his organization. Kennedy was later forced to deal with these exigencies in his major policies speech at Georgetown University. This



carefully written well-thought out speech, delivered in a formal manner, was when Kennedy was at his finest. However, this may be a case of the proverbial too little too late. Kennedy, in the interview with Post had come off as a frustrated, political opportunist, rather than a concern citizen. Even though his Georgetown speech was voted as one of his finest, this image was already firmly embedded in the public mind. Kennedy had presented a legitimate political issue, the only problem was that he chose to present it in an unfavorable setting and at an inappropriate time.

This examination of Kennedy's non-consecutive discourse provides lessons for any individuals concerned with the communicative act. One does not always find significant communication in large lecture halls, the Oval Office, or the Senate Chamber. Critical discourse is occurring around us everyday, and persons in the field of rhetorical criticism must acknowledge and apply this awareness. Hopefully, the case study involving Senator Kennedy illustrates this point. Kennedy's remarks in the interview were a mistake; he should have waited until the Georgetown Speech to reveal his policies on Iran. In political campaigns and in other fields for communication, one cannot avoid taking stands on issues, but at the same time, there are wrong situation and right situations, in which to articulate these stands. Nor only is the selection of time, audience, and subject matter crucial, but also the setting of that particular speech. Kennedy, in not taking care in selecting the appropriate mode of delivery for his speech, may have on his hands what a Democratic Senator proclaimed as a problem "worse than Chappaquidik."(22)

The study of rhetorical criticism is elemental to an understanding of the communicative act. Communication is the common controlling element of all disciplines. A rhetorical analysis of Kennedy's campaign rhetoric demonstrates the need for modern communicators to understand different rhetorical tactics. The need is obvious for the presidential aspirant, but the same challenges confront all of us who desire to modify action and restrain decision.

(1)Carroll Arnold, *Criticism of Oral Rhetoric* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Publisher, 1974) p. 239-240.

(2)*Ibid.* p. 242.

(3)*Ibid.*

(4) *The New York Times*, December 5, 1979, p. B18.

(5)Lloyd F. Bitzer, *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press) Jan., 1968 p. 6.

(6)*Ibid.* p. 4.

(7)*Ibid.* p. 6.

(8)Peter Goldman, *et al.*, *Newsweek*, December 17, 1979, p. 46.

(9)*Ibid.* p. 45.

(10)*Ibid.* p. 46.

(11)*Ibid.*

(12)*New York Times*, December 4, 1979, p. A18.

(13)*Ibid.*

(14)*Newsweek*, December 17, 1979, p. 46.

(15)*Time*, December 17, 1979, p. 27.

(16)*Ibid.* P. 27.

(17)*Newsweek*, December 17, 1979, p. 27.

(18)Terrence Smith, *New York Times*, December 4, 1979, p. B18.

(19)*Time*, December 17, 1979, p. 27.

(20)*Ibid.*

(21)*New York Times*, December 5, 1979, p. B18

(22)*Newsweek*, p. 46.

**THE STATE OF SPEECH IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND:  
A REPORT ON THE COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION  
OF THE PACIFIC TOUR**

*Carlene E. McDowell and Earl E. McDowell*

At first we were uncertain about what the speaker was talking. Was ORC an organization? How was it spelled? We did not have a copy of his paper to check. As we listened we realized from the context that the word which was puzzling us was "oracy." Although we are not familiar with the word, we are very familiar with the concept. We, however, use the term "speech" or "oral communication." Such was our initiation to the conference on Developing Communication Competence in Children held at the University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia, on July 12-18, 1979.

Enclosed in our packet of materials was a copy of this poem which related to the concerns of the conference.

**Communicating**

*Communicating's more than merely talking,  
Communicating's when a thing unsaid  
Is heard and shared and given deeper meaning  
It's like good bread*

*And cheese. Now either, by itself, is splendid  
And yet, when you combine and taste the two,  
They add to one another a fresh flavor.  
The same is true*

*Of minds that meet and match. There's something extra,  
A gleam, a swiftness neither knew before.  
Talking stays in one room. Communicating  
Opens the door.*

*Jean Little*

The format of the conference was designed to promote communication and to open doors.

All participants were assigned to discussion groups. The purposes of the groups were to discuss and develop ideas set forth in the major papers that were presented and to define issues which could be investigated by work parties. A reporter from each group shared the discussion and topics with the assembly. Participants then joined a work party on the fourth day of the conference. Areas selected to be discussed by the work parties included (1) formulating aims and designing curricula for schools, (2) assessment and accountability, (3) cross-cultural communication in a pluralist society, (4) interpersonal communication and the mass media and (5) teacher behavior and change in schools. Questions and concerns were generated by the whole assembly to give the work parties a starting point. Work parties then spent two days discussing the specific areas before reporting back to the assembly.

Guiding the conference were basic assumptions set forth by Frank Bitmead, Senior Lecturer, Department of Continuing Education, University of New England, and Bill Crocker, Principal Lecturer in Language Studies, Armidale College of Advanced Education, which were shared to some extent by all participants.

*Carlene E. McDowell*, MA, Language Arts Department, is an instructor at Burnsville Senior High School, Burnsville, MN.

*Earl E. McDowell*, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN.



- : Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal
1. The term "oral communication competencies" and "oral communication skills" are more or less interchangeable.
  2. Most people would develop a reasonable standard of oral communication competence without any help from school.
  3. It is important for the good of the individual and of the society that each child should be helped to develop to the utmost his own ability to communicate effectively.
  4. The fundamental way in which schools can foster oral communication skills is by exposing each child to a wide variety of satisfying communication experiences.
  5. In addition to being facilitators of worthwhile experiences, most teachers want to be more purposeful and systematic in helping their pupils develop communication skills.
  6. In order to become most effective in helping their pupils, teachers need to have an understanding of the nature of oral communication competence and be able to programme, teach and assess activities designed to develop communication skills in children at various stages in their development.(1)

To understand the basic assumptions, it is helpful to understand where oral communication has been in Australia. In his article, "The Historical Present," W. J. Crocker points out that early speech training in Australia was influenced by Britain and emphasized elocution—i.e. correct pronunciation, grammar and inflection. Speech training of this sort fell into disrepute in schools and usually was taught by private teachers. When Robert Oliver visited Australia in 1957, he encouraged Australian teachers to help students understand and develop skills that would assist them in any speaking situation. Oliver's visit helped to change the focus of speech from articulation errors to interest in developing skills which would increase the students' effectiveness in their professional, social and personal lives. Influenced by American ideas and by changes in Britain, interest in speech education flourished in the sixties. "The approach has changed from a normative training in correctness to one of individual development."(2)

According to W. J. Crocker the changes are occurring most rapidly at the tertiary level where new courses were started in business communication, public relations and media, communication theory and skills of communication. Research also is being completed in mass media, communication in organizations and communication patterns in the classroom. In addition, attempts have been and continue to be made to form a national communication organization. Crocker points out that "The inauguration of the Speech Communication Association (Australia) in Queensland, and the publication of *Australian Scan* are significant events for the study of communication in this country."(3)

As we participated in the work parties, we had a feeling of *de ja vu*. Hadn't we been through this before? It was participating again in our first steps of bringing speech into the curriculum through the English classes. It was remembering our attempts to convince the administration of the value of oral communication and our continuing battle to convince others that not just anyone can teach speech, but that trained, competent teachers are vital to the development of a student's oral communication skills.

In her paper, "Oral Communication Instruction in the U.S.A.: Emerging Issues," Barbara Lieb-Brihant, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., pointed out that "...recent data from the U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics indicate that, at best, only 65% of senior high schools offer identifiable speech communication courses. It is likely that few of these schools require speech courses for graduation and it is difficult to



ascertain the actual prevalence of speech in English courses." (4) Like our colleagues in Australia, we still are wrestling with the vital issues of oral communication. B. Lieb-Brilhart indicated that through projects sponsored largely by the Speech Communication Association (United States), resources are available on what should be taught, who should teach communication skills, what are the characteristics of the ideal oral communication program and how communication skills should be assessed. Her paper summarizes each of the areas. (5) Her report reinforced Crocker's contention that a national body can help to promote the development of oral communication in Australia.

Whether oracy should be a component of essential learning for all Australian students has been considered by researchers on comprehensive studies according to Sid Bourke, chief research officer for the Australian Council for Educational Research. In his paper, "The Assessment of Oracy: Feasibility and Methods," Bourke indicates that the study "...set out to investigate the school and teacher objectives and practices in the development of oracy from years 3 to 10, to determine what were the oracy skills generally agreed as important, and to assess the feasibility and desirability of testing competence in oracy." (6) A statement of listening and speaking objectives was prepared from available curriculum guidelines. Teachers then reacted to the statement of objectives in group interview settings. A majority of the teachers considered oracy to be important in itself. A major concern of teachers was how to assess student performance. The framework developed by the researchers consists of three dimensions. The first dimension is ability which consisted of oral vocabulary, literal meaning, implied meaning and analytical and critical thinking. The concept dimension is a continuum between formal and informal situations. The purpose dimension consists of five categories: personal, recreational, classroom, business and citizenship. Within this framework numerous possible objectives were created and rated by teachers and other interested in oral language programs. Twenty-two listening and twenty-two speaking objectives were selected. Listening tests of multiple choice and completion items were created on material presented from audio cassettes. Speaking tests were conducted in the form of interviews with individual students. At the time of the presentation of the paper, results were not available. (7) The thrust of the research revealed concerns similar to those of accountability which are present in the United States.

We left the conference on Developing oral Communication Competence in Children feeling that steps were being made in a positive direction to promote oral communication and to make it part of the curriculum. We left words of encouragement as we know the attempt is not an easy one.

Our meetings with teachers of speech in New Zealand revealed a facet of oral communication that is unfamiliar to us, but, perhaps, will be recognized by others in the speech field. Oral communication is not part of the public school curriculum. If one is interested in improving speech skills, a private speech teacher is the person to see. Since our background has been with public school systems, the idea of a private speech teacher (like a private music or dance instructor in the United States) was novel to us. The student's progress is assessed by the New Zealand Speech Board. The Board is best explained by examining its aims and objectives.

The aim of the New Zealand Speech Board is to develop versatility in the use of language, with particular emphasis on oral skills.

The Board's programme ranges from assessments in oral communication, to the special skills of public speaking, teaching and interpretation in performance. Syllabuses are designed to meet and supplement modern educational requirements at primary, secondary and tertiary levels in schools, speech and drama studios, theatre schools and adult



: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal  
vocational training centres.

