

: Volume IX, 1982 Speech Association of Minnesota Journal

*Speech Association
of
Minnesota*



Journal

Volume IX

1982

THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA JOURNAL

**Published by
The Speech Association of Minnesota**

1981-82

Volume IX

**Editor
Stephen T. Olsen
St. Olaf College**

Editorial Advisory Board

**Ronald Arnett
St. Cloud State University**

**Timothy Choy
Moorhead State University**

THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA JOURNAL

Volume IX

1982

CONTENTS

Editor's Page	i
<u>Ways That Argument May Be Applied In The Oral Interpretation Events</u> Kathleen H. Olsen	1
<u>In What Ways Is Argument Applied In The Non-prepared Speech Events?</u> James W. Pratt	12
<u>M. Tulli Ciceronis: In L. Catilinam Oratio Prima Habita in Senatu</u> Ansis V. Viksnins	21
<u>In Search Of An Aural Curriculum: A Starter Unit For Teaching Listening At The Secondary Level</u> Harvey Weiss	25
<u>A Dialogical Examination Of Conflict Assumptions</u> Ronald C. Arnett	31
<u>Communication Consulting: Some Practical Concerns</u> John Burtis	39
<u>Organizational Training: Some Distinctions</u> John Bourhis	43
<u>Speaking Societal Politics Instead Of Heavenly Politics From The Pulpit</u> Russell Hann	47
<u>Karl E. Mundt: Advocate For A Representative Government</u> Linda Snyder {1st place award--1982--Essays in Honor of Karl Mundt Competition--undergraduate division--sponsored by the University of South Dakota}	56

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. Contributions may be either (1) an article of 1000 to 4000 words, written in formal or 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/Theater policies, programs, and practices in secondary schools and colleges.

Two sets of articles in this year's Journal may be of particular interest to some of our readers. The first two articles (by Professors Olsen and Pratt) were originally presented at the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation sponsored by SCA and AFA at Alta, Utah. They are reprinted with permission of the Speech Communication Association. I asked these authors to share these articles with us because they are valuable for two different audiences. For the person beginning a career in the coaching of individual events, these articles provide insights by two nationally prominent coaches/judges about factors to be considered by students (and coaches) if they wish to successfully compete in interpretation and/or extemporaneous speaking. For the person interested in communication/argumentation theory, these articles remind us of the wholistic nature of our profession by focusing argumentation theory on two areas that traditionally are not associated with argumentation discussions--oral interpretation and non-prepared speech events. The second set of articles (by Professors Burtis and Bourhis) should be of interest to readers who have considered communications consulting as an avenue for expanding personal professional growth and/or income. The consulting program presented at the SAM Convention at Hibbing (1981) was so well attended and generated such interest that I invited the participants to share some of their ideas with our readership. These two articles are a response to that invitation.

A very special "thank you" goes to Timothy Choy and Ronald Arnett (the new editor of the Journal), for serving on the Editorial Advisory Board during the past two years. The Board has seen its function not so much as that of screening articles, but rather as helping authors get their ideas published to share with others. Our authors (and certainly I!) appreciate their support and fine work.

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. Articles submitted for publication in the 1983 Journal should be submitted by 1 March 1983. Send your article to: Ronald Arnett, Speech Communication Department, 215 Performing Arts Building, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301.

WAYS THAT ARGUMENT MAY BE APPLIED
in the
ORAL INTERPRETATION EVENTS

Kathleen H. Olsen *

The oral interpretation of literature evolved historically because there was no way to mass produce the thoughts of writers. It was assumed that literature was meant to be read aloud. Before the invention of the printing press oral reading was the only means an author had to publish thoughts. Wallace Bacon notes that "the power of the spoken word before the invention of printing was a times magical. To the medieval and early Renaissance mind, reason was the attribute that most clearly distinguished man from animal, and man's capacity to reason was best demonstrated through his power of speech." 1

Oral interpretation of literature is the "oldest of the speech arts (antedating the formal study of rhetoric; antedating the actor)." 2 Greek historians, for example, read their works aloud to audiences. Poets gathered together to hear each other's poems. Playwrights were heard almost solely at the great dramatic festivals, where their plays competed for prizes. Contests in the literary arts became an integral part of Greek games and festivals, where poets and playwrights recited their works and delighted listeners by their ability to make the written word come to life. For those who did this best, prizes were the reward. Today we are not as accustomed to listening to literature aloud. As a result, we miss what Henry James called the most rewarding test of literary excellence, the test by which literary forms are subjected to "close pressure" of oral performance. For it is under this pressure, James says, that literature gives out "its finest and most numerous secrets" 3

The tradition of the ancient Greek contests in the literary arts is still part of our contemporary times, however, insofar as literature is read in a competitive situation at forensics tournaments for high school and college competitors. It is this contemporary competitive format of oral interpretation which has given rise to the question: In what ways are the principles of argumentation applied in interpretation events?

Before answering the question directly, it is important to make a few overviews about what follows. This paper is not an attempt to deal with an in-depth analysis of the aesthetics of literature or of oral interpretation. Nor does it intend to negate in any way the aesthetic

* Kathleen Olsen is the Associate Director of Forensics at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. This article was originally presented by invitation in 1981 at Alta, Utah, for the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation sponsored by the Speech Communication Association and the American Forensic Association.

aspects of the oral interpretation events. Furthermore, this paper obviously does not cover all of the aspects of argumentation theory which might apply to oral interpretation of literature. What this paper is is a thought paper--an attempt to verbalize fundamental links or similarities which exist between argumentation theory and oral interpretation events within the parameters of competitive oral interpretation of literature.

The American Forensics Association recognizes four oral interpretation events for intercollegiate competition: prose interpretation (a selection or selections of prose material of literary merit, which may be drawn from more than one source); dramatic interpretation (a cutting from a play or plays of literary merit); and duo interpretation (a cutting [scene] from a play, humorous or serious, involving the portrayal of two characters presented by two individuals).

Success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to secure the decisions we want from others. Much of our significant purposeful activity--competitively or on a daily basis in our own personal lives--requires us to make decisions. While some persons make decisions by flipping a coin, the wise decision maker pursues other avenues (unless, of course, his task is to get the Super Bowl started). "Argumentation, the art and science of using primarily logical appeals to secure decisions,"⁴ is as relevant for the competitive oral interpreter as for the debater, or the persuasive speaker, or the extemporaneous competitor.

The principles of argumentation operate prior to, during, and after the presentation of the interpretation. The emphasis in application of these principles shifts, however. The interpreter used argumentation principles primarily prior to the actual presentation; the listener/critic uses them during and after the presentation to help with the decision making or ranking of competitors. Although the use of argumentation principles shifts, the principles themselves are active throughout the entire communication situation.

Four aspects of interpretation which relate to argumentation theory will be considered in this paper. They are:

1. The selection of material for interpretation;
2. Analysis of the material for interpretation (author's message, analysis of the selection, etc.);
3. Abridgement (cutting the selection to conform to time constraints); and
4. Audience analysis.

These four areas are relevant first to the competitor and then to the listener/critic as the communication situation evolves from the student's desire to compete in interpretation events, to finding a selection, to preparation of the selection, to practice, to the performance, to the ranking by the listener/critic on the final cumulative ranking sheet. The remainder of this paper deals with each of these four areas as they apply to the performer and the listener/critic.

SELECTION OF MATERIALS

"Sounds, words, movements, ideas, dreams, hopes are the bases of putting one's arguments together. They are gestures by which man seeks to convey to those around him the secrets that must otherwise die within him." 5 The function of speech and more broadly argument is to allow man to convey his ideas. Writing is often a preliminary to oral discourse--a way of trying to make the oral word more precise, more meaningful.

When the interpreter searches for a selection, the search is much the same as the debater seeking evidence to support the ideas for the affirmative or negative case. The interpreter has a theme or idea which he wishes to develop, to communicate; the debater has examined the issues in the proposition and seeks supporting material to build his case. The same process is undertaken by persuasive speakers seeking material by which they may move listeners toward a particular value or course of action. The key is the residual message which each communicator wishes to communicate. Just as debaters or persuasive speakers know there are certain authorities which support their positions, so too the interpreter knows that different authors have distinctive characteristics and viewpoints. So the interpreter will search for authors who have expressed the message he wishes to communicate.

The interpreter not only thinks about the theme to be developed, but also about how he wishes that theme to be developed: suspensefully? in a straight-forward manner? through the use of dialogue? through the use of narrative description? with the use of dialects? with one or more characters? The interpreter will seek out an author whose style comports with the message or the theme as well as with the devices which the interpreter desires to use (or can use effectively).

The next issue to be addressed concerning selecting material may not be as important for the competitive debater as the competitive interpreters, but it might be of nearly equal concern for the informative or persuasive speaker. Can the interpreter, as an individual performer, develop the theme in the manner presented by the author? This involves a consideration of such aspects as language choice, mood, and character development. In other words, is the author's style compatible with the interpreter's skill level? Does the interpreter have the skills to use the author's devices effectively in an oral communication situation? Essentially these questions address issues of a given performer's delivery skills. Because the interpreter is working with an existing piece of writing written by someone else, the aesthetic demands of timing, rate, rhythm, and pitch must be satisfied with absolute precision. The interpreter cannot simply read the concluding paragraph of a mystery or increase his words/minute rate by 150 like a debater running out of time. Those things could cause the entire selection to lose meaning and direction. So the interpretation events require more vocal precision.

Carroll Arnold in the Criticism of Oral Rhetoric presents the idea of the "unspoken contracts in speaking." He states that "to analyze and synthesize judgements about a rhetorical situation is to spell out a series of contractual terms under which rhetors function in order to alter the situation as they intend." The interpreter desires to communicate the selection to the listener/critic to create a change inside the body of the listener/critic. "By coming to speak [interp], each speaker [interpreter] announces that this particular audience in this particular situation holds a key to some fulfillment of his goals and desires." Listener/critics, says Arnold, know this and therefore "they watch their speakers [interpreters] closely, actively, sometimes defensively, emitting streams of 'Yes's' and 'No's' inside themselves as they listen." 6 Herbert A. Wichelns stated this idea a little differently when he wrote:

. . . Poetry always is free to fulfill its own law, but the writer of rhetorical discourse is, in a sense, perpetually in bondage to the occasion and the audience; and in that fact we find the line of cleavage between rhetoric and poetic. 7

Once the interpreter has committed to the competitive format, he has reduced the "cleavage" that Wichelns talks about and has placed himself in the same bondage to the occasion and audience as the writer of oral discourse. The interpreter is attempting to communicate someone else's work, but the interpreter has the greater risk in that the selection of the material will reflect on him and his person. The interpreter makes an "unspoken contract" with the audience in the same way the public speaker does. The material which has been selected for competition as well as the physical presence of the interpreter indicates the interpreter's desire to have a fulfillment of certain goals and desires. The interpreter would then be subject to Arnold's "compact" which follows:

For reasons of my own I have decided to stake some of my hopes on you and the judgements you form in this situation, at this time. I have chosen to speak [interpret]. . . time. I recognize you will insist that I adjust myself, my thoughts, and my purposes to the attitudes you already have. . . .

I concede that you shall be the judge of me, of whatever feelings I seem to express. I concede that the primary thing that will count between us is the satisfaction you can find in the relationship I evolve with you in the coming minutes. . . . I accept personal responsibility for all I say and do and for my ways, and I concede that you have a right to judge me as a person according to what you think of my sayings and doings.

We all know that I came here to manage you somewhat. I know that you grant me that privilege very tentatively. I recognize that you can, and have a right to, reject me at any moment of our relationship. To the extent that this makes me

uneasy, I ask you to make what allowances you can for ways in which my unease may affect what I say and do. . . . I shall try to give you some immediate rewards for allowing me to try to change you; but if I don't succeed in that, I know you will judge me the failure, not simply my ideas and strategies.

On these terms please let me try to change you.
I say 8

So the interpreter has the same "contractual" obligation to the listener/critic that the public speaker does and the listener/critic of oral interpretation has the responsibilities of the listener/critic in a public speaking situation.

Thus, when selecting material it is important to choose something which attempts to meet the following criteria:

1. Is the piece interesting to the individual interpreter and is it potentially interesting to others?
2. Does the interpreter have the skill and ability to use the author's devices effectively to create meaning?
3. Does the selection allow both the interpreter and the listener/critic to grow and expand both their skill and knowledge?

All of these aspects of material selection happen with the interpreter prior to the actual performance. When the interpreter stands up to present the oral interpretation, the listener/critic becomes involved in this same process of material selection. It is at this point that a shift takes place. The same questions and aspects that the performer considered now become the concerns and bases by which the listener/critic makes judgements on the performance.

ANALYSIS OF MATERIALS

When each side in debate is arguing the opposite position, we ask ourselves which we are to believe. Logically, we will believe the student who does the better job of presenting evidence to establish his position. Evidence is the raw material of argumentation. It consists of facts, opinions, and objects which are used to generate proof. The advocate brings together the raw materials and, by the process of reasoning, produces conclusions. The debater usually searches through a wide variety of resources for evidence--the building blocks of his message. Even though the interpreter has had another author initially put together the facts, opinions, and objects which are used to generate proof (a conclusion--a viewpoint about the world), the interpreter, too, must conduct an evidential search. The interpreter attempts to find information about the author of the selection, the author's credibility, the piece's social and intellectual milieu, and the accuracy of the author's use of evidence to justify the conclusions which are drawn within the work.

The interpreter looks at the work to determine "the available means of persuasion" which exist within the work itself. This is done by asking questions about the directness of the discourse. The interpreter begins to test the "evidence" found in the discourse in order to test the credibility of the author's ideas and his perceptions of those ideas. Since the interpreter in the purest sense is advancing an argument--that the selection he has chosen and his interpretation of it is correct--the interpreter may ask the following questions which are similar to those asked by anyone advancing an argument: 9

1. Is there enough evidence in the story to justify the conclusions it draws or asks the audience to draw?
2. Is the evidence (the theme and/or idea of the selection) clearly expressed?
3. Are the ideas consistent with other known evidence (images, metaphors, the social and intellectual milieu, etc.)?
4. Is the story consistent within itself?
5. Is the author competent to write on this subject?
6. How does it fit its purported social milieu?
7. Is the source [author] acceptable to the audience?
8. Does the selection have literary merit?
9. Is the material suited to the competitive format?
10. Is the material suited to the listener/critics who will listen and make judgements about it?

The interpreter, however, goes one step further. The interpreter also examines the selection and analyzes the places which need rate and inflection changes, develops the thought groups of the author, and tries to get "into" the author's thought process. Although the debater and other types of public speakers do this, too, it is somewhat easier for them to get "into" the thoughts of the author since they themselves are the primary authors of their own arguments. The interpreter must work harder in this area to make his argument regarding the selection for oral interpretation come through to the audience.

The listener/critic will mentally run through the same questions--again a shift in the application of the principles of argumentation takes place. While the analysis-of-material considerations were the focus of the interpreter prior to the presentation, they become the focus and the judging criteria of the listener/critic during and after the presentation. These questions help form the bases, in the competitive format, for determining who has done the better job of oral interpretation in that round when it becomes time to rank the competitors.

ABRIDGEMENT

Sometimes the length of a story, poem, or play precludes its being read in its entirety. For example, the American Forensics Association time limits allow a maximum of ten minutes for each of the four interpretation events (the ten minute limit includes the presentation of an introduction, transitional materials, and, of course, the actual

reading of the program itself). If the interpreter wishes to use an abridgement, the focal point of the story must be found, the point without which the narrative would not achieve its purpose. This is similar to the selection of issues used to build a debate case. The brief is an outline of the issues and supporting materials selected and arranged to support a particular position. Since an affirmative or negative team cannot use ALL the evidence they have on a given year's topic, they select issues and evidence while still trying to create a whole prima facie case with the constraints of the time (usually 8-3-5). They cannot use an entire Presidential Commission Report, they pick and choose the best supporting materials for their use, materials which help build the strongest case. In a similar process, the interpreter who needs to abridge a selection chooses to keep those elements which keep the focus of the story. Any details not relevant to the climactic unit should be cut. Sometimes this may include sub-plots, minor characters, or a condensing of background or descriptive material. The important consideration is to have a prima facie selection--one which provides good and sufficient reason for listening to the selection and which provides credibility for the story as it progresses.

The elimination of parts of a selection should not distort or twist the theme of a selection. An example of this occurred in a mystery story I once heard read. The reader choose to cut several of the clues which were needed to come up with the correct solution to the case. The leaps of faith the listener/critics were asked to make subsequently were too great, the story lacked logical sufficiency to be accepted, and the audience felt cheated because they did not have the crucial information to "solve" the case, information that the story's detective had. The distortion or misrepresentation of material has become such a problem to some people and groups that author Neil Simon and the O'Neill Foundation will not allow their works to be performed or used in any abridged manner. All of O'Neill's and Simon's works must be performed in their entirety. 10

The burden of proof in oral interpretation events lies with the reader and stays with the reader. The interpreter is taking the risk of presenting the selection as well as of supporting his position's logic and reasonableness. The interpreter is asking the listener/critic to concur that the decisions of selecting the materials, analyzing the materials, and abridging the materials were made correctly. In much the way that an affirmative or negative debater asks for a decision in a debate, the interpreter asks that his position [residual message] and his views on it be accepted by the listener/critic. The reader also holds presumption at the start of the reading. Presumption favors the reader in that the value at the time the selection starts is set forth by the interpreter based on the author and the material chosen. Presumption, however, can shift to the listener/critic if the listener/critic perceives that the values which are set forth in the introduction and/or the material itself are not being met. In the competitive round, the final determination of the logical sufficiency of the abridgements made rests with the listener/critic.

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS

It is the task of an advocate to discover the preferences, wants, or beliefs of the particular audience that will render the decision. All public speaking texts and argumentation and debate texts devote some space to the process of a speaker analyzing the intended audience. In their 1977 Quarterly Journal of Speech article, "Reader, Text, Audience: Oral Interpretation and Cognitive Tuning," Kaplan and Mohrmann provide evidence that the same process holds true for an interpreter. They state, ". . . readers who anticipated that the audience was thoroughly familiar with the literature formed a more detailed and complex impression of the materials," and, importantly, "perceptual differences start to arise at the very outset, the expectation of performance shapes the initial impression of the literature." 11 Wallace Bacon expands on this idea when he states, "The audience enters into communion with the reader; each moves toward the central concern which is embodied in the text. In communion, communication occurs." 12 This is also part of Arnold's "unspoken contract" which the reader and the listener/critic enter into. The contract affects both parties. Accurate audience analysis helps the reader get his message through to his listeners. In addition, accurate audience analysis is important because any speaker or interpreter knows that the degree and quality of response from an audience affects the performance. It may assist, it may interfere, it may augment, it may reduce.

The first verbal outcome of audience analysis is the introduction of the selection(s) to be read. The introduction to the oral interpretation selection serves the same function as an introduction in any speaking situation. It is the first view the listener/critic gets of the reader. The primacy effect is as important here as in any other form of communication. In an introduction the debater states the affirmative or negative rationale, states the proposition exactly, defines terms when needed, and then forecasts the subsequent speech structure. The oral interpreter follows the same pattern. The interpreter states the reasons for selection the story, poem, or play; states the title and author's name; creates a reason for the listener/critic to listen and to look forward to the reading; and sets a tone which prepares the listener for the selection. Defensive, apologetic, condescending, didactic, dogmatic introductions may alienate an audience and deny the writer any chance to be heard. A good introduction for an interpretation event, a public speaking event, or a debate puts the listener in the proper frame of mind so that the position/arguments/thesis of the message to follow may be favorably advanced.

It is important for the interpreter to realize that successful communication with the audience depends on the audience's ability to relate to the selection, to the ideas presented, and to the interpreter himself. If an audience has no common ground with what is happening in the selection it will be difficult, no matter how technically well done, to do well in a competitive round. The interpreter and the debater both need to demonstrate a sharing of ideas, interests, and beliefs with an audience. Both need to indicate a willingness to be

friendly and to share in an attempt to expand the audience's views while attempting to argue their particular positions.

The interpreter also needs to take stock of how he will be perceived while reading the selection. A distinguished physical appearance is an obvious asset to both the speaker and the interpreter. It will provide fewer distractions, fewer reasons for the listener/critic's mind to wander to other things. I once judged a final round of an interpretation event which had a young man so gaudily attired that all three judges could not remember after the round anything about his selection--the sartorial splendor had worked against his real purpose.

An important question which the reader should ask is "does the material embarrass him to read in front of anyone?" If one is attacking racial, ethnic, or religious groups and the listener/critic turns out to be in that group, could the interpreter still present the interpretation without feeling self-conscious and without destroying the message of the selection? Not all the judges who judge at tournaments are like that interpreter's specific coach. Judges come from different backgrounds and as such have different values and beliefs. The judges may be currently active forensics coaches, former competitors, high school teachers, or the person off the street. Not all the judges who judge interpretation events are interpretation specialists. A well done oral interpretation which establishes common ground, was selected well, was abridged well, analyzed well, and presented well will reach its particular listener/critic in the same way that the well developed argument has impact on its own particular listener/critic.

Oral communication is by its nature audience centered. Anybody engaging in an oral communication situation needs to acknowledge the audience. It is again the listener/critic who must ultimately decide if he has been moved by the communicator. For example, if the presentation was intended to be a painful experience for the listener, was there a sensory awareness on an affective level which created the sense of pain or the need to help, to move to action, or to do what ever the debater, public speaker, or interpreter intended?

Argumentation theory does play a role in the oral interpretation events at a competitive level. In addition to the considerations already raised, there is one final dimension of argumentation theory which plays a role in the oral interpretation events as in all human communication situations. It is what Richard Whately in the Elements of Rhetoric called "deference." Whately defines deference as:

The person, Body or book, in favour of whose decisions there is a certain Presumption, is said to have, so far "Authority"; in the strict sense of the word. Any recognition of this kind of Authority, --an habitual Presumption in favour of such a one's decisions or opinions--is usually called "Deference."

Whately goes on to state that "deference is apt to depend on feelings;

often, on whimsical and unaccountable feelings." 13 For the communicator--interpreter, public speaker, or debater--when the time comes for the listener/critic to make the final judgement, deference may play a role. It may be that for the judge at that particular time, in that particular round, everything just clicked with one of the contestants: the poise and confidence was there; the selection or material hit home and was related well to that listener/critic; the vocal quality the listener/critic hears was right; the timing perfect; etc. The next time the same listener/critic hears the same program, there may not be the same electrifying effect. Deference, based on feelings--often whimsical and unaccountable feelings--was happening. Argumentation is the art of using primarily logical proofs to secure decisions. As we strive to make logical appeals and to obtain logical decisions, deference does and will enter into the decision by those who try to make wise decisions.

CONCLUSION

When the assignment for this paper first came, I looked through some college textbooks which are currently used to teach argumentation and debate and some others which are used to teach oral interpretation of literature. I was struck by the number of similarities in their respective "Table of Contents." Chapter headings such as the following are common:

Analyzing the Problem	--	Analyzing the Literature
Structure of the Case	--	Structure of the Short Story/Poem/Play
Speaker as Person	--	Interpreter as Person
Evaluation of Debate	--	Criticism of Performance

I thought at first that it was just the conservative nature of the textbook companies seeking to discourage too much creativeness in communication textbook chapter titles. By preparing this paper, however, I have concluded that the theories of oral interpretation and argumentation do, in fact, have more than superficial commonality.

Oral interpretation is the study of literature through the medium of oral performance. Competitive oral interpretation is an activity with long historical roots which continues today at forensics tournaments across the country. The interpreter can find effective guidelines for improving his effectiveness as a communicator in the theory and practices of argumentation, just as the persuasive communicator can find insight in interpretation theory. These are not two independent, unrelated fields of communication. The theory of argumentation and the theory of oral interpretation have had, and will continue to have, a symbiotic relationship.

ENDNOTES

1. Wallace A. Bacon, The Art of Interpretation, 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), p. 5.

2. Ibid.

3. Henry James, The Golden Bowl (New York: Kelly (Augusta M.), 1909), preface.

4. Austin J. Freeley, Argumentation and Debate: Rational Decision Making, 3rd ed. (Belmont, Cal: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1971), p. 2.

5. Bacon, p. 3.

6. Carroll C. Arnold, Criticism of Oral Rhetoric (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974), pp. 38-39.

7. Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans (New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1962), p. 212.

8. Arnold, pp. 42-43.

9. These questions are adapted from Chapter Seven, "The Tests of Evidence," in Freeley, pp. 95-111. Although the end result of asking the questions remains the same, I have inserted interpretation terminology for purposes of illustration.

10. The Samuel French Basic Catalogue of Plays, 1980. After all Neil Simon plays there was a statement added in the 1980 Catalogue requiring that the plays must be performed in their entirety. The O'Neill Foundation, which approves performances of that author's works, will not allow abridgments of his works, either.

11. Stuart J. Kaplan and G. P. Mohrmann, "Reader, Text, Audience: Oral Interpretation and Cognitive Tuning," Quarterly Journal of Speech 63 (1977): 59-65.

12. Bacon, p. 500.

13. Richard Whately, Elements of Rhetoric: Comprising an Analysis of the Laws of Moral Evidence and of Persuasion, with Rules for Argumentative Composition and Elocution, ed. Douglas Ehninger (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963), pp. 118, 120.

**IN WHAT WAYS IS ARGUMENT APPLIED
IN THE NON-PREPARED SPEECH EVENTS?**

James W. Pratt *

In 1974, the National Developmental Conference on Forensics concentrated on debate as argumentation. But it is quite clear that argument is also applied in the individual speech events. The distinction which Daniel O'Keefe has drawn between making arguments and having arguments is a central difference between the application of argument in debate and in the individual events. 1 Wayne Brockriede makes this distinction as argument, a product made, and arguing, a process engaged in. 2 Contestants in individual events make arguments--they advance claims which they support, they seek adherence from their audiences by reason-giving--as do debaters; they do not, however, have arguments with an opposing team, and this absence of clash means that they do not attack, refute, or rebuild. Individual events contestants make a different type of implicit competitive claim in a round than do debaters: not "My partner and I ought to win this round because we did the better job of debating," but "I ought to be ranked first in this round because my speech was better than those of the other contestants."

The 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics agreed upon a definition of argumentation as "the study of reason giving by people as justification for acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values." They agreed that forensics education is education in the comparative communication of arguments, and that forensics activities are laboratory experiences for helping students to understand and communicate various forms of argument more effectively in a variety of contexts with a variety of audiences. 3 In their discussion of an audience-centered theory of argumentation, Richard Rieke and Malcolm Sillars say that argumentation is "the process of advancing, supporting, and criticizing claims"; they emphasize the importance of the use of analysis and support in leading the audience to grant adherence to the speaker's claims. 4

I will be using these definitions as I examine how argument is applied in the non-prepared speech events. The two events in this category (of the ten competitive events offered at the American Forensic Association's National Individual Events Tournament) are

* James W. Pratt is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at the University of Wisconsin--River Falls. The original version of this article, which was presented at the SCA - AFA Conference on Argumentation, Alta, Utah, dealt with argument in both extemporaneous and impromptu speaking. Readers interested in Professor Pratt's comments about impromptu speaking may receive a copy of the original paper by writing to him at U.W.--River Falls, River Falls, Wis. 55809.

Extemporaneous Speaking and Impromptu Speaking. To call these two events "non-prepared" is, of course, a bit of an overstatement. A more accurate term would be "limited-preparation" events. In Extemporaneous Speaking, the contestant chooses one of three topics, then has thirty minutes in which to prepare a seven-minute speech on that topic. Most contestants have, of course, been preparing for this speech throughout the academic year: reading newsmagazines, assembling resource files, and competing at other tournaments. Even the specific topics are probably not much of a surprise to contestants who have qualified for the NIET: contestants know that the topics will be expressed as questions about current events, and most contestants would probably do quite well if they were asked to predict the 108 topic-questions to be used in the NIET. (A question which does come as a genuine surprise is likely to be criticized as unfair, trivial, or obscure; and, unless three such questions are offered to a single contestant, such a question is not likely to be chosen.) The contestant in impromptu speaking has no choice of topic but does have some preparation time--often as much as three minutes. Although it is expected that the specific topic will be a surprise to each contestant, some limits are predictable: the topics will be "of a proverb nature," so students can expect a pithy, familiar statement which expresses a well-known "truth" or fact; the topic will not be a question to be answered but will be a statement which the student may analyze in a variety of ways. The term "non-prepared" speech events does not, then, mean literally non-prepared; rather it distinguishes this category of events from the "prepared" events in which speeches--and arguments--are written, practiced, polished, revised, often memorized well in advance of the contest presentation.