A student should

- 1) be able to express himself with clarity, confidence and courtesy in personal, social, business and professional situations, speaking in public and (where this is his aim) in the theatre,
- 2) Through an enjoyment of what he reads, develop an appreciation of literature, and have the ability not only to read silently with perception, but also to read aloud with a sensitivity for content and style that will hold the interest of the listener,
- 3) develop his ability to listen with discernment and courtesy,
- 4) develop a vocabulary rich enough to express thoughts and ideas with clarity and imagination,
- 5) develop a resonant, flexible and appropriately projected voice,
- 6) develop speech of internationally acceptable standards, free from affectation or from speech habits which may cause ambiguity or embarrassment.(8)

Candidates enter for a grade examination for initial (seven years old) and for Grades 1 through 8 (which includes eight to seventeen year olds and older). A syllabus sets forth the expectations of the candidate at each grade level. Examinations are conducted by the New Zealand Speech Board in Speech and Drama, Practical Speech Performance, and Oral Communication/Public Speaking. In addition, Vocational Speech Examination, Certificate of Public Speaking and Diplomas in Speech and Drama and in Public Speaking are available.(9) As we studied the syllabus, we found a greater stress placed on memorization, use of voice and delivery than we currently find in oral communication courses in the United States. Little emphasis appeared to be placed on group communication and interpersonal communication. This brought to mind the changes in the United States and Australia from what had previously been stressed, such as elocution and public speaking, to the present, such as content and interpersonal.

The examinations of the New Zealand Speech Board appear to be rigorous. It would be interesting to see how oral communication students from the United States would achieve on the examinations.

As we communicated with speech teachers in Christchurch, Rotorua and Auckland, New Zealand, we learned that attempts are being made to have oral communication become part of the public school curriculum. Presently, speech does exist in a number of private institutions. It appears that New Zealand has similar struggles ahead as Australia and the United States have had and still have to some extent. Possibly through continued international exchanges we can continue to benefit one another as we grow.

(1)Bill Bocker and Frank Bitmead, Letter of Welcome, conference on Developing Oral Communication Competence in Children, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia, July 12-18, 1979.

(2)W. J. Crocker, "The Historical Present," *Australian Scan*, I (June 1977), 3.

(3)*ibid.*, p. 1.

(4)Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, "Oral Communication Instruction the U.S.A.: Emerging Issues," Paper presented at the conference on Developing Oral Communication Competence in Children, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia, July 12-18, 1979, 2.

(5)*ibid.*, pp. 1-18.

(6)Sid Bourke, "The Assessment of Oracy: Feasibility and Methods," Paper presented at the conference on Developing Oral Communication



Competence in Children, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia, July 12-18, 1979, 3.

(7)*Ibid.*, pp. 1-10.

(8)New Zealand Speech Board, *Speech and Drama, Public Speaking, Vocational Speech Syllabus*, 1977, 1.

(9)*Ibid.*, pp. 1-73.

## SPANISH PUBLIC SPEAKING: AN EXAMPLE OF CONFRONTATION

Donald E. Sikkink

Robert Coldston calls the incident "the most dramatic intellectual and emotional confrontation between the two Spains."<sup>(1)</sup> Alan Lloyd writes that it has been seen as "one of the great confrontations of history."<sup>(2)</sup> James Michener agreeing with these judgments adds an element of suspense when he states:

Doubts have been cast on the authenticity of some of the details of the...confrontation. The original account came from a journalist, Luis Portillo, and was accepted by Hugh Thomas and many other serious writers. Joe Maria Perman, one of the scheduled speakers that day and member of the Royal Academy has denied that it took place but Emilio Salcedo...says that during the formal addresses relating to Spain's role in the New World, Unamuno was inspired to take a few notes on a piece of paper which has come down to us. At the conclusion of the set speeches he rose to make a few observations based on his notes but was interrupted...where upon something like the scene I have described took place, though not in the highly dramatic form suggested by Portillo. I have discussed this matter with a fair cross section of Spaniards and they believe an intellectual scuffle, pretty much as described by Salcedo, did occur."<sup>(3)</sup>

The event in question involves a brief impromptu speech given at Salamanca University on October 12, 1936, by the seventy-one year old rector of the university, Miquel de Unamuno.

Professor Unamuno was born September 29, 1864, in Bilbao of Basque parents and was educated at the Instituto Vizcaino and the University of Madrid. He became a professor of Greek at Salamanca in 1891 and ten years later was selected as rector of that university. Unamuno was removed as rector in 1914 for political reasons and returned to teaching duties. In 1924, he was exiled for political reasons to the Canary Islands by Primo de Rivera's dictatorship, returned in 1931, was again elected rector and in 1934 was made "rector-for-life."<sup>(4)</sup> Unamuno's first book was *En Torno al Casticismo*, published in 1895, followed by *Paz en la Guerra* in 1897. His most important book is generally agreed to be *Del Sentimiento Tragico de la Vida en los Hombres y en los pueblo*, which was published first in 1913.<sup>(5)</sup>

Spain, celebrating the Festival of the Spanish Race, on October 12, 1936, was in the early days of its tragic Civil War. Violence in Spain had spread rapidly in the confusion which followed the elections of February, 1936. The Popular Front, committed to a republic, had failed to win a clear national majority but in many of the impoverished villages of southern Spain its

Donald E. Sikkink, Ph.D., is a Professor Speech at St. Cloud State University.



supporters had won over sixty percent of the vote and "town hall after town hall went tumbling into the hands of the Socialists and anarchists."(6) Lawlessness, arson, and murder broke loose throughout the country. Parliamentary sessions became so dangerous that members were searched for arms before being allowed on the floor. Politicians of both the right and left were assassinated. In a July session, Calvo Satelo, a finance minister under Primo de Rivera, called for military action against the government. He was assassinated that same night.(7)

The Civil War officially began on July 17, 1936, when conservative elements of the army, moved by the assassination of Satelo, announced their intention to overthrow the republic. In the early days of the struggle Spanish Africa, plus major centers in southern and western Spain fell to the "rebel", (Nationalist) forces, while much of the countryside, Madrid and northeastern and southeastern Spain, remained under the control of the "loyalists" (Republicans). Salamanca in west-central Spain, 100 miles northwest of Madrid, has been nationalist territory from the beginning. And it was here on September 29 that General Franco was accepted as Head of State by the military junta then controlling the National Forces. Franco was installed in this role on October 1 in Burgos.(8) The October 13th celebration was the first significant public event to occur after his being named as Head of State.

This celebration was held in the main Lecture Hall of the university. Constructed in the fifteenth century, the walls of this hall were hung with impressive tapestries. The band played hymns as the sunlight streamed through ancient windows on to a raised red carpeted platform which contained ten wooden benches for the leading figures of the university plus seven high-backed chairs occupied by Rector Unamuno, who was to preside, Senora Carmen de Franco, representing her husband, Dr. Pia Y. Daniel, the bishop of Salamanca, the Governor of the Province, General Jose Millan Astray, the principle speaker and other generals from the army.(9)

The exact size and composition of the audience is in doubt but there are good reasons for assuming that a majority in attendance were strongly committed to a nationalist view of the Civil War. Included in the audience were university personnel, townspeople, army officers, religious officials, and a delegation from the Fascist political group known as Falangists, who were easily identified by their blue shirts.

The scheduled main speaker, General Jose Millan Astray, was an unusual figure. Blind in one eye, lacking an arm, gaunt and bemedaled, he created almost a hypnotic impression in his public appearances as he called out his favorite cry of "Viva la Muerte" (Long live death). In his speech the general dwelt on the theme that at least half the citizens of Spain were criminals, that this was especially true of Catalonia and the Basque country and that these "cancers" would be removed by Spain's health giver, Fascism. The speech ended with a Nationalist chant which according to Alan Lloyd's description went as follows:

Spain, credit the Fascist leader in the audience.

Spain, cried the Fascist leader in the audience. One, roared the blue shirted Falangists. Spain, he repeated. Great, come the response. Spain, he persisted. Free, the audience clamored. As one, the blue shirts rose, right arms aloft and saluted a portrait of Franco on the wall. Franco, hailed the leader and they all chanted Franco! Franco! Franco! The rest of the audience rose uncomfortable, but one man, the presiding officer, Miguel Unamuno, remained motionless, seated.(10)\*\*

\*\*The first part of this chant is apparently from the Falangist Hymn which starts as follows:



*Cara al Sol (Face to the Sun)*

Face to the Sun, wearing the tunic  
Which yesterday you embroidered,  
Death will find me, if it calls me  
And I do not see you again.

Arise, battalions and conquer  
For Spain has begun to awake  
Spain-United! Spain-Great!  
Spain-Free! Spain-Arise!

There is a good probability that the events described to this point did happen in approximately the manner indicated but, as already suggested, there is some doubt that the confrontation which will now be described did occur.

To infer what may have happened one must have some knowledge of the position taken by Unamuno and other intellectuals with reference to the Republic and the Civil War. Most intellectuals had supported and participated in the founding of the Republic and most, including the great philosopher of the period, Jose Ortega Y Gasset, had strongly backed the Republic at the start of the Civil War. However, Republican atrocities and the increasing influence of the communists caused several of them to flee to foreign countries where they repudiated their original support. Unamuno took almost an opposite course. He was in Nationalist territory at the start of the war, and he offered limited support to them on the grounds of "civilization against tyranny." This support led to the Republican government to move to deprive him of his rectorship in August of 1936, but now, due to Nationalist atrocities and rhetoric, he was to take a different position.

Rector Unamuno as the person responsible for presiding over the meeting came to the podium at the close of the ceremony. Rather than adjourn the meeting he chose to speak from notes he had prepared while Astray was speaking. His initial comments served as an introduction and a justification.(11)

All of you are hanging on my words. You all know me, and are aware that I am unable to remain silent. At times to remain silent is to lie. For silence can be interpreted as acquiescence. I want to comment on the Speech of General Millan Astray. The rector moved quickly to dismiss the personal affront involved in the general's attack on Catalans and Basques. He said: Let us waive the personal affront implied by the sudden outburst of vituperation against Basques and Catalans in general. I was myself, of course, born in Bilbao. The bishop here, whether he likes it or not, is a Catalan from Barcelona.

Then he moved on to state his general philosophical objection to the scene he had witnessed:

Just now I heard a necrophilous and senseless cry—"Long Live Death." To me it sound the equivalent of 'Muera la vida' ('To death with life') and I, who have spent my life shaping paradoxes which have aroused the uncomprehending anger of others, I must tell you, as an expert authority, that his outlandish paradox is repellent to me.

Unamuno then moved to a dangerous direct attack on General Astray as a means of specifically illustrating his objection to the speech.

General Millan Astray is a cripple. Let it be said without any slighting undertones. He is a war invalid. So was Cervantes. Unfortunately, there are all too many cripples in Spain now, and soon there will be more if God does not come to our aid. It pains me that General Millan Astray should dictate the pattern of mass psychology. A cripple who lacks the spiritual greatness of Cervantes is wont to

: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal see ominous relief in causing mutilation around him. General Millan Astray would like to create Spain anew, a negative creation, in his own image and likeness. For that reason he wishes to see Spain crippled as he unwittingly made clear.