Students in individual events do not, as a principle goal, seek actual adherence from their immediate, relevant audience--the critic/judge--any more than do debaters. If they do gain adherence from the judge, so much the better; but we expect judges to maintain an objective attitude of evaluation of students' skill and ability in making arguments, not a judgment of their success or failure in gaining a judge's personal adherence to their claims. I am often persuaded by speeches I hear in debate and individual events competition, but I try to set aside my personal reaction as I make a judgment about the student's skill and ability in argumentation. Although I decided very early in the debate season a few years ago that I never wanted to drive a car equipped with air bags, I often voted for debate teams who argued that I ought to be forced to do just that--because they did a better job of arguing for their position in that round than did their opponents. Even though I continue to drink a great deal of coffee (which may be a dangerous admission to make while I'm in Utah) and recognize my own rationalizing, I gave a high rank to the orator who warned me of the danger of that practice and urged me to cut back on my caffeine consumption: even though she didn't change my behavior, she did a good job of constructing arguments and of supporting her claims. And although I may personally have no faith in the ability of economists to predict anything, I will judge an extemporaneous speaker who uses predictions of Walter Heller or Milton Friedman as support for claims with the acknowledgement that many people find such sources credible.

Within this context, I will turn to an examination of the application of argument in the non-prepared speech events, using tape recordings of the final round of Extemporaneous Speaking at the 1981 National Individual Events Tournament as the illustrative data base. 5 In the final rounds of Extemporaneous and Impromptu Speaking at Baltimore, the rankings of the five judges were quite varied: only one of the twelve contestants had a range of rankings as narrow as three (3-5); seven contestants had ranges of four (1-4 or 2-5); and four contestants had full ranges of five (1-5). Such an outcome is not unusual in the final round of a national tournament, presumably because all contestants in such rounds are very good and judges must differentiate rankings on very fine distinctions. I assume that each contestant in each of those two final rounds was making the implicit claim, "I ought to be ranked first in this round"; more than half of the contestants gained adherence to that claim from at least one of their judges. I will try not to assume the role of a judge, though, in my examination of these speeches; I will focus on the descriptive question, "In what ways is argument applied?" What evaluations I do make will fall within that descriptive focus.

In the Extemporaneous Speaking final round, all four topic-questions required judgmental answers. And, like good debate topics, the topic-questions were reasonably balanced so that a persuasive case could be built for divergent answers. Three of the questions were projective, requiring answers about events in the future (Can terrorism be stopped? How likely is Soviet intervention in Poland? What benefits can be derived by the U.S. in El Salvador?). The fourth question required a causal judgment about a past event (What caused the split in Britain's Labor Party?). In each of the four speeches, the speaker gave a clearly identifiable answer to the topic-question, and that answer became the central claim in the speaker's argument. Beneath that central claim, each speaker organized subordinate claims, supporting them with data of various sorts; and once those subordinate claims were established to the presumed satisfaction of the audience, they served as data for the central claim. The notorious "three points of analysis," the stereotypical organizational pattern for extemporaneous speeches, appeared in only one of the speeches; the other three speeches were organized under two main headings, with substructure. All four speeches were introduced with relevant quotations (W. S. Auden, Ernest Hemmingway, Jeff McNally, Winston Churchill) which were used to lead into the statement of the topic-question; the topic-question was stated at times ranging from :22 to 1:30.

Speaker #3 (Speakers #1 and #2 were not recorded) included a statement of significance in his introduction, and he answered his topic question ("Can terrorism be stopped?") in the concluding sentence of his speech ("No"). Saying that the desire for the action and the ability to execute it are fundamental to all human actions he posed two sub-questions: "Can we eliminate the motive for terrorism' ability to do that action?" Using one example, the Baader-Meinhof gang, he concluded that the motives of discontent with society are so varied that they are impossible to eliminate. The speaker subdivided his second

sub-question again into two parts. Because, he said, "power is derived from two sources," can we eliminate (1) the terrorists' ability to organize similar malcontents, and (2) the terrorists' ability to obtain weapons? Describing the limited ability of counterintelligence agencies to infiltrate and control terrorism, he concluded that counterintelligence can only curtail, not stop terrorism. He commented that the restructuring of the FBI and CIA, which restrained their counterintelligence activities, was "not all bad," because their previous activities--opening mail, breaking and entering--were "as harmful as terrorism." He concluded, "A society which is a police state is not a society worth protecting from terrorism." The speaker posed "a number of problems" under his second sub-point (ability to obtain weapons). Using two examples (Baader-Meinhof and Soviet Marxism), he said that "a number of governments have beliefs in supporting terrorists groups which agree with them." The speaker argued that we ought to interest terrorists in sophisticated weapons because they are less effective than the "homemade weapons--bombs, gas, booby traps--which are always available" and because the homemade weapons are more destructive than the sophisticated weapons; he used a hypothetical example of chlorine gas in the World Trade Center to illustrate his point. Concluding that we "can't take away their motives or their weapons," the speaker posed a final historical analogy as the answer to the question:

In the 1870's, in Czarist Russia, terrorism was rampant but reform was being implemented. The third section of the secret police had successfully infiltrated many terrorist groups. A young man, a chemist, tried to use a homemade bomb (because there was gun control in Russia) on Czar Alexander III; he was hanged and executed. Effective methods to eliminate motives and weapons of terrorism were used in Czarist Russia. A man in the audience--his younger brother--saw the hanging and changed his name--to Lenin.

The conclusion: no matter what is done, terrorism will never be stopped.

The data used to establish the speaker's claims included example, hypothetical example, analogy, and assertion. Curiously, the speaker included no source citation in his speech, with the initial exception of his quotation from W. H. Auden. Surely the speech displays the characteristics of argument; whether the arguments are good or bad--whether they would gain adherence from the audience--is another question. Although I may be willing (personally, but not as a judge) to accept the asserted arguments because they coincide with some of my own beliefs and values, others with different values may not. The speaker's assertion about the equal harm of the FBI's opening mail and terrorism, his implication that therefore the United States was a police state, and his conclusion that a police state is not worth protection from terrorism fall into this category, as does his assertion that homemade weapons are more effective than are sophisticated weapons. His concluding historical analogy might not be accepted by audience members who saw more differences than similarities. The logical structure of the speech is clear and tight; the sub-claims, once they are

accepted by the audience, serve as sound data for the central claim.

Speaker #4 included a significance statement in his introduction and used a definitional distinction for his organizational structure. ("How likely is Soviet intervention in Poland? The answer depends on how you define intervention. Non-military intervention is likely and is going on now. In military intervention, the USSR has a small military presence now, but the possibility of a full-scale invasion is small.") The speaker supported each of these claims with example and testimony, extensively documented from recent and varied sources. Under non-military intervention, he used the example of United States involvement in Iran and applied the example, by analogy, to the Soviet Union in Poland. Quoting the Economist, the Baltimore News-American, and the Christian Science Monitor he described instances of Soviet non-military intervention in Poland and concluded, "Overall, it's obvious that non-military intervention has been important in the Poland crisis and will continue to be." Under military intervention, he quoted Casper Weinberger, the Chicago Sun Times, and the Christian Science Monitor to describe the existing Soviet military presence in Poland and to explain three reasons why the Soviet Union would not want to increase its military involvement in Poland. He concluded, "Overall, the possibility of a large-scale military intervention is small." The speaker's final statement referred to the introductory McNally quotation which restated his central claim.

The speaker used example, analogy, and testimony as data to support his claims. His example of United States involvement in Iran was his only undocumented evidence. His citation of credible sources and their recency (usually identified as "this week" or "last week") increased the likelihood of audience adherence. The arguments were clearly structured and subordinated; the two sub-claims, once accepted by the audience, constituted the central claim.

The topic-question which Speaker #5 chose required him to identify benefits to be derived by the United States in El Salvador; after a brief introduction, he organized his speech into "two possible areas of benefit: the military arena and the international diplomatic spectrum." He then presented a chronological orientation to the question: "to understand the U.S. role in El Salvador, we must look at the past, the present, and the future. Quoting two recent issues of Forbes, he described the past and the present; he quoted a Washington Post article which outlined three future options for the United States in El Salvador. He placed these options under his two initial headings (military and diplomatic) and quoted articles in two issues of the Christian Science Monitor and the Economist to describe advantages and disadvantages of exercising the options. Using the examples of Cuba in 1957 and Nicaragua in 1977, he challenged the analogy of those events to El Salvador. He asserted that "the largest benefit to the U.S. is diplomatic," and he described the messages we would communicate to "our enemies, our allies, and someone I don't know how to classify (Mexico, usually an ally, but an enemy on El Salvador)." He summarized the benefits he had claimed, and referred to his introductory Hemmingway quotation to restate his central claim.

This speaker used a more complex organizational structure in his speech, but the points were logically related and his analysis was easy to follow. He used a full range of supporting data for his claims. He documented data quite fully, and the assertions which he made seemed justified by prior analysis. Surely given the controversial nature of United States involvement in El Salvador, a speaker might reasonably expect to encounter judges whose personal views on the issue differ widely. The topic-question, too, was more loaded than were the others: it required the speaker to identify "benefits" which the United States may derive in El Salvador when a case might well be built to support the claim that the United States should not even be in El Salvador, let alone derive any benefits from being there. This may be a situation in which the (presumed-to-be-objective) judge says, "You've not gained my adherence, but I wouldn't expect you to; you've still made a good argument."

Speaker #6 had the longest introduction (1:30) and an overt significance statement. She said that her topic-question ("What caused the split in Britain's Labor Party?") could be answered "in two words: voter sentiment." She organized her speech under three headings: a theory of political parties, how that theory manifested itself in voter sentiment in Great Britain, and how the theory filtered up through party politics and caused the split in the Labor Party. Crediting the theory to Roy Adams of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, she used examples (the United States, El Salvador, and Italy) to describe how parties emerge in countries with moderate to multiple ideologies. On her second point, she quoted the Christian Science Monitor to describe how the theory was manifested in Great Britain. Finally, she quoted the Economist to describe how changing voter sentiment caused the split in the Labor Party. Concluding, she restated her central claim with a quotation from the Financial Times of London and a statement by Shirley Williams of the Social Democratic Party.

The speaker chose a clear and logically appealing organizational structure (theory/application) which was appropriate to the causal arguments which she made. She used a range of supporting data and quoted from credible sources. One problem with her source citation was that she regularly identified a source immediately after stating her main point; it was impossible to tell when (if ever) the quoted or attributed material ended until the next main point and source citation appeared. The specifically-quoted material was apt, however; and the concluding Shirley Williams quotation concisely embodied the speaker's central claim and illuminated the theory which she applied. Causal arguments are usually difficult ones to establish, especially when one seeks to claim the cause for complex social behavior. This speaker made some wise strategic argumentative decisions, given the difficulty of the task: she chose a global theory of political behavior from a presumably competent source (after all, whoever he may be, we know he's from the University of Wisconsin-Madison) and applied that theory in a quite broad fashion. Her initial answer to the topic-question, that the split was caused by "voter sentiment," was also quite safe, but not very helpful until we heard further analysis, since any political event

which requires votes is caused by voter sentiment. The argumentative task was also more difficult because this topic dealt with past, rather than future events: just as incumbents must run on their records while challengers may freely make promises, so a speaker may persuasively speculate about future events but will be more restricted in analyzing past events.

The four extemporaneous speakers followed a consistent pattern of argument: they made central claims to answer the topic-questions of their speeches; they organized their speeches into a series of subordinate claims which, when established by the data they offered were intended to function as data for the central claims. They offered evidence to support claims which met the standards of the Extemporaneous Speaking event, although one of the speakers did not cite sources for his evidence. The impromptu speeches display similar patterns of argument. They differ somewhat, though, because of the different type of topic (a statement to which the speaker is to react rather than a question which the speaker is to answer) and because of the much more limited preparation time. The judging standards which relate to the arguments made are consequently different. The extemporaneous speaker is expected to meet higher standards of clear, logical organization of arguments than is the impromptu speaker who has organized arguments very quickly. The extemporaneous speaker has access to outside sources as support for the claims and is expected to use such sources; the impromptu speaker must rely on personal knowledge, experience, and logical speculation. Data accepted by judges to support claims made by impromptu speakers might well be judged to be inadequate to support a similar claim made by an extemporaneous speaker.

[At this point in the original presentation, Professor Pratt analyzed the impromptu topic and the specific speeches of each of the six final round contestants -- ed]

This examination of the speeches given in the final rounds of Extemporaneous and Impromptu Speaking at the 1981 National Individual Events Tournament supports the quite obvious conclusion that speakers in those non-prepared events use argument. Their speeches conform to the criteria of argument: they advance, support, and criticize claims, and they give reasons as justification for acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values. They use a variety of supporting data, which presumably will be acceptable to their audiences, to try to establish subordinate claims; once established, those subordinate claims serve as data for the central claims they have made, either in answering their extemp question or in responding to their impromptu topic. Some speakers qualify their claims extensively ("So this analysis might suggest that Ibsen may have been right that sometimes the minority is right") whereas others make absolute claims ("Obviously, it's clear that the minority is not always right"); the strength of claims made varies from one speaker to another. Warrants for arguments were implied; no speakers provided backing for warrants nor presented rebuttal conditions for claims. The speeches embody argument which is similar in many ways to the arguments made in debate, especially in first affirmative constructive speeches. While the extemporaneous and impromptu speakers need

not anticipate direct refutation of their arguments, they must nevertheless structure persuasive cases recognizing that argumentation is an audience-centered process and that an audience should be induced to grant adherence to the claims advanced. The judge in debate who concludes at the end of the first affirmative constructive speech that the affirmative team has or has not presented a prima facie case is making a judgment very similar to that which the judge in extemporaneous or impromptu speaking makes at the conclusion of each speech. Is the case logically adequate? Is the supporting material strong, credible, and consistent? Has the speaker met the audience's expectations of sufficient and persuasive argument? Whether those arguments were good or bad, weak or strong, consistent or inconsistent; whether the speaker gained adherence to his or her claims, whether the speaker's analysis was superior to that of the other speakers in the round--these evaluations are the responsibility of the judges, who must then display their skill at argument by constructing persuasive cases on their ballots.

ENDNOTES

1. Daniel J. O'Keefe, "Two Concepts of Argument," Journal of the American Forensics Association, XIII (Winter, 1977), pp. 121-128.
2. Wayne Brockriede, "Characteristics of Arguments and Arguing," Journal of the American Forensic Association, XIII (Winter, 1977), pp. 129-132.
3. James H. McBath (ed.), Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective (Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1975), p. 163.
4. Richard d. Rieke and Malcolm O. Sillars, Argumentation and the Decision Making Process (New York: John Wiley, 1975), pp. 6-7. Many of the terms which Rieke and Sillars use, and which I will use, to describe arguments and their parts are taken from Stephen Toulmin, The Uses of Argument (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1964), with which I assume my audience is familiar. Toulmin's layout of arguments could be used to diagram the arguments presented in extemporaneous and impromptu speeches, as I have done with one of those speeches. That lay out is included at the end of this paper.
5. In Extemporaneous Speaking, only the last four speakers were recorded; in Impromptu Speaking, all six speakers were recorded. Two contestants competed in the final round of both events. The recordings, made at the National Individual Events Tournament at Towson State University in Baltimore on April 12, 1981, are available from me.