At this point the speech was interrupted either by Astray, his supporters or by both. Cries of "Long Live Death" and "Death to Intelligence" filled the Hall. When silence returned to the room, the poet-philosopher concluded his impromptu remarks with these words:

This is the temple of the intellect and I am its high priest. You are profaning its sacred precincts. I have always, whatever the prophet says, been a prophet in my own land. You will not convince. You will win because you possess more than enough brute force, but you will not convince because to convince means to persuade. And to persuade you would need what you lack: reason and right in the struggle. I consider it futile to exhort you to think of Spain. I have finished.

There was silence. Esteban Madruga, professor of Canon Law and Senora Franco arose and led the rector from the room.

And what was the impact, the effect of this speech? In the short run it was negative. Unamuno was placed under house arrest and died a few weeks later on December 31, 1936. The Nationalists ordered all "left wing" books burned in the interest of the public good. The Civil War went on until March of 1939, with both sides making Unamuno's prediction of untold "mutilations" and "all too many cripples" tragically accurate. And in the long run? How do we measure the impact of a wise man bravely speaking words of truth? How do we know what effect Unamuno had on his immediate audience and the audience beyond that knows of this incident? We may only hope that his words about reason and right ultimately persisting are correct. Perhaps they hold a message of importance for our current society.

The Lecture Hall at Salamanca contains lists of men who have brought honor to the university, but as Michener notes:

Today in the hall which his bravery consecrated there is no mention of Unamuno's name and surely no bust or portrait, but often visitors sit in silence, their eyes closed, thinking of this courageous man of his poem to Salamanca.

'Forest of stone that history tore  
from the bowels of mother earth  
Refuse of quietude, I bless thee  
My Salamanca

In the depths of my heart I cherish  
thy robust spirit; when I shall die  
cherish thou, my golden Salamanca,  
My memory.'(12)

(1) Robert Coldston, *The Civil War in Spain*, (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1966), p. 118.

(2) Alan Lloyd, *Franco*, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969), p. 139.

(3) James Michener, *Iberia, Spanish Travels and Reflections*, (Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawalt Publications, Inc., 1969), p. 539.

(4) Anthony Kerrigan, *The American Peoples Encyclopedia*, 18 (New York Grallieu, Inc., 1962).

(5) Stephen Gilman, *Collier's Encyclopedia*, (New York: Crowell-Collier Educational Company, 1970).



(6)Larry Collins and Dominique La Pierra, *Or I'll Dress You in Mourning*, (New York: Signet Books, 1969), p. 62.

(7)James Clough, *Image of Spain*, (London: Harrap and Company, 1961), p. 112.

(8)Hugh Thomas, *The Spanish Civil War*, (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1965).

(9)The description of the physical setting is based on the works of Coldston, Lloyd, and Michener, already cited and writer's own visit to the university.

(10)Lloyd, *op. cit.*

(11)No text of speech exists. My efforts to examine the "notes on a piece of paper which has come down to us" were unsuccessful. The excerpts which follow are primarily based on the version which appears in Michener, which is apparently taken from the published account given by Luis Portillo.

(12)Michener, *op. cit.*

## COMMUNICATION AS DIALOGICAL INTERPRETATION

Ronald C. Arnett

The process of interpretation allows the human to understand communicative happenings. When speaking with another in any communicative context, interpretation naturally occurs. In each communicative happening, a person needs to make sense of what he hears and perceives. The meaning of a message does not come to a person without his involvement in the interpretive process. If an individual perceives that the clouds appear dark and threatening, he will probably interpret the possibility of a storm occurring. A distraught friend or loved one may come to visit and one may immediately interpret a mood of depression. Nothing needs to be verbalized. The message radiates from the other's presence. The interpretation then gives direction to how one should deal with the visitor.

Interpretation is a common occurrence in the communication process. This natural happening, interpretation, is also referred to as the hermeneutic act. Making sense of communication is a hermeneutic act, in that communication only makes sense when the human interprets the messages he perceives. The aim of this article is to describe a particular form of the hermeneutic act, dialogical interpretation, which requires an intermingling of horizons of interpreter and any text. In this discussion of dialogical interpretation, the term text designates any message that one is attempting to interpret. Any communicative event in a small group, interpersonal conversation, organization, or public address can be viewed as a text. Throughout this article, text is equated with a communicative event. The task is to dialogically interpret or attempt to understand a communicative event or text.

### Horizons of Interpretation

Dialogical interpretation requires a meeting between text or communicative happening and interpreter. In this meeting, interpreter is not a subject addressing an object called text or communicative event; rather, the interpreter and the communicative happening are horizons that meet in the

Ronald C. Arnett is an Assistant Professor of Speech Communication, St. Cloud State University.



: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal  
dialogical situation. An horizon is a World of possibilities and implications that are particular to each interpreter and text or communicative event addressing the world. For example, the World of possibilities of a conversation with a friend can imply comradeship and joy. However, to attempt this conversation while another is speaking could imply boredom, inattention, or insensitivity. The horizon or World of possibilities changes as one's interpretive view or way of looking at a particular communication is altered. As one's interpretive view changes, the implications of what a particular conversation means is also altered.

The World of possibilities and implications constitutes an identity or horizon for each phenomenon. For instance, there are restrictions on the ways one can conceptualize a cube. To view a cube as a circle is to lose sight of the cube's horizon or World of possibilities. To interpret a text or communicative event, such as a prayer, as if interpreting a conversation between two brothers is to lose sight of the prayer's horizon and to engage in something other than interpretation of the communicative event of a prayer. An interpreter who views communicative happenings from an existential-phenomenological standpoint accepts another horizon or World of possibilities when he looks at events in a stimulus-response or behavioristic manner. Thus, all phenomena, including text or communicative happening and interpreter have horizons or Worlds of possibilities. Both the communicative situation or text and interpreter bring their horizons to the interpretive situation, which leads this exploration to view interpretation as the meeting of horizons in dialogue.

### Language as Ground for Dialogical Interpretation

To view text or communicative event and interpreter as horizons or Worlds of possibilities leads one to reject the traditional subject/object interpretive mode. Movement away from a subject/object view of interpretation is present in Martin Heidegger's understanding of language as the house of Being. Language is the common denominator of all life—everything speaks, in that it implies something else. Interpretation requires one to be sensitive to the speaking or implications of a phenomenon. Language is the gatherer of all possibilities; when the human takes up this *a priori* living happening, language, he makes present an already meaningful world. As Heidegger would refer to it, the speechless pre-given is revealed through language. Language is "...the collecting in one place the total history leading to things being the way they are...We need not add meaning to the World, for it with the power of language—expresses its meaning to us and through us..."(1) Language is an *a priori* living happening that collects possibilities for the human, who then lends his voice to the already meaningful. Both text or communicative happening and interpreter have an horizon or a World of possibilities which is embodied in language. Text or communicative event and interpreter and everything, according to Heidegger is a language event. Through language, Being discloses itself.

...something *is* only where the appropriate and therefore competent  
...something *is* only where the appropriate and therefore competent  
word names a thing as being, and so establishes the given being as  
a being...The being of anything that is resides in the word...  
Language is the house of Being.(2)

Language is the discloser of all possibilities, including Being itself. Thus, both communicative event and interpreter, which are language events in that their horizons or World of possibilities are revealed through language, can allow previously unnoticed possibilities to unfold. The basing of interpretation in the *a priori* project World of language leads to the rejection of the notions of subject addressing object in the hermeneutic act, while affirming the possibilities of the horizon of the communicative event. The human is not a subject that seeks to interpret an object called text or



communicative happening. An object does not speak, imply, or signify a meaning, but a language event does. Both text and interpreter imply something; each has its own horizon or World of possibilities. The human reveals language through his expression and the text reveals language through its expression. Interpretation is the bringing together of these two language events. Interpretation does not consist of a subject positing meaning on an object; interpretation is the meeting of two language events or Worlds of possibilities.

### Objective and Subjective Interpretation

Objective interpretation requires one to be a detached nonparticipating observer, who attempts to analyze a text or communicative event without being involved with the work. Objective interpretation contends that a true interpretation can be verified by other interpreters. One's own person should never influence an interpretation. However, a dialogical interpretation of a communicative happening necessarily involves the interpreter in the study. Michael Polanyi has pointed to the needed closeness of the researcher to his work as "indwelling."<sup>(3)</sup> One needs to involve himself in the text if he desires to explore its depths.

In 1927, Heisenberg expressed the principle of uncertainty mathematically. He declared that classical physics could not make accurate predictions in microphysics. One needs to possess simultaneous knowledge of velocity and position and the relationship between variables is such that the more precisely one attempts to measure one variable, the less precisely one can measure the other. One can choose what part of the whole one wishes to comprehend, but the whole itself cannot be grasped. The principle of uncertainty demonstrates that each attempt at measuring something makes it a new and unique event.<sup>(4)</sup> One can only deal with isolated parts and the sum of all the parts does not equal the totality of an event. The most significant epistemological implication of Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty is:

*... 'the fact that we cannot observe the course of nature without disturbing it.' ... The very attempt to observe a particle 'knocks it off its course,' and the more accurately we pin down its position, for example, the more unsure we are of the degree to which we have affected its momentum... in short there are no innocent bystanders; the act of observation is at the same time unavoidably an act of participation.<sup>(5)</sup>*

Heisenberg showed that maintaining a detached and objective attitude when exploring phenomena is an illusion. The principle of uncertainty proclaimed a poignant revelation to the scientific community—one cannot observe the course of any event without disturbing it.

Both Heidegger and Gadamer rejected the subject/object viewing of the world that suggests that one can stand outside his world and view it objectively; the human's being-in-the-world is situated and historical. One cannot separate himself from the world in order to view it objectively. What one observes is based on the historical moment of his looking.

*(The human's historicity) is the... fundamental structure of his 'being-in-the-world'. This structure shows most lucidly that 'world' is not the sum total of objectively given entities existing in and by themselves but rather the situational locus in which man finds himself embedded at any given time...(Man's) action is thus not a free projecting of possibilities but is conditioned and therefore limited by tradition, that is, by the remote origins of the individual and historical human situation.<sup>(6)</sup>*

The human is not free to be objective. Being-in-the-world makes it impossible to stand outside the world; and the historicalness of humanness makes an objective judgement that will stand for all time unfeasible.



: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal  
Martin Heidegger Heidegger also considered subjective interpretation as inadequate. In June 1938, Martin Heidegger gave a lecture entitled, "The Founding of the Modern Image of the World through Metaphysics"; in this presentation he articulated the limits of subjectivism.

The consequence of the (subjectivism) is that the human subject is seen as the ultimate reference point for the status of all that is seen... This syndrome Heidegger calls 'subjectivism' [*Subjektivität*].