Speaker #4: Extemporaneous Speaking

Q: How likely is Soviet intervention in Poland?

US support of Shah. Iranians mad at us.

Support for a foreign leader in the face of popular opposition is intervention.

US intervened in Iran.

US in Iran & USSR in Poland are comparable. If USSR is successfully intervening now, we can expect them to continue.

Q: likely

Non-military intervention is likely.

(Central Claim #1)

Economist: USSR successfully urged replacement of Comm. Pny leader in Poland; PM replaced at urging of USSR.

If USSR has influenced Polish govt in these instances, then that is intervention.

USSR is intervening in Poland.

Ch.Sci.Monitor: Polish govt is influenced by USSR.

USSR has troops in Poland per Warsaw pact.

Weinberger, Chi. Sun-Times: USSR invading Poland by osmosis.

"Invasion by osmosis is accomplished by presence of troops."

USSR is not likely to incur these disadvantages even though they're able to intervene, esp. when their non-military intervention is so successful.

Q: Small possibility

Full-scale intervention is unlikely.

(Central Claim #2)

Internal problems in USSR; citizens already unhappy w/troops in Afghanistan. 3. Would strain US/USSR relationship; Reagan wouldn't change hard-line stand.

D (Data/claim structure of GSM argument is offered as a unit of data by the speaker.)

McNally: USSR has capability but won't exercise that option.

M. TULLI CICERONIS: IN L. CATILINAM ORATIO PRIMA
Habita in Senatu

Ansis V. Viksnins *

He was one of the greatest orators the world has ever known. Not only a captivating and dynamic speaker, he was also a statesman, author, and philosopher. For his brave and patriotic actions taken during the time of a national crisis, citizens hailed him as "father of the fatherland." This man, who lived over two thousand years ago, lives on, as a shining example of a political hero, a noted scholar, and a master orator. Today we will consider Marcus Tullius Cicero and analyze one of his grandest and most effective orations.

The focus of our analysis will be provided by a treatise on the character of an orator, *De Oratore*, which was written by Cicero himself. Written after his retirement from public office in 54 B.C., *De Oratore* offers insights as to Cicero's views on effective communication. The book is written primarily in dialogue form, describing a hypothetical conversation between Lucius Quintus Crassus and Marcus Antonius, both famous but deceased orators. Through an inspection of that work, we gain a better understanding of Cicero's mastery of oratory and more specifically of the oration he gave nine years before he wrote *De Oratore*. The speech is Cicero's First Oration Against Catiline.

The scene of the oration is the temple of Jupiter Stator in Rome, with the Roman Senate in emergency session. Noted Latin professor A. S. Wilkins describes the times as marked with civil unrest and conspiracy against the republic. Senator Lucius Sergius Catilina, leader of a conspiracy against Cicero and loyal public officials, sits in the Senate chamber on the afternoon of November 8, 63 B.C., knowing that the two men he sent to kill Cicero that very morning have failed to accomplish their nefarious mission. He also knows that Cicero is privy to his plot of revolution and murder. Cicero enters, is taken aback by the gall and audacity of this traitor to sit among other senators who know nothing of his plot, and breaks into a grand oration:

Quo usque tandem abutere Catilina, patientia nostra? Quam diu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet?

Which I have translated from the Latin as, "How long, Catiline, will you abuse our patience? How long does that madness of yours mock us?"

* Ansis Viksnins is an undergraduate political science and Latin major at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. This article is a transcription of his competitive forensics speech used in the events of "Communication Analysis" and "Rhetorical Criticism." Since this was originally an oral presentation, the oral style has been retained in this written version.

In this manner, Cicero proceeded to speak for nearly one hour.

Cicero writes in *De Oratore* that in any persuasive oration he considers two points: "The one, how to recommend myself or those for whom I plead; the other, how to sway the minds of those before whom I speak." In this particular oration, Cicero establishes himself by referring to his own credibility, and by associating his arguments with those of the Roman people. To persuade his audience of Roman senators, he employs an innovative approach to the factors he considers success in persuasion--proving what is maintained to be true, conciliating those who hear, and producing in the listener's mind whatever feeling or cause the circumstances may require. Cicero uses an unconventional way of proving his case, and combines the ideas of conciliation with the producing of a general feeling of disgust towards Catiline. We shall consider both points--how he proves his case against Catiline and how he arouses the contempt of the Roman Senate.

The case against Catiline features no contracts, testimonies, decrees, or any other substantive evidence; it is founded entirely on the orator's own arguments and reasoning. Cicero draws from inferences and knowledge he has received. He describes the steps he took in secret to safeguard the republic and asserts that he knows every detail of the conspiracy. Quintilian, the famous Roman rhetorician, stated that Cicero always put on the authority of one who has knowledge of the truth. Throughout the speech, Cicero attacks Catiline's reputation and paints him as an obsessed, sinister, and morally depraved criminal, hated by senators, citizens, and even his own parents. In fact, one may say that this entire oration of six hundred forty lines is powerful accusation. The accusations draw meaning from Cicero's own credibility, his *auctoritas*.

During the speech, Cicero frequently points out his popularity, his overwhelming election, and his duty as the highest elected official of the state, charged with the sacred duty of consuls, when he says, "Let the consul see to it that nothing of harm touch the republic." He further strengthens his accusations by employing a powerful form of a patron-client relationship, such as used by lawyers in court. In an article entitled, "The Rhetoric of Advocacy and Patron-Client Identification," in the Fall, 1981, *American Journal of Philology*, Professor James May explains that Cicero speaks as if the republic itself were Cicero's patron in court. Cicero's policies are those for the common good of all. For example, Cicero includes two incidents of the father-land speaking with him, advising his what course of action to take.

To strengthen his argument, Cicero also used a device described by Aristotle in his *Rhetorica*, considering both sides of a question. He wonders how Catiline has been able to sustain the conspiracy, why he has not ordered Catiline to death, and what future generations will think of his actions. In doing so, he provides the listener with a full presentation of the issues of the case, and good reason to believe his final judgment. Through all these devices, he builds a convincing argument.

The manner in which Cicero arouses the feelings of the Senators is marvelous. Based primarily on ornamentation, his style aroused not only the anger of the Roman senators, but it also excites the captivated, modern-day reader. His word choices are sharp and powerful. In terse, staccato-like sentences, he hurls forth charges, calling Catiline a castaway, a hoodlum, and a murder. He adds emphasis to the powerful language by anaphora, the repetition of a key, hard-hitting word like "nihil agis, nihil moriris, nihil cogitas"--"you do nothing, you undertake nothing, you know nothing." In a particularly acute metaphor, he compares the other lesser conspirators to perniciosa sentina -- foul bilge water! An apt simile states that the conspiracy is like a consuming disease, deeply settled into the flesh and bowels of the republic. He creates an allusion, in which Catiline sets up a shrine to crime at his house and consecrates his murderous weapons at the altar before going out to accomplish his wicked deeds. Several stylistic devices besides these need mention. Using an early rhetorical device called praeteritio, Cicero often claims that he will "pass by" or overlook certain facts, such as Catiline killing his wife and son--but in pretending to omit these from his speech, he has already come out and stated them. In a dramatic closing apostrophe, Cicero addresses the statue of Jupiter Stator in the Temple and appeals that justice be done. Finally, we must admire the elegantia of this oration, the clarity of words, the precision of the Latin grammar, and the well balanced, correlated sentences.

Evaluating the effectiveness of the speech, it is an accepted fact that the oration deeply moved the audience. The speech had two principle objectives--to urge Catiline and his followers to go into exile and to persuade the Roman Senate that Catiline was indeed a public enemy, that action against him was necessary. When Catiline rose to speak in defense of himself, the Senate drowned his pleas with shouts of "Proditor! Traitor!" Cicero's oration not only obtained the favorable sentiments of the Senate, but it was also effective in that it achieved its second purpose--Catiline left the city in disgrace, and was killed about two months later in a battle with Roman legions.

The First Catilinarian Oration achieved much more than the temporary goal of persuading the Senate, it established a model of innovative, tremendously effective, persuasive oratory. In the speech, Cicero presents his case not so much on the logically constructed proof of classical oratory, but rather on the weight of his own influence, his auctoritas. This interesting deviation from classical oratory makes the oration even more fascinating.

Because the speech is an excellent piece of communication and because it describes an exciting, crucial period of classical Rome, it has survived over the generations as a masterpiece. Although the oration may be well over two thousand years old, let us not forget what Cicero believed about this oration, and all his other works, and what was stated by Ralph Waldo Emerson centuries later: "Speech is to persuade, to convert, to compel; speech is power!"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristotle. Rhetorica. trans. John Henry Fresse. London: William Heinemann, 1926.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. De Oratore. trans. E. W. Sutton. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Kennedy, George. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- _____. The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- May, James M. "The Rhetoric of Advocacy and Patron-Client Identification: Variations on a Theme." American Journal of Philology, 102,3 (1981), pp. 308-15.
- Wilkins, A. S. ed. The Orations of Cicero Against Catalina. London: Macmillan, 1972.

**IN SEARCH OF AN AURAL CURRICULUM:
A STARTER UNIT
FOR
TEACHING LISTENING AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL**

Harvey Weiss *

"I know it's important, but where do I find the time?" "I'd like to teach listening, but I don't have any idea where to start!" "With all the budget cut-backs, it's hard to find the necessary funds for new materials." These and similar comments reflect the dilemma of language arts teachers in our secondary schools. They don't know where they would fit a unit on listening into an already crowded curriculum; new courses are almost impossible to get approved. Money is tight everywhere. Even if all these contentions could be met, where does the classroom teacher turn to find the necessary and appropriate materials to start teaching listening? Hopefully, this article can be of some practical help.

The following proposed "starter unit" outline might be, in part, the answer to the questions raised above. It is a 10-day lesson plan, with accompanying materials and methods to teach a beginning unit on the skill of effective listening. Ten class periods can be absorbed into almost any course, in any curriculum anywhere, with a minimum amount of disruption, preparation and money. It is not a replacement for a full course of nine or eighteen weeks, nor majority of our educational institutions. But it can be done by anyone, for very little money, and most importantly, it is a beginning!

Here, then, is a brief day-by-day guide on what to teach, the materials to use (in most cases send for), and some rationale for each of the content lessons. The footnotes at the end of this article indicate titles, addresses, and costs of the materials alluded to in the guide.

AN AURAL CURRICULUM "STARTER UNIT"

The objectives for this unit could be all or some of the following:

- Define and understand what the term listening means.
- Create student awareness that listening is an integral part of the entire communication process.
- Provide a beginning for studying listening theory.
- Students will identify some of their listening

* Harvey Weiss is Communications Instructor at Cooper High School, New Hope, Minnesota.

strengths (improve) and weaknesses (correct).

Day One: Administer a predrill diagnostic listening test. 1

Rationale: Establish the student's most natural beginning level of listening efficiency.

(Instruct them that they should try as hard as they can to do well. You can explain that on Day 2.)

Day Two: Explain course outline for next two weeks:

A. Announce that their pretest scores will be used to determine 1/3 of their listening unit grade, (try to get them corrected as early as possible) by using the % of improvement on the post-drill test taken at the conclusion of the unit.

B. Explain that the next 1/3 of their unit grade will be on all written work handed in and worksheets completed. These include:

1. Successful completion of student listening log.
(they are to keep track of how much time they spend listening in each of their classes for one full week. This includes teacher lectures, discussions, films, or any form of message reception.

Hand them out today. You can collect them on Day 7.

2. Writing a short essay on the importance of good listening, and some benefits derived from accurate listening.

Assign it today, and it should be due on Day 3.

3. Cooperative participation in the listening games and activities done in class as a group. Day 7 is the scheduled activity day.

4. Hand in a completed Bad Habits Inventory and accompanying worksheets used on Days 4 & 5.

5. Watching film, Listening Between The Lines, and completing the worksheet on the film, used on Day 3.

C. (Outside of Class) The final 1/3 of unit grade will be determined on the following:

1. Reading a chapter or two from any of the several sources provided. 2

They can be given one week to read and do chapter outlines provided by the teacher. Discuss it on Day 6.

- ***2. Listen to five, 10-minute audio taped mini-lectures taken from the first five chapters from the bench-mark textbook by Nichols & Stevens. 3

You will have to purchase the book, make up your own lectures, tape them in your own voice, and make up the student guide-sheets.

Final discussion of the 5 lectures is scheduled for Day 8.

***NOTE: These two exercises should be done by students individually in a quiet setting like the library, media center or other arranged space.

Day Three: Show introductory film, and discuss its content. 4

Rationale: Give students a general overview of entire topic of listening which includes:

hearing vs. listening-

listening as a 3-step process-

obstacles to effective listening-

suggestions for critical listening-

A guide-sheet can be distributed before or after showing, to reinforce their good listening (viewing?) habits or point up their need to do something about their bad habits.

COLLECT STUDENT ESSAY ASSIGNED ON DAY 2.

COLLECT STUDENT GUIDE-SHEET ON TODAY'S FILM.
(return for final unit test on Day 9)

Day Four: Administer 10-Point Personal Listening Habits Inventory. 5

This can be followed by listening in class, to an audio-tape, entitled, "He Who Has Ears," by Dr. Ralph Nichols. This entertaining speech elaborates on all of the points covered in the student inventory. 6

Rationale: Enables the student to focus on their own patterns of message reception hopefully will try to improve on what they find lacking.

Discussion can follow, if appropriate, on their inventory scores, and each point as they are covered on the audio-tape.

Day Five: It will take all, or portion of another day in class to properly discuss and listen to the tape.

Day Six: You should now discuss, explain, clarify or expand on, the main points of the student's reading assignment which was to be done outside of class.

Rationale: To introduce students to some basic listening theory, make them responsible for doing this on their own time, and provide them with a basic understanding of the common principles of listening in the communication process.

COLLECT THESE WORKSHEETS FOR PROPER CREDIT (return in time to study for test on Day 9)

Day Seven: Devote entire day to one or two "games or activities" 7 the class can do as a group. It forces them to engage in some of the mental discipline needed for good listening.

Rationale: Reinforces the concept that being a good listener doesn't have to be all work, it can be fun and entertaining, too!!

COLLECT Student Listening Log WHICH THEY HAVE

BEEH COMPILING SINCE Day 2.

Day Eight: Use entire class period helping students complete their mini-lecture guide-sheets which they have been working on outside of class for the past week.

COLLECT THESE AFTER THE TEST ON Day 9.

Day Nine: Administer a test on the reading assignment, the 5 mini-lectures and on the film worksheet.