Subjectivism is a broader term than subjectivity, for it means that the world is regarded as basically measured by man. In this view the world has meaning only with respect to man, whose task is to master the world.(7)

Subjectivism promotes an interpretation of the world that forgets the horizon of the communicative happening. Only man is important enough to possess and bestow meaning. Manipulation of what a communicative event implies is legitimized by subjectivistic thinking. As measurer of the world, the human ignores all but his own subjective horizon.(8) A subjectivistic view of the world contends that an individual should be able to posit his own personal meaning on any event. The person forgets that the communication under investigation also has an horizon or World of possibilities. In a subjectivistic interpretation, a person only sees what he seeks to discover. The varying implications of the communicative event's own horizon are ignored.

### Dialogue of Horizons

Objectivism emphasizes the communicative happening as *object*, by attempting to exclude the observer. Subjectivism stresses the *subject* by ignoring the horizon of the text or communicative event. Hans-Georg Gadamer offers an alternative to objective and subjective interpretation. Gadamer contends that a text always goes beyond one's subjective interpretation; and to talk about a text as a work in isolation is to take an abstract view of an object. The decisive point in interpretation for Gadamer is that neither the work nor the interpreter can stand outside of history. Both text and interpreter are involved in the interpretive process.(9)

Gadamer conceptualized a dialectic between text and interpreter. He supported this assertion by tracing the various understandings of human knowledge. He found that the ancient Greeks considered thinking to be a natural part of being. They did not limit thinking to their inner subjective understanding. They conceptualized a dialectic between themselves and what they were conscious of.

Knowledge was not something that they acquired as a possession but something in which they participated, allowing themselves to be directed and even possessed by their knowledge. In this way the Greeks achieved an approach to truth that went beyond the limitations of modern subject-object thinking rooted in subjectively certain knowledge.(10)

To participate with knowledge means that a person both influences and is influenced. This is also true for the dialogical interpretation; to interpret a communicative happening is to influence and to be influenced. Communicative event and interpreter affect one another. Dialogical interpretation occurs when the horizons of the communicative event and interpreter meet. Both the horizon of the communication being studied and the interpreter must be listened to and acknowledged. The intermingling of the horizons or World of possibilities of communicative happening and interpreter is the basis of dialogical interpretation.

Dialogical interpretation attempts to make present previously hidden possibilities. Paul Ricoeur in the article "Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics," emphasizes that the hermeneutic act discloses possibilities that were already present, but previously unnoticed. The communicative



event, like the interpreter, is a being-in-the-world, not separate from the world. This implies that the horizon or World of possibilities of the communication being studied is also present *in* the world. The possibilities and meaning of a communicative happening is ready to be uncovered or disclosed. The meaning of a communication does not reside in the depths of the speech or the recesses of the speaker's mind. Meaning is always present in front of the communicative event for all to potentially see, but it is not yet disclosed.(11)

To bring into view possibilities that are actually present, yet unseen, one must listen to both the communication under study and interpreter. Neither communicative happening nor interpreter are presuppositionless. They both bring horizons to the interpretive event that can open up possibilities. In any dialogue, both partners bring their horizons or Worlds of possibilities to the situation and each listens to the other. The meaning of the dialogical encounter emerges from "between" them. In the hermeneutic act, the interpretation emerges from the "between" of communicative happening and interpreter. In hermeneutic dialogue, the interpreter must listen to the communication. This requires one to adhere to Heidegger's etymological tracing in the early Greek language of the term *phenomenon*, which means "... that which reveals itself." (12) Just as a Biblical scholar grounded in hermeneutics must listen to the living word of God in Biblical text, an interpreter of a communicative event must allow the communicative happening to speak.

An example of the importance Heidegger placed on allowing phenomena to reveal themselves or speak was demonstrated in his rejoinder to Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of the Will to Power. Heidegger considered the Nietzschean view of knowledge as an expression of the Will to Power as offensive. One does not know an object, according to Heidegger, by conquering or subduing it, but by allowing it to speak or reveal itself as it is. Only by allowing the possibilities of a text to reveal themselves can one get a truthful interpretation of a work. Heidegger's etymological tracing of truth found that the Greek word for truth is *a-letheia*, which literally means revelation or unhiddenness. Truth is a possibility that discloses itself.(13)

Truthful interpretation means disclosing possibilities that were previously unseen. To disclose possibilities, the interpreter must listen to the communication with a listening that is limited and historically situated. The situatedness of each interpreter's horizon always results in seeing more and less in a communicative situation than may be actually present. Each interpretation is an intermingling of horizons, which gives birth to a newly constituted event. The interpreter must go beyond the communicative event in order to reveal unseen possibilities. The interpreter must also recognize that some concerns in the text or communicative situation will be left unexplored and/or interpreted beyond their original implications. Any interpretation always discloses and obscures the meaning of the text. Martin Heidegger's hermeneutic was based on the premise that interpretation both reveals and obscures the meaning of a text.

(Heidegger asks)...what the text did *not* say...He goes behind the text to ask what the author did not and could not say... An interpretation is not a simple return to the past but a *new* event of disclosure... Thus, every interpretation must do violence to the explicit formulations in the text. To refuse to go beyond the explicitness of the text is really a form of idolatry, as well as of historical naivete.(14)

Interpretation is not objectively discovering what the communication actually means, but a dialogue of the horizons of communication and interpreter that can open up previously unseen possibilities.



Merleau-Ponty also points to the happenings of dialogue in interpretation. Merleau-Ponty rejected both objective and subjective understandings of events. He conceptualized all happenings as occurring in a "phenomenal field" or context that is "ambiguous." He contended that ambiguity made it impossible to see where one event started and another stopped. All elements and happenings intermingle.(15) Dialogical interpretation rejects subjectivism for similar reasons. The horizons of the communication being studied and interpreter are so intermingled that objective or subjective interpretation is not even feasible. Both text and interpreter are intertwined in the phenomenal field of the interpretive process. The phenomenal field or context defines both communicative happenings and interpreter through their dependence on each other. A communicative event needs an interpreter to open its possibilities; and an interpreter needs the communication to broaden his own horizon. Without the interpreter, communication is a closed set of possibilities; and without the communication being studied, the interpreter is closed in upon his own horizons. The ambiguity within the phenomenal field points to the impossibility of determining where the horizon of communicative happening stops and the horizon of interpreter begins, which implies the necessary intermingling of horizons in a dialogical interpretation.

Merleau-Ponty contends that the interpreter always sees more and less than is in a communicative situation, due to the ambiguity of language.

Language like other cultural institutions, is often regarded as a tool or an instrument of thought. But then language is a tool which accomplishes far more and is far less logical than we might like it to be. It is full of ambiguity... Ultimately, language like culture, defeats any attempt to conceive it as a system capable of revealing genesis of its own meaning...(16)

Language is not an objective tool, nor is it constructed subjectively by the human. Language is ambiguous; it has a life or horizon of its own that can point to and imply a World of possibilities. But this World of possibilities cannot be categorized or totally grasped. The ambiguous nature of language is congruent with the idiological view of interpretation. The meeting of communicative event and interpreter allows more and/or less to be seen in the historical situation than was originally present in the communication.

Dialogical interpretation affirms the inevitability of the hermeneutic circle, communicative event and interpreter being mutually influential in the interpretive situation. However, the notion that the hermeneutic circle is a subjective event is rejected. Paul Ricoeur announced his displeasure that the hermeneutic circle is often conceived as a circle between two subjectives, interpreter and text or as a projection of the interpreter's subjective wishes. This understanding of the hermeneutic circle emphasizes empathy, psychologism and subjectivity.(17) The interpreter of this article views the problem of the hermeneutic circle in terms of two horizons, which are based in the *a priori* language World, meeting. From the "between" of this meeting emerges the interpretation.

...the reader understands himself before the text, before the world of the work. To understand before, in front of, a world is the contrary of projecting oneself and one's beliefs and prejudices; it is to let the work and its world enlarge the horizon of my own self-understanding...I say that interpretation is the process by which the disclosure of *new modes of being*...gives to the subject a new capacity of knowing himself...

In that way the hermeneutical circle is not denied, but it is displaced from a subjectivistic to an ontological level; the circle is between my way (or my mode) of being—beyond the knowledge which I may have of it—and the mode (or the way) of being disclosed by the text as the work's world.(18)



Dialogical interpretation does not deny the hermeneutic circle, but a subjective understanding of the circle is rejected. Dialogical interpretation is the meeting of two Worlds in language, which allows possibilities to be opened up "between" the text or communicative event and interpreter.

The author of this article views hermeneutics as "...the 'art of rendering indirect communications understandable,' which can only be explained by the dialogical 'model of participation in communication learned in interaction.'" (19) There can never be a final interpretation; each dialogical meeting will be different due to the historical and suppositional nature of communicative event and interpreter. In dialogical interpretation the security of objective knowledge and comfort of each man being the sole judge, (subjective knowledge), are rejected. In dialogical interpretation, both communicative event and interpreter are horizons or Worlds of possibilities that meet in the hermeneutic situation. The interpreter must be willing to risk himself by bringing his own horizon or World of possibilities to the interpretive situation while listening to the communication and being guided by it. Dialogical interpretation is the intermingling of two Worlds of possibilities in hopes of disclosing from the between of communicative happening and interpreter what may go unnoticed in everyday looking.

(1) Stanley Deetz, "Essays on Hermeneutics and Communication Research" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University, 1973), pp. 11-12

(2) Peter D. Hertz, trans., *On the Way to Language*, by Martin Heidegger (New York: Harper and Row Publisher, 1971), p. 63.

(3) Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967), p. 55.

(4) Floyd W. Matson, *The Broken Image: Man, Science and Society* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966), p. 125.

(5) Matson, pp. 124-125.

(6) Kurt F. Reinhardt, trans., *Major Problems in Contemporary European Philosophy*, by Ludwig Landgrebe (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1966), pp. 117-118.

(7) Richard Palmer, *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969), p. 144.

(8) Palmer, pp. 144-147.

(9) Palmer, pp. 162-164.

(10) Palmer, pp. 162-164.

(11) Paul Ricoeur, "Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics," *New Literary History*, VI (Autumn, 1974), p. 106.

(12) William Barrett, *Irrational Man: A Study of Existential Philosophy* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), p. 214.

(13) Barrett, pp. 214-215.

(14) Palmer, pp. 147-148.

(15) Albert Rabil, Jr., *Merleau-Ponty: Existentialist of the Social World*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 31.

(16) John O'Neil, *Perception, Expression, and History: The Social Phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty*, (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970), pp. 61-62.

(17) Ricoeur, p. 107.

(18) Ricoeur, pp. 107-108.

(19) Ed McLuskie, "Against a Science of Human Communication: The Role of Hermeneutics in Contributing Arguments from the Frankfurt School" (paper Presented at Central States Speech Convention, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, April, 1974), p. 11.

: Volume VII, 1980 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal

PROPERTY OF  
DR. CYNTHIA R. CARVER



**Speech Communication Program**  
**Division of Humanities**  
**University of Minnesota, Morris**  
**Morris, Minnesota 56267**

Cynthia Carver  
1214 Meadow Lane  
Onalaska, WI 54650

Nonprofit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
**Paid**  
Morris, MN.  
Permit No. 123  
Third Class