To be consistent, give the test orally. Read each test item only twice. This enhances their skills of concentration, recall, and cognitive material.

(Remember, this test and corresponding worksheets is 1/3 of their unit grade!)

Day Ten: Give students their post-drill diagnostic listening test. 8

Rationale: See if they have improved any in this short period of time.

Use the difference in the results with the predrill diagnostic test any way that is practical for you. The ideal would be to use any improvement as the basis for their grade. (i.e. 7-10% = A, 4-6% = B, etc.)

I've used all of these activities in my Effective Listening semester course at Cooper High School in the Robbinsdale School District for the past ten years. They seem to get more fun every time I use them. If you need help of any sort regarding this "starter unit," please do not hesitate to call or write. Good luck!!

ENDNOTES

1. The Brown-Carlson Listening Comprehension Test, Harcourt-Brace & Javonovich. Test, manual, and student scoring sheets can best be obtained by calling them at 312-647-8822. Cost: about \$15.00.

2. Several book sources will serve your needs here. For example:

Listening Processes: Attention, Understanding & Evaluation by Paul G. Friedman. National Education Association: Washington, D. C. 1979. Cost: \$0.75. 31 pages.

Listening: A Way to Process Information Aurally by Robert O.

Hirsch. Gorsuch, Scarisbrick Publishers: Dubuque, Iowa, 52001. 1979. Cost: \$6.95. 42 pages.

Listening: Its Impact on Reading and Other Language Arts, by Sara W. Lundsteen. NCTE: 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois, 61801. 1971. Cost: \$3.00. 135 pages.

Listening by Andrew D. Wolvin & Carolyn Gwynn Coakley. William C. Brown Company Publishers, 2460 Kerper Blvd., Dubuque, Iowa, 52001. 1982. 189 pages.

3. Ralph G. Nichols and Leonard A. Stevens, Are You Listening? (McGraw Hill & Company, 1957). Cost: \$8.95. 236 pages.

4. Listening Between the Lines. This fifteen minute film is available for purchase or rent (\$30.00) from Alfred Higgins Productions, 9100 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 90069.

5. The Listening Habits Inventory may be found in Education, January, 1955.

6. Audio tape of speech given by Dr. Ralph Nichols expanding on the ten bad habits of the personal inventory. The tape is available from Telstar Productions, 366 North Prior Ave., St. Paul, Minnesota, 55104. Cost: \$12.95.

7. Some good sources for listening activities to use in class include:

Are You Listening? see note 3 above. Forty-four things to do are listed in back of the book.

A T.R.I.P. booklet entitled Listening Instruction is available from the Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Annandale, Virginia, 22003. Cost: \$2.50. It contains 38 exercises on a variety of topics and levels.

Listening (see note 2 above). Exercises to try follow each chapter of the book.

8. Use test form Bm of the same Brown-Carlson Test listed in note 1 above. Form Am is suggested for predrill purposes.

A DIALOGICAL EXAMINATION OF CONFLICT ASSUMPTIONS

Ronald C. Arnett *

Dialogue and conflict are not novel to speech communication literature, yet with the recent emphasis in the last decade on dialogue and conflict studies, little has been done to investigate these two areas in combination with the exception of Brown and Keller's Monologue to Dialogue. They assert that the test of any dialogue is not in casual conversation, but in conflict.

Following Brown and Keller's lead, this article provides an introductory look at how dialogue communication offers an alternative to some basic conflict theory assumptions. Specifically, two notions that undergird conflict theory in our discipline are explored. First, the recent stress on conflict management, in place of conflict resolution, is examined from a dialogic perspective. And, second, the assumption, "the meaning is in the person," is contrasted with the dialogue emphasis on the "between."

One word of caution, before I proceed. Dialogue communication rooted in Buber's existential/phenomenology is not possible at all times. Every I-Thou eventually fades into the realm of I-It. Thus, a dialogic approach to conflict is by definition a limited answer to interpersonal problems. It can not be employed at all times. But, such an approach is unique and potentially helpful enough to warrant examination and consideration.

Conflict Management

In an article by Hawes and Smith, Kenneth Boulding, well respected by conflict researchers, is quoted as a major critic of the term conflict resolution. Boulding's concluding remarks are quoted as follows: "I am not sure now, however, that 'resolution' was the right word for the Journal of Conflict Resolution of our enterprise." 1 Boulding's neutral premise is questionable from a dialogical viewpoint, which affirms the inevitability of bias, due to the historical situatedness of any decision or judgment. Even in terms of the "natural attitude" of everyday perception, the term management is not considered a neutral term in a hierarchical society. The taken-for-granted cultural implications of this term suggest having someone to manage. As some speech communication theorists have stated, concepts commit the user to a world-view, a position, 2 which implies that neutrality of inquiry is not possible. The mere act of deciding what to study or explore is a choice rooted in value, as persuasively argued by conflict theorist, Anatol Rapoport. 3

* Ronald Arnett is Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minnesota.

If one accepts the assertion that neutrality is not possible, then an academically honest analysis of conflict situations requires announcement of the perspective or bias carried into an inquiry. Such an orientation is inherent in an article where John Waite Bowers admits his bias to his readers before providing his conflict analysis. 4 Bowers' honesty is called for by individuals related to both interpersonal and rhetorical studies. The father of third-force psychology, Abraham Maslow was outspoken about this issue. In addition, Nilsen and Wallace have stated the importance of sharing one's motivations and values with an audience, particularly if one is attempting a one-sided address.

In sum, neutrality is seen as impossible by some theorists, which calls into question Boulding's hope of using the term management as a more "neutral" term. Some individuals would claim that every term is rooted in some form of conceptual bias, making none of the typical terms (resolution, management, or conflict regulation) without limitations.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis is that as important as the use of a term is, it may not be the fundamental issue. As Bowers suggests, the value system one takes into a conflict encounter may be the crucial point. The rest of this section examines what the implications of a dialogical value may be in approaching another in a conflict situation.

For the sake of brevity, I will not detail the entire dialogical attitudinal framework pointed to by Buber, but I will highlight two important assumptive values: (1) the person must be affirmed in the midst of conflict; (2) one must stand one's own ground and state one's own view. Perhaps one can operationalize this by suggesting that love is needed in the sense of affirming the other, and power is needed to state one's own voice. Such a viewpoint was described by Martin Luther King, Jr., who attempted to utilize a dialogical orientation in his protests. Robert Scott and Herbert Simons also saw the unity of contradictories in King's rhetoric. Each has quoted King's well-known statement on power and love. ". . . power without love is reckless and abusive and love without power is sentimental and anemic." 5

In the essay, "Power and Love," Buber reveals that a dialogical approach to conflict does not permit power to become an absolute, and love is not allowed to confirm all in relativistic nonjudgment. One must confirm the person, while simultaneously engaging in judgment. Perhaps no where in Buber's writings in this effort more clear than when he was awarded the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade in Frankfurt, Germany in September 1953, less than ten years after the systematic slaughter of seven million Jews. In this address he walked the narrow ridge between the power of judgment of German actions and the love of confirmation that recognized that the common link between persons is often a shared moral weakness. 6

In essence, Buber provides an attitudinal guideline for one approaching a conflict situation dialogically. One must walk a "narrow

ridge" between power and love, in hopes of confirming the other in a conflict and simultaneously speaking one's view. A favorite quotation from Maurice Friedman summarizes this value system:

Sometimes that dialogue can only mean standing one's ground in opposition to him, witnessing for what one believes in the face of his hostile reaction of it. Yet it can never mean being unconcerned for how he sees it or careless of the validity of his standing where he does. We must confirm him even as we oppose him, not in his 'error' but in his right to oppose us, in his existence as a human being whom we value even in opposing. 7

The value base of a dialogical approach to conflict requires a dual action of confirmation of the other with accompanying conviction to state one's own view, even in the midst of opposition. This concern for both parties in a conflict exchange is further evident in the next part of this article, which examines communication meaning as relationship bound.

Dialogical Meaning--"Between" Persons

Much of the conflict literature in our field that stresses a "person-centered" view of conflict emphasizes an inner focus. We are accustomed to hearing interpersonal phrases, such as the following: "get in touch with your real self," "follow your own impulses or organismic feelings," and "trust your own self-actualizing tendencies." Often the above are watered down versions of the authors' original intent, but our linguistic descriptions often revolve around the theme "meaning is in the person."

This "meaning is in the person" stance has proved beneficial in interpersonal studies, but it is not the only "person-centered" assumption possible. The inner focus of "meaning is in the person" has been critiqued in conflict literature by Simons. Maurice Friedman has stated that focus on the inner person results in a psychologistic ethnocentric view with "I" being the center of communication, not the relationship.

At this point, I need to make two generalizations concerning the results of the inner focus or notion, "the meaning is in the person," which the rest of this article explores. First, the inner focus often assumes an accompanying undue emphasis on feelings. I believe it is important to be in touch with one's feelings, but not always follow them. Second, the rooting of meaning inside the person results in a feeling of ownership of experience. This view is just a short step from feeling that one can have ownership of a "best" solution offered in a conflict, in which there is a winner and loser--the former being the owner of the "best" solution.

For Friedman, Buber, and other authors of dialogic communication, the notion of the "between" is an alternative to the stress on meaning

emerging from inside the person. The "between" is not based on the following of feelings or the assumption that one can possess the "best" solution. (Note that this is a world-view not accepted by all; thus, working from a win/lose perspective may, at times, be appropriate. However, the more important the relationship, the more necessary that both members feel they have won--that the relationship, not one person, owns the final solution.) Buber's "between" is grounded in the assumption that meaning is relationally constituted with participation, but not necessarily with the consent of the participants. Buber would contend that the "between" is a set of "signs" that one follows in the relationship of transaction--John Stewart would call this notion the "spiritual child."

The sign sensitivity of Buber's ontology causes a problem, because it is admittedly difficult to define. However, Buber is only talking about messages that we all receive in the midst of a dialogue that indicate the appropriate response. He believes that the transaction between persons allows a historically situated "sign" to emerge between persons that tells them how to respond. Some would call Buber's assertion magical, but he would contend that signs are natural, concrete, and frequently ignored; therefore their existence is questioned.

Each of us is encased in an armor whose task is to ward off signs. Signs happen to us without respite; living means being addressed. . . . The signs of address are not something extraordinary, something that steps out of the order of things. . . . What happens to me addresses me. 8

When Buber does respond to a sign "between" persons, he responds both to the person and the situation. The transaction embodies both. He states: "I understood my dialogical powerlessness. I had to answer, but not to him who had spoken. As far as a person is part of a situation, I have to respond, but not just to the person." 9 The significance of this statement is, once again, that feeling is not the primary guide for the necessarily "proper" resolution of a conflict, according to Buber. Such a view is at odds with the classic definition of productive and destructive conflict described by Deutsch.

. . . a conflict clearly has destructive characteristics if the participants in it are dissatisfied with the outcomes and all feel they have lost as a result of the conflict. Similarly, a conflict has productive consequences if the participants all are satisfied with their outcomes and feel they have gained as a result of the conflict. 10

Of course, in most instances a conflict is beneficially resolved when both parties are satisfied. However, dialogically one may resolve a conflict in accordance with the situation, yet feel internally dissatisfied. Not all appropriate resolutions of conflict will make one feel good. Ruben (1978) has similarly contended with Deutsch's affective emphasis.

While the view of conflict epitomized by Deutsch is widely cited, it seems to fail to take account of the transactional, symbolic, and reflexive aspects of communication . . . an affective criteria is clearly not an adequate basis for determining whether conflict is good or bad, functional or dysfunctional, to be avoided or not. 11

Rubens then quotes Simmel to emphasize that learning can and does often happen from frustration and pain, not always from satisfaction.

Maurice Friedman provides a classic critique of the affective criteria, which is the ground of much self-fulfillment literature. The human cannot ". . . ignore the possibility of the tragic conflict between realizing one's potentialities to the full and playing one's part in an historical situation which may call on one to sacrifice this realization of self, and perhaps life itself." 12 Thus, one's internal feeling cannot be the primary guide in attaining the "between" of dialogue. One may even work for a resolution that does not feel right for oneself, but is demanded and is appropriate for the situation.

A dramatic illustration of a dialogic view of "signs" is described by Viktor Frankl. Shortly before the United States entered World War II, Frankl was to receive his immigration visa to the United States. Frankl's elderly parents fully expected him to leave Austria. But at the last minute, he hesitated. He knew that any day his parents would be taken to a concentration camp and he was in conflict about whether or not to stay with them. As he considered the consequences of his actions he noticed a piece of marble on a table at his home.

When I asked my father about it, he explained that he had found it on the site where the National Socialists had burned down the largest Viennese synagogue. My father had taken this marble piece home because it was part of the ten commandments. The piece showed one engraved and gilded Hebrew letter. My father explained that this letter is the abbreviation for only one of the commandments. Eagerly I asked, "Which one is it?" The answer was "Honor thy father and thy mother: that they may by long upon the land." So I stayed with my father and my mother upon the land and decided to let the American visa lapse. 13

Frankl's story is extraordinary and open to numerous psychological interpretations of projection and rationalization. However, such interpretations are valid only as affect, not sign sensitivity, guide one's actions. Indeed, Frankl's experience and Buber's communicative system are not the norm, but such material opens up interesting possibilities and provides a unique challenge to some of our traditional assumptions.

One final point is that the internal viewpoint is frequently associated with a sense of freedom, epitomized by the statement, "do your own thing." But such a freedom does not generate change for many,

particularly the powerless. In fact, such freedom may even weaken collective action and work to the advantage of those in power. Philip Slater suggests that it is a "con job" to tell people to never conform. A misuse of individual freedom makes a coordinated effort against the system impossible. 14 Christopher Lasch has similarly criticized psychological or internal man as the final product of bourgeois individualism. He stated that love with sacrifice is now being replaced by love as individual fulfillment. The stress on internal feelings too easily weakens responsibility for others and lessens the chance of a productive conflict encounter designed to challenge the established order. 15

Fitzpatrick and Winke speak of the influence of commitment in a relationship in conflict. Their research has indicated that the more committed a person feels to the relationship, the more risk one will take in terms of emotional outburst. 16 However, perhaps Buber's dialogue requires a different relationship between commitment and affect. The more important the issue, the greater is the need to respond to the demands of the situation and person. When one is emotionally upset and focusing solely on inner feelings, ways to resolve or manage a conflict situation may go unnoticed. Could it be that the less important the issue, the more appropriate following inner impulses may be? And when the issue is of maximum importance, focusing on the dialogue between situation and persons, not one's internal state, is needed?

As Gregory Bateson has stated, we may need an ethic of relating "between" persons and events. The focus on the inner self as a decision-making center is a product of a frontier ethic of individualism that has led us into many serious errors. 17 Bateson and the assumptive base of dialogue imply a new Copernican Revolution that rejects the ethnocentric person and responds to the demands of the situation, at least when the conflict requires one's committed attention. Thus, internal feeling cannot be the primary guide in attaining the "between" of dialogue in a conflict situation. One may even work for a resolution that does not feel right for oneself, but is demanded and is right for the situation "between" persons.

Conclusion

In the 1977 keynote address to the Central States Speech Convention, Marie Nichols posed a challenge to individuals interested in the interpersonal aspects of speech communication. She called for continuing inquiry into the foundation of such approaches. 18 This article has responded to her call by delineating two assumptions that ground our understanding on interpersonal conflict and examining each in the light of dialogical theory. First, the value and bias with which one enters a conflict situation (establishment or change bias) is of even greater importance than the word used to qualify the term conflict. Second, the internal premise of "meaning is in the person" focuses attention on oneself instead of the ongoing transaction "between" persons in the conflict situation.

In addition, this article has revealed dialogue as an unconventional conflict approach--unlikely to become a popular method, for it requires a commitment to respond to the demands of the situation, not necessarily our feelings. Thus, dialogue will not and can not become the only conflict resolution method appropriate in our historical period. But it does meet the demands of our transitional time, by challenging taken-for-granted egocentric views of communication and pointing to some interesting possibilities.

In summary, dialogue is based in the value of affirming persons, while following the dictates of the transaction of "signs" between person. This desire to affirm persons, but not see feelings as sacrosanct may seem like contradiction. But dialogue, according to Buber, is "the unity of contradictories." Of course, this approach does not embody all the answers, but, perhaps, its true value lies more in the questions it asks about our taken-for-granted communication and conflict assumptions.

ENDNOTES

1. Leonard C. Hawes and David H. Smith, "A Study of Assumptions Underlying the Study of Communication and Conflict," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973), 423-435.
2. Stanley Deetz, "Essays on Hermeneutics and Communication Research" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Ohio University, 1973), p. 63.
3. Anatol Rapoport, "Strategy and Conscience," The Human Dialogue: Perspectives on Communication, eds. Floyd Matson and Ashley Montagu (New York: The Free Press, 1967), pp. 79-96.
4. John Waite Bowers, "Communication Strategies in Conflicts Between Institutions and Their Clients," Perspectives on Communication and Conflict (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), pp. 132-133.
5. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Let Us Be Dissatisfied!" Gandhi Marg, 12 (1968), p. 222.
6. Martin Buber, Pointing The Way: Collected Essays (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), pp. 232-253.
7. Maurice Friedman, The Hidden Human Image (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), p. 368.

8. Martin Buber, The Way to Response (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), p. 119.
9. Martin Buber, "Replies to my Critics," The Philosophy of Martin Buber, eds., Paul A. Schillpp and Maurice Friedman (Open Court Press: La Salle, Illinois, 1967), p. 726.
10. Morton Deutsch, "Conflicts: Productive and Constructive," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969), p. 10.
11. Brent D. Ruben, "Communication and Conflict: A System-Theoretic Perspective," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64 (1978), p. 20.
12. Maurice Friedman, To Deny Our Nothingness: Contemporary Images of Man (New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1967), p. 30.
13. Viktor Frankl, Psychotherapy and Existentialism (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967), p. 34.
14. Philip Slater, Earthwalk (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1974), p. 187.
15. Christopher Lasch, The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1979), pp. 22-43.
16. Mary Anne Fitzpatrick and Jeff Winke, "You Always Hurt the One You Love: Strategies and Tactics in Interpersonal Conflict," Communication Quarterly, (Winter, 1979), p. 10.
17. "A Conversation With Gregory Bateson," ed. Lee Thayer, Communication: Ethical and Moral Issues (New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1973), p. 248.
18. Marie H. Nichols, "When You Set Out For Ithaca," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977), pp. 148-149.

COMMUNICATION CONSULTING: SOME PRACTICAL CONCERNS

John Burtis *

Projections regarding education in the future invariably focus on the increased specialization required to meet the needs of an increasingly specialized country. Current trends indicate that students can command good technical jobs straight out of high school or college. Such a trend is well underway and is modifying the educational process to best serve the specialist.

This focus on specialty does not herald the end of the need for general education. People still are served by liberalizing studies. Rather, the trend requires that educators speculate about and experiment with alternatives to the established format for presentation of the more general aspects of education.

In a practical sense, three possibilities seem most likely. First, students will either receive general educational training while they are in school or they will never receive it. Second, students may return to school/campus for evening classes to supplement rather specialized knowledge. (Current increases in older and nontraditional student enrollment indicates this trend is well underway.) Third, students may be served by in-service trainers and consultants who bring classroom theory into the realm of work-place pragmatics.

The third approach is the concern of this paper. Communication specialists find themselves at home when dealing with people. People who work find themselves experiencing a number of communication related difficulties at the work-place. The scene is set for an application of nontraditional education via work-place training and consulting.

This paper will begin with a brief discussion of the differences between short-term training and long-term organizational development relationships. Once the dichotomy is made, focus will be on a description of the process employed in long-term commitments to a specific group of people or a specific business.

Long-term consulting relationships best replicate the commitments an instructor feels in the traditional classroom. First, the relationship itself between instructor and participants, becomes valued. Over a period of time, dialogue is encouraged, involvement increases and interaction is expected. Disclosure about family and personal situations will undoubtedly occur. The end of the commitment may well leave all participants--instructor included-- feeling cut off from an important relationship.

* John Burtis is an Instructor in the Speech Communication/Theater Arts Department at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota. He also serves as a communication consultant for businesses in that region.

A second distinction is in the realm of possibility. A one or two shot commitment allows for little more than training. There is no time to discover information which can be used to actually begin the consulting process. Instructors are generally limited to a preestablished topic and approach. Only minor modifications are possible in the short-term.

The final distinction between short and long-term relationships is in the skills required for the later. In essence, an instructor may be able to fool most of the people over the long haul. Nontraditional students test their instructors with tremendous rigor. Everything taught in a nontraditional class is subject to immediate application and rejection. Rest assured that the instructor will be informed immediately if the words of wisdom he/she is spouting don't cut the mustard under the scrutiny of reality. The consultant must be both flexible and ingenious in application.

Now that the distinctions are drawn between short and long-term consulting relationships it is appropriate to discuss the process by which the long-term consulting occurs. This author does not intend to unduly limit the creativity of prospective consultants. Rather, the following is a description of the fundamental parts necessary to any such long-term different or additional topics should also be discussed. A consultant must be flexible enough to satisfy the employer while simultaneously serving the trainees.

Perhaps the best approach to topic generation is to start with material which is tool building and then provide material which focuses on specific skills. Tools are general in application while skills are specific. If the trainees are supervisors, a prerequisite to the tools topics would be to help them understand what role they serve. In this case their responsibility is to train and supervise other workers. Once this role is explored and accepted, general tools such as listening, instruction, empathy, and watching out for communication pitfalls can all be approached. If the consultant models these tools, the trainees will heighten their appreciation of the material.

Once an appreciation for these tools is developed, the consultant will probably sense an eagerness to apply new-found tools to specific situations.

The consultant must be able to provide skills material as well. How to manage by objectives, how to motivate employees, how to manage time and a variety of other "how to" topics are all included at this stage.

The key word for the topic selection stage is develop. A consultant does not present a topic or set of topics to the trainees. Rather, a consultant must develop the trainees with a package of topics which include fundamental material to help the trainees in all situations and specialized material to aid the trainee immediately. Thus, the development of the trainee as he or she relates to the organization

is the key, not the topic itself. Without such a focus, the consultant will inevitably miss base with a number of the trainees while struggling to complete the explanation of a topic.

The third stage of the process is to train. It is important to note that training is only one fifth of the consulting process. The advantages of training in a long term situation are that the instructor has ample time to "learn the language" of the shop and that the instructor can adjust to the most salient issues of the students.

These advantages are also obligations of the good consultant. There is no excuse for not learning enough from the workers to speak to them and train them in their own working perspective.

In addition, new issues will crop up weekly and even daily which should be addressed. When the workers are experiencing conflict or are struggling with a poor appraisal form, the consultant must be able to step back from his/her own topics and help out with that which is important at the time. When employees are taught at the work-site, they bring their work to class. If the consultant does not recognize the need to help, the consultant's efforts will be less effective.

The fourth stage of the process is to watch the progress of the trainees. At this time, the battery of instruments which was side-stepped in stage one might be appropriate. The consultant now has the trust and respect of the students. Now is the time to follow them around on the job and watch them respond to situations which arise that require use of the material covered.

This is another information gathering stage. The consultant is either planning the next set of topics or the final interview with each employee. If the process is to end soon the trainees will want and deserve and indication of their success. The consultant should gather data on tool and skill improvements, descriptive material on general worker style, and areas for future work. This information allows the final interview to be a work session.

The final stage of the process is to get feedback. The consultant must be concerned with the perceptions of the trainees and a survey may be the best way to gather such information. If the survey is neglected, the consultant may well feel that the project lacked closure. This stage is mostly for the consultant's benefit and future application, but it can also help the trainees receive a proper perspective about the experiences they have undergone.

The above five stages are critical in the long term consulting process. Time allocation for each stage will vary according to circumstances related to the individual nature of each job. The consultant should try not to feel locked in to a set schedule any more than necessary. Rather, a priority must be placed on the willingness and ability to address important issues whenever and however they arise.

The consultant is interested in organizational development and must steer his/her efforts toward general goals for the company. However, the consultant deals with people in their day to day communications and must be able to develop a bridge between everyday techniques for handling problems and long term goals for the company.

ORGANIZATIONAL TRAINING: SOME DISTINCTIONS

John Bourhis *

Organizational consulting actually consists of two distinct training processes: (1) organizational training, and (2) organizational development. In this section of the paper, we will: (1) define organizational training and differentiate it from organizational development; and (2) provide some insights and "tips" we have found effective.

Training programs are initially distinguished from development programs in terms of temporal limitations. Training programs as a general rule operate within a very limited, predetermined time frame, usually one to three days in length. For the most part the consultant is contacted by an individual representing a client, and that client has a predetermined amount of time that he or she wants devoted to a training program, which is usually a function of the financial resources the client commits to the training. Any program in excess of this one to three days time frame begins to require a proportionately greater commitment on the part of all individuals involved. If a client is unsure as to how much time will be required, the consultant should discuss the possibility of a development program which is not constrained to the same degree by temporal considerations. Hence one distinguishing characteristic of training programs is that the client usually has a predetermined time frame in mind, and that time frame is comparatively shorter in length than that required for a development program.

An additional distinguishing characteristic of training programs is in terms of audience composition. Essentially a consultant can deal with either a homogeneous or heterogeneous audience. In a training program you are much more likely to encounter a heterogeneous audience composed of individuals representing several different organizations and/or individuals from several different levels of an organization. For instance, a local bank may ask you to present a one day training program. Your audience in this case may consist of only tellers, or only loan officers in the bank, or some combination thereof. The nature of your audience can affect the nature of the material you present and the manner in which you present it.

Just as an effective speaker analyzes an audience in advance to determine the most appropriate format and content for a speech, so to should the consultant analyze his/her audience to determine the appropriate format and content for a training program. The consultant will/ should present information on leadership differently to a group of construction workers versus a group of bank presidents. Certain exercises, for instance role plays can be adversely affected when used

* John Bourhis is an Instructor in the Speech Communication/Theater Arts Department at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota. He also does communication consulting with private industry.

in heterogeneous situations. The teller who is role playing with the bank president may feel somewhat intimidated. This concept of heterogeneity is an important distinguishing characteristic. Training programs tend to be more mixed and diverse than development programs which enable the consultant through extended time frames, and proportionally larger resource allocations to segregate an audience.

Additionally the amount and quality of the information provided to the consultant prior to training tends to be limited. You may have several letters from your client, a phone call, or a combination describing the nature of the project you have been contracted to perform. These communications usually involve the nature of the program to be presented and what the client perceives his/her needs to be (salary, dates, etc). That's ideally what happens. Frequently, you never see the client prior to your presentation. You arrive at the organization the day of the presentation and begin frantically looking for this mystery client. Everything we know about communication theory would clearly indicate that this is the most inefficient and error prone system of interaction. Frequently you may discover that the individual you have been in contact with is not the person in charge of this particular program; the audience you had anticipated is in fact radically different than the one described to you; or that the nature of the program has radically change from the time of initial contact with the prospective client. Unfortunately, clients are not very sympathetic. They have hired you to perform a particular service for their organization and expect you to be very flexible. This is a problem that is more common in training programs than development programs. By their nature the client and consultant do not interact with as much frequency or detail in training programs. Development programs are much more sophisticated, much more difficult to create and perform and from the client's perspective much more expensive. A training program on the other hand is usually a short term one shot project. The key distinction here is that the consultant must be flexible. The ability to adapt material and presentational style in a short period of time is a critical ability that consultants need to cultivate, if they are to be successful in the training program circuit.

Almost everyone in our discipline has the potential to effectively run a training program, but very few individuals can run development programs. Most individuals with a sound background in communication theory, an ability to be flexible and spontaneous, and with the above knowledge can be effective trainers. However, this does not mean this individual would also be an effective consultant on a project that is developmental in nature. As a result, training is a very competitive business. There are many people capable of this process competing for a limited market. Consultants who specialize in organizational development are highly trained individuals who provide a very specialized service to organizations.

The final distinction between these two processes concerns the content of training programs versus development programs. Training programs tend to be exclusively skill oriented in their content. These

programs or workshops as they are frequently called are designed to impart a set of very specific skills to the audience in a limited time frame. The consultant who is interested in conflict, leadership, motivation, and productivity cannot be expected to adequately or effectively cover these complex topics in an eight hour training session. Most people would agree that an effective job of imparting such knowledge takes a longer time frame and requires a much greater commitment on the part of all individuals involved. These programs are generally aimed at changing people's behavior behavior versus training people to be more effective in some dimension of communication.

The types of skills that are frequently taught in training programs involve basic communication effectiveness. For instance, effective public speaking is a popular topic in this area. Individuals are interested in how they can write and present an effective speech. They want to know how to write an effective introduction/conclusion; how to organize a speech; how to analyze an audience; how to incorporate different types of evidence in a speech; how to incorporate a variety of logical and emotional appeals into a presentation; how to use visual aids effectively; tips on delivery; and how to handle "stage fright." The critical distinction here is the phrase "how to." In such instances the audience isn't concerned with the theoretical explanation of why eye contact enhances speaker credibility. What they are interested in is the fact that eye contact makes them more effective speakers. They want to know the brass tacks. How can I be more effective when I communicate with other people? In this area of "how to" topics there are a number of programs that are common: how to effectively run a press conference; how to handle the hostile audience/customer; how to conduct an effective interview; how to run an effective business meeting, how can I be a more effective listener; how can I use feedback more effectively; how to be an effective time manager; how can I be more effective using the phone; how to increase office management skills; Each of these topics can be easily managed in one to two hours. In combination several of these topics organized around a general theme form a training program. In a training program the primary goal of the consultant is to teach individuals how to be more effective at doing something in a limited amount of time.

Once the individual has decided to conduct a training program there are several "rules of thumb" or tips that can make a significant difference in the effectiveness of one's training efforts. Just as a speaker analyzes his/her audience, so should the consultant analyze his/her audience. The goal is to find out as much information as you can about your client, the company, the program and the location of the training. For instance, will the presentation occur within the organization? Will there be interruptions? Will the boss be coming into the training session and asking for such and such file or will the training occur off-site? What are the facilities like? Will you have all of the appropriate instructional materials provided for you or do you have to bring these materials with you? Is the training program to occur in an impersonal formal classroom situation or do you have some flexibility in arranging a more informal environment? How large will the group

be? Who will be in the group? What are the demographics of the audience? Each of these questions is very important. Many of them are the sort of questions that the college instructor takes for granted in their classroom teaching assignments. The important thing to keep in mind is that your audience in these situations is vastly different than the audiences you encounter in the classroom. Remember, students are used to being students, employees are not!

Lastly there are several things that you can incorporate into your training programs that can make a difference. First, the scheduling of breaks in the training is critical. A scheduled break can serve many purposes. They enable the audience to relax and re-energize themselves. It provides you with time to adapt and change the program, if necessary on the basis of feedback you obtain from participants during this time. And basically it provides you with a rest as well. Imagine teaching one of your classes for eight straight hours! Second, whenever possible attempt to encourage audience participation. You will know more about the principles of communication that anyone else in the audience. However, they will know more about their jobs and how the information can be practically applies in their everyday work situations! Remember, these individuals want practical tips that they can take and apply immediately. So use the members of your training sessions as invaluable resources of information. Given the right environment and some persistence/ patience on the part of the consultant these individuals will be a valuable asset to the training program.

SPEAKING SOCIETAL POLITICS INSTEAD OF
HEAVENLY POLITICS FROM THE PULPIT

Russell Hann *

The Vietnam War, the draft, civil rights, riots, university take-overs, deteriorating morals, drugs, love, free sex, rock music, cults, Eastern religions, new religions. The government, the church, the whole United States was under attack by the youth of the sixties. A time of revolution: if one didn't agree with something--stage a protest. There was war in the streets:

. . . the youth of America were going crazy: black ones burning city blocks, white ones occupying universities and holding hostages, trying to levitate the Pentagon with obscene chants, capping joints instead of kegs at the Delta House and ten thousand self-exiled to Canada to avoid the draft. 1

The sixties were violent times--the generation gap widened until both the older and younger confronted each other and declared war.

Appropriate for this time a pastor delivered a sermon entitled "Is God Over Thirty? Religion and the Youth Revolt." His name was David H. C. Read; the date was April 9, 1967 (almost the apex of this turmoil), and the place was the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City. 2

This sermon is worth examining because it can give an insight into the attitudes, values, and ideas common during the sixties toward religion. It will also reveal one man's attempt at solving a problem his generation faced.

The rhetorical standard I will be using to evaluate this speech is the Historical approach as set forth by Ernest J. Wraga. He wrote:

The study of ideas provides an index to the history of man's values and goals, his hopes and fears, his aspirations and negations, to what he considers suitable and irrelevant When seen against a contextual backdrop, speeches become at once a means of illustrating and testing, of verifying or revising generalizations offered by other workers in social and intellectual history. 3

By using this standard I hope to answer three questions: (1) Does the sermon reflect the time period's attitudes, values and atmosphere? (2) Is the speaker's attitude and ideas consistent with the norm? and (3)

* Russell Hann is an undergraduate Speech Communications major at Moorhead State University, Moorhead, Minnesota.

Is the sermon only appropriate for the time period it was given or could it be timeless?

The conclusions reached in this criticism deal with the common Sunday church sermon. There is concern today about just what is appropriate for a minister to say from the church pulpit. In this criticism, the content of a sermon will be analyzed and more information concerning what is appropriate and not appropriate for sermons will be given. From this, hopefully, a conclusion can be more easily drawn about the minister's role in the pulpit today.

The speaker was Rev. Dr. David H. C. Read. He was born in Cupar, Fife, Scotland in 1910; attended Daniel Stewarts College, Edinburgh; received his M. A. from the University of Edinburgh in 1932; his B. D. from New College, Edinburgh in 1936; became an ordained minister at the Church of Scotland in 1936. In 1939 he became the minister at Greenbank Church, Edinburgh, till 1949; became chaplain to Her Majesty the Queen, Scotland, from 1952 to 1956; then in 1956, he became a minister at the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church. He is the author of The Spirit of Life (1939); Prisoners Quest (1944); I Am Persuaded (1962), and other publications. Dr. Read was said to be a strong speaker with a good sense of timing. He engaged difficult and sensitive topics with directness and economy of style. 4

The setting was inside the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church on April 9, 1967. As churches usually exemplify, the assumption can be made that the congregation was predominantly middle-class Americans between the ages of 35-70. The fact that the youth were revolting against the church would also account for minimal attendance by the 20-30 year old age group. The immediate audience was his congregation, but his sermon spoke to both the youth and the elders of this country.

The first question to raise is: does the sermon reflect the ideas of the society to which it is a part? A speech, according to Wraga, should be able to be used to discover what the society of its time was like. Read began his message by reading Luke 3:23: "When Jesus began his work he was thirty years old." Then Read stated: "... and in a matter of months they heard him say: 'It is finished,' and he was dead." Read then went into explaining that whatever view we have of Jesus, we must face that He was young--and that He died young.

I begin with this, because in the current debate between youth and age (or, as the older like to say, between youth and experience) there is a tendency to line up religion with the prejudices of the old. Now it may well be that the religion we see on the surface today--the organized network of official church activities--does appear to belong to the older generation, and often indeed to be part of what youth writes off as the "Establishment." Yet Christianity, however it may be molded into the conventions of middle age from time to time, began with a young Saviour, young disciples, and a fresh and revolutionary message . . . When we speak of the

"revolt of youth," we should remember that this is precisely how the initial impact of the Gospel on any of us--whatever our age--could be described today.

The generation gap has been around since Adam and Eve gave birth to Cain. Read stated that youth and age were never in perfect accord. He cited also the conflict between Saul and David as the jealousy of age. Read ended this section with: "This generation didn't invent the generation conflict. It's built in."

Read went on to warn his congregation not to judge the youth wholly on what they heard and saw on the news. "Vice is always more newsworthy than virtue." Read described what picture could be easily conjured up about the youth by the information given by the news. But:

I have no reason to believe that there is more lawlessness and immorality among the young than the middle-aged, and every reason to believe that there is, on the whole, a healthy, honest, open-minded, inquiring, good-hearted generation coming up behind us.

His main emphasis in these quotes was that there was a generation gap that was causing the youth revolt--but was there a generation gap present in 1967? By analyzing what people were saying in 1966 we can find out if Read was consistent with the attitudes of the youth.

It is useful to consider two letters to the editor of Time magazine dated January 7, 1966, in response to an earlier letter:

From Mrs. Marguerite P. Gale (Lansdowne, Pa.)

I don't deny the right of dissent to the Vietnicks, the pacifists, or any responsible person. But dissenters' reasoning as expressed by young "MEN" like Mr. O'Brien can border the absurd. He cites his "SACRIFICES" to gain an education. Many young people, and even old people, have made the same sacrifices. Most, thank God, gain maturity and a sense of responsibility along the way. But for the grace of all men who have served in peace and in war since 1776, young Mr. O'Brien might not have an opportunity to make his sacrifices. The Viet Cong cannot emasculate Mr. O'Brien, he has done it himself. If his selfish kind should prevail we would all eventually lose everything. 5

From Robert Foutts (Compton, Calif.) in response to the same letter by Mr. O'Brien.

I am disturbed at the series of letters by cry babies who feel that a few years devoted to the defense of this great country is too great a task to undertake. To Mr. O'Brien, I can testify that I too attended college while working 48 hours a week--after I got my Purple Heart. There are thousands like me who made financial sacrifices to serve, and if this country needs a 36-year-old overweight paratrooper tomorrow, I shall be more than happy to defend Mr. O'Brien's pet store, regardless of where it is located. 6

Another letter from the January 7, 1966, Time magazine from Marilyn Chadwick (College Park, Md.) can also serve as an example of this generation gap:

I am one of today's "alienated" youth. Your Essay "On Not Losing One's Cool About the Young" [Dec. 24] deeply disturbs me, for I feel that it does no more than add to the already heavy strain of mass misinterpretation regarding my peer group. We are not the impulsive, irrational, rebellious youth you describe. We are the hope of a society racked by changing moral standards, breakdowns of age-old prejudices, and adults who cannot or will not bend to accommodate to new situations. Naturally we are going to make mistakes, for the answers are not in past history but in billowing clouds of the future. My advice to the adult world is: Drop your cool and read the signs clearly. We aren't searching for kicks. We're looking for answers to the problems bequeathed to us by you. 7

David Pichaske in his book A Generation in Motion stated: "This wholesale negation, this angry no, was much misunderstood by America's elders and by establishment apologists, who took it to be simple nihilism. It was exactly the opposite." 8

There was an overwhelming gap between the elders and the youth, but this is not what Read specifically wanted to deal with. He saw the youth revolt against the churches as taking two main forms. The first concerned the church's public image as an organization, and the other concerned the personal behavior of professed Christians. These were Read's two points. As he stated the first point in his sermon:

The revolt of youth is against what we might call "packaged religion." . . . The churches seem to appear as the repositories of packaged religion. With their formal services, their organization, their rules, and their rigid posture in society, they look like the very antithesis of what living religion might be. Youth, looking for the expansion of the spirit, the release of the emotions, the enlargement of consciousness that religion ought to mean, is in revolt against the neat wrappings in which we seem to present our

beliefs, and the formal channels through which we seem to force the life of the spirit. With their vision of what real contact with God might be they reject the assembly-line by which they seemed to be doomed in the churches to pass from baptism through church school to confirmation and conventional membership in the pattern of their elders. . . . We can lose the living God in the formula of our creeds; we can smother the Spirit in the regularities of our liturgy; we can lose the reality of Christian love in the trivialities of our churchiness. The youth revolt reminds us that the Church of today is in constant danger of overorganization, of worshipping the ecclesiastical machine rather than the living God.

In this segment Read made the statement that the youth were looking for the expansion of the spirit: the release of emotions. Read seemed confident that religion was still needed in the youth's lifestyle--no matter how broad, the youth were looking for something to believe in. The congregation must have been upset by the remark that their church was "packaged" and too confined for the youth. In view of the generation gap, this statement must have been met with mixed reactions. Was Read's observation of the youth's religious thoughts consistent with what was really going on? Again the broad picture must be observed. David Pichaske in his book A Generation in Motion observed:

They [the youth] would do anything just for the sake of doing it, for the sake of gathering more evidence, for the sake of having a new experience, for the sake of pressing further along. . . . The generation was religious in the broadest sense. . . . A major complaint of the sixties against the fifties was the loss of spiritual values: the sellout of the virtues taught in Sunday school, the loss of "Justification" and "Vocation." Sixties people sought both and they sought religious affirmation in the broadest sense by rejecting the rules and superstitions and rigidities of orthodox religion. 9

The faith in Jesus was also exhibited by the youth when John Lennon of the Beatles on March 4, 1966, made the comment that he thought the Beatles were more important than Jesus Christ. 10 What followed was the banning of Beatles music on popular radio stations, protest marches against the sale of Beatles records, and public bonfires of Beatles records. 11 To some of the youth of the sixties, Jesus Christ was still more important.

Read stated that the youth were against the "packaged" religion--were they? Two black civil rights leaders had this to say. In January, 1967, Stokely Carmichael, when asked by a priest what church people should do, said:

They should start working on destroying the church and building more Christ-like communities. It's obvious that the church doesn't want Christ-like communities. Christ--he taught some revolutionary stuff, right? And the church is a counter-revolutionary force. 12

Another black leader, James Baldwin, stated: "The church does not attract the young. Once that has happened to any organization, its social usefulness is at least debatable." 13

Read's ideas have been parallel to what the youth of his day were feeling and saying about the church. His application on how to deal with the youth problem was that the older generation should tell the youth they were right when they said the church seemed packaged in set forms. Read insisted, though, that in any live movement conformity thrives. "What is needed is the entrance into the Church of a youth that accepts the challenge of Christ, and is willing to move from within to reform its structures and make alive its forms and ceremonies." Read did not let the youth pass the buck--the way to unwrap a packaged church was to start unwrapping it from within.

Read directed his second and final point at the church and its elders more than the youth (whereas the first point dealt with the youth more than the elders).

The personal criticism that youth directs at the church member can be bluntly summarized: it is hypocrisy. It is a hard word, but we must face it. The young are extremely sensitive to the gap that yawns between our professions of belief and our behavior. . . . They say we talk about love, but act in self-interest; that we sing about peace, but support war; that we shout about moral standards but acquiesce in glaring injustice; that we proclaim the priority of the spiritual, but order our lives by the material; that we condemn youthful promiscuity but practice the serialized polygamy of divorce. All these, and many other, charges of hypocrisy are leveled at the conventional over-thirties in our churches.

What are we to say? First, just this: that we have indeed much of which we are ashamed. If we can't say that, we are indeed hypocrites every time we repeat together a confession of sin.

Read was charging his listeners with hypocrisy. This was a daring statement to make towards his congregation. Did Read have grounds for such a blatant statement? Was that a valid charge?

Their [the youth's] elder's easy accommodation to injustice, corruption, and patent lunacy maddened children of the

sixties, whose no was no to a no: a yes. . . . They [the youth] all believed in things like ethics, equality, and justice. They expected, especially in America, everybody to get a fair deal. And they could see that nobody was getting a fair deal. 14

Read's charge, it would appear, was correct--the youth did see their elders as hypocrites. Read also pointed out that everyone is a hypocrite both young and old. After charging everyone with hypocrisy Read gave this application:

There is no one here, whatever your age, who is not capable of being renewed in spirit, born again, open like a child to the grace of God in Jesus Christ. After all, it is not just to deplore our sins that we come together. It is to rejoice in the rejuvenation of the Gospel, the refreshment of the mercies that are "new every morning."

Read then brought the sermon to a conclusion with:

Is God over thirty? We laugh at the question, and say he is ageless. But in so saying we keep the impression somehow that he must be infinitely old. To be ageless is also to be infinitely young. And it is the youthfulness of God, the modernity of his Spirit, that will in our day, as in the past, revive and renew the Church. He sees this family of his now, looking right past the surface of our years, few or many, and we know the truth of the prophetic word: "He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall: but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint."

From this analysis of Read's sermon, we may conclude that the sermon did reflect the time period's attitudes, values, and atmosphere. This sermon does prove useful, then, to gain a better understanding of what people were thinking in 1967.

The second question to be answered was: Is the speaker's attitude and ideas consistent with the norm? Read was 56 years old when he delivered this sermon. He spoke out for the youth, for civil rights, against the Vietnam War, and against Christian apathy and worldly materialism. He rebuked his own generation for taking the youth revolt too lightly and not paying attention to what the youth were saying. In view of the evidence offered thus far in this criticism, it is clear that Read's views and attitudes were not the norm for his age group. Read was a minority in speaking out for the youth and its causes. Most middle-aged Americans, as was shown, were not willing to admit the youth had a point to get across that was worth listening to.

The August 26, 1966, Time magazine offered more evidence of this. Time revealed that outspoken preachers on civil rights reported their collection-plate income dropped as much as 50% after a sermon on integration. 15 Read must have had a lot of opposition since he spoke on this and even more radical issues involving the church. Read had attitudes and viewpoints common in the youth, not a 56 year old man. This point could help in future analyses of what the congregation's reaction might have been.

The final question was: Is this sermon only appropriate for the time it was given or could it be timeless? The main point to this sermon was that the youth were worth listening to--they had a point to be made. Read showed that Christ was still young when He was crucified and that the generation gap has always been and most likely always will be present. We could ask the question today: "Do the youth today have anything worthwhile to say?" and we would still get close to the same answers given during the sixties. The older generation is always classified as wise and the younger as ignorant. This sermon is relevant in any time period with a generation gap. It is also an index into history for Read captured the time era and its ideas. This sermon is timeless because it dealt with a problem that will be around for years to come and because it can be used to gain insight into the sixties views of the youth and church.

Thus, this sermon was an appropriate and worthwhile speech. Its ideas reflected the time period as Wrage said a speech should. Its main point was a valid one and was one that will keep this sermon relevant for years to come.

Through doing this criticism, I have gained insight into how the youth viewed the church during the sixties and how one man tried to make the church more vital to the youth and to society. This will help in analyzing today's church and how it attempts to get the youth involved in church activities. Three questions have arisen from this criticism and might prove interesting points for future analyses:

(1) Has the Christian church changed because of the youth revolt during the sixties?

(2) A critic could also take the older church members view of religion and contrast it with the youth's. How is it different from this criticism which emphasized the youth's expectations of a church?

(3) Do sermons usually result from actions in society or are they just spiritual growth talks? Which is or could be most effective?

ENDNOTES

1. Jacob Brackman, "My Generation" in Smiling Through the Apocalypse, ed. Harold Hayes (New York: The McCall Publishing Co., 1968), p. 635.

2. Lester Thonssen, ed., Representative American Speeches: 1966-1967 (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1967), pp. 129-37. Unless otherwise referenced, the situational details and quotations from David Read's speech are from this source.
3. Ernest J Wrage, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History" in Methods of Rhetorical Criticism, ed. by Bernard L. Brock and Robert L. Scott (2nd ed.; Detroit, Mich: Wayne State University Press, 1980), pp. 116, 124.
4. Thonssen, 130, 192.
5. Letters, Time, January 7, 1966, p. 6
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p. 7.
8. David Pichaske, A Generation in Motion (New York: Schirmer Books, 1979), p. 51.
9. Ibid., pp. 93-95.
10. Tom Schultheiss, comp. & ed., A Day in the Life (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Pierian Press, 1980), p. 155.
11. Ibid., pp. 164-66.
12. Bernard Weinraub, "The Brilliancy of Black" in Smiling Through the Apocalypse, p. 683.
13. Ibid., p. 721.
14. Pichaske, pp. 51-52.
15. Religion, "Caution on Civil Rights," Time, August 26, 1966, p. 58.

KARL E. MUNDT
ADVOCATE FOR A REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Linda Snyder *

President Richard Nixon, in his speech at the dedication of the Karl E. Mundt Memorial Library in Madison, S.D., said "You have in Karl Mundt a tremendous power for S.D. in Washington." 1 John Milton, South Dakota historian, commented "The voters of South Dakota returned him to the Senate four terms and spoke of him as a patriot and a nice man (which meant conservative and antisocialistic.) 2 Nation magazine described Mundt in 1965 as "so conservative, it is hard to imagine anyone to his right." 3 Fern Volk, a South Dakota constituent, said, "Yes, he was a nice man. My sister and he were in the hospital at the same time, and he had flowers sent to her every day." 4 U.S. News and World Report, in 1951 described him as "a forceful speaker, one who taught elocution, and is in much demand for addresses before luncheon clubs and other organizations." 5

Karl Mundt served as U.S. Representative from 1938 to 1948, and as U.S. Senator from 1948 to 1971. During these years, Mundt became well-known and well respected among fellow Congressmen. He was a strong advocate of conservation, and anti-communism; he pursued his beliefs vigorously.

Part of Mundt's power as an advocate and ability to initiate change came from his abilities as an orator. Historian John Milton, when describing Mundt's position on communism, stated, "Mundt's talent lay in his oratory." 6

Mundt himself realized the "power of the spoken word." He founded the National Forensics League, an organization that was established to encourage competitive speaking; and he taught speech at Eastern State Normal School in Madison, S.D. He spoke in every state of the union, in twenty-two countries, and gave over two hundred high school and college commencement addresses. 7 He made use of his exceptional speaking abilities wherever he went and in whatever he did.

Mundt firmly believed that true freedom could exist only by adherence to the Constitution of the people, rather than to the rules of the politicians of the time. He once said "The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free run--uncontrollable by the politicians of time and place." 8 In all of the positions he took and causes he supported, Mundt saw the necessity of abiding by the Constitution and the precepts it established in the 1700's.

* Linda Snyder is a junior Speech Communications major at Moorhead State University, Moorhead, Minnesota.

By looking into his past, one can also maintain that Mundt was a man ahead of his times. For example, he initiated action on countless environmental and conservation issues before ecology became a popular concern in the country. 9 He was a man ahead of his times, a man who sought to improve the country by maintaining the ideals he believed were set forth in the Constitution, and a man who had firm, unwavering beliefs and convictions. Though these qualities may not have always earned him popularity or helped him gain support for a proposal, he was an individual worthy of respect.

Perhaps Mundt's major contributions do not lie in specific areas of concern or can not be traced back to a single issue, but rather, were in the kind of person that Mundt was. He tackled unknown and unpopular causes without fear of opposition, and he persisted in finding solutions to problems. An examination of how Karl Mundt persistently dealt with an unknown and sometimes unpopular cause may give us a better understanding and appreciation of him and the values he represented. Such a case study is Mundt's position on the electoral college reform.

Mundt spoke before fellow senators three times in regard to the electoral college reform plan he proposed. The first occasion was in 1953, the second was in 1955, and the third, in 1967. He also submitted reform bills or supported ones similar to his nearly every year between 1953 and 1969, holding to a strong belief that the system, as it existed, was not constitutional. By the analysis of each speaking situation, and the application of Albert Croft's and Ernest Wrage's ideas, some important conclusions can be drawn about Mundt and his contributions to society.

In examining this issue, perspectives developed by Croft and Wrage will be utilized. 10 Croft suggests that a criticism of any rhetorical event enables one "to find larger implicative meanings of speeches, and to find unique ways the speaker has manipulated forms to imply certain messages." Wrage proposed that ideas are formulations of thought as the product and expression of social incentives and a social environment. From the premises that Croft and Wrage set forth, we can argue, that Mundt's ideas were a product and expression of social values and social influences. In order for them to be accepted by society, they must be similar to, or at least appear to be similar to, the values of the audience. The electoral college system, as it exists, has revealed in itself the flaws that Mundt and others attempted to change. As a rule, all of a states electoral college votes go toward one nominee "even though his popular vote majority in that state is as small as one vote." The United States has had fifteen "minority presidents," presidents who did not receive a majority of the popular votes cast in an election. 11 Almost one of every three presidents, then, in United States history has not been elected by the majority of U.S. citizens. The thought that the American public was not electing its office-holders, especially the U.S. president, was a disturbing one to Mundt.

It may have been the gross misrepresentation of the popular vote in November of 1952¹² that prompted Mundt to speak out in the 1953 congressional session. This problem was recognized not only by Mundt, but by several other congresspersons as well. In 1953, at least six bills were submitted for electoral college reform. During his third term as senator, another incident occurred. In 1960, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was elected to the presidency by a narrow margin, causing more criticism of the electoral college. Nixon, rather than Kennedy, may have won had the reform procedures been adopted and implemented earlier. 13

On June 30, 1953, Senator Mundt introduced the Mundt-Coudert "District" plan. In this speech before the entire Senate, Mundt made appeals to the value of equality of all U.S. citizens, and emphasized the crucial importance of abiding by the Constitution, as our founding fathers intended. He pinpointed the "selfish motives" of pressure groups and proposed that "each voter in America shall likewise have a vote of like power and authority in the election of his president." He predicted that his plan "would preserve the balance between urban and rural areas . . . which was intended by our forefathers." 14

In 1955, he spoke to the senators of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, but he appealed to the same values with a slightly altered style of speech. Mundt began this time by pointing out injustices of the existing system. He said "the general ticket system has reinforced one-party dominance and contributed to voter apathy in these states." Mundt continued his speech by explaining the flaws of the other proposed reform systems and, finally, told why his plan was best. He emphasized, that states should have equal voting power per capita, and that "the district system would tend to equate the political groups electing the president with those electing the congress." He also added that his plan "might foster harmony between the president and congress." 15

In his 1967 speech, which was much shorter than the previous two, Mundt exposed the listening senators to a similar appeal. In this situation, Mundt spoke more out of necessity than personal motivation to support his bill. The American Bar Commission had proposed an alternate reform solution and Mundt spent most of his speaking time revealing this reform system's deficiencies. Mundt said "These recommendations go far beyond what is necessary to achieve a much-needed, long overdue, and proper reform of the electoral college system by which we elect the president and vice-president. They would reshape the foundations on which the Constitution rests. Are we ready to do this?" He only briefly mentioned his bill for electoral college reform at the end. 16

Again in his 1955 speech, Mundt's commitment to preservation of constitutional privileges was obvious as he emphasized the "one-man-one-vote" philosophy, and introduced eight solid reasons why the "district" plan "would embody the best features of the existing electoral college system at the same that it would introduce urgently needed improvements in that system." 17

His 1967 speech, when he spent only a few seconds persuading for his bill to be adopted, but spent several minutes discussing the unconstitutionality of the other bill, reiterates the fact that abiding by the Constitution was of first importance to Mundt.

In appealing to values of equality and constitutionalism in his peers, Mundt could not go wrong. Each senator, of course, was bound to a belief in the Constitution and in the equality that the Constitution grants to every American citizen. By drawing his conclusions from the values that the other senators in the audience possessed, they ought to have agreed with Mundt.

Mundt's proposals for electoral college reform were never accepted, nor were any of the other countless proposals that were submitted between 1953 and today. The system remains the same today as it did thirty years ago when Mundt began to agitate for change. Mundt was a prominent senator in his day, his long tenure had given him considerable exposure, and ample opportunities to express his opinion on a wide range of issues. He gained many sources of support for his reform proposal, including Strom Thurmond, a democrat from South Carolina who spoke frequently for reform, Harvie J. Williams, executive vice president of the American Good Government Society, 18 and the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government.

Why, then, didn't Mundt's bills pass, if indeed, his values of equality and constitutionalism were the same as other senators? What values did society possess during this period of time that may have influenced the fate of Mundt's proposed legislation? What other values did Mundt represent that may have encouraged a negative response to his proposals?

A consideration of society's values in 1953, 1955, and 1967 and of Mundt's other observable values during these times provide some answers.

In 1948, Mundt and then Representative Richard Nixon cosponsored and debated for a bill that "established the presumption that the Communist party is under foreign direction and requires the party to register membership with the Department of Justice." 19 Even concerning this issue, Mundt said "It will stand up constitutionally" This bill created so much controversy that there was an "anti-Mundt-bill-march" on June 1, 1948. According to Current Biography of 1948, the bill "was also the subject of criticism by the major part of the American Press." 20 Mundt never retreated on his stance against communism. Although he was described as "breezy and amiable" in conducting the hearings, he received much criticism. U. S. News and World Report said, "Mr. Mundt . . . has tried to be friendly to both sides, to displease neither. The result, many complain, has been lack of forcefulness that might have avoided irrelevancies, and speeded up the hearings." 21

During this period of time, Mundt's reputation as a conservative worked against him. The dogmatic beliefs behind McCarthy's rampage were probably linked to Mundt's similar beliefs on anti-communism, making any or all of Mundt's proposals more questionable. In 1967, the economic security was unstable and Vietnam was emerging as a major controversy. Samuel Lubell, an independent reporter and political analyst, said "The temper [of the country] is one of mixed waverings . . . more caution is sought in what is pushed through Congress." 22 During this time, democrats still held the majority in congress and the president, Lyndon B. Johnson, was also a democrat.

Despite the varying conditions that Mundt faced in each speaking situation, his position on the electoral college remained the same. Perhaps the values that Mundt represented: constitutionalism, tradition and equality, were similar to the values of his audience, but were not considered important enough to act upon. Other values, whose importance was emphasized by current problems, took precedence over the electoral college reform. The possibility of national division caused by the anti-communism/communism dispute and hearings turned the peoples' focus toward protecting individual rights and freedoms rather than equality. The Vietnam controversy in the 1960's captured the attention of every American, once again pushing aside the protection of values of equality and constitutionalism, for seemingly, more pressing problems. Without the sensed urgency to protect the values that Mundt represented in his appeals for electoral reform, no action could be expected.

Obviously it was not Mundt's poor speeches or lack of respect that caused Mundt's bills to fail, nor was it his neglect to appeal to accepted values. The country's and congressmens' preoccupation with "larger" problems was at the root of Mundt's difficulty in securing action. Each senator may have held the same beliefs in securing action. Each senator may have held the same beliefs concerning equality and the constitution as Mundt did, but the protection of other values took higher priority. Because each member of congress is limited in the number of issues in which he or she can pursue change, the "lesser-pressing items" that do not appear to need immediate attention are often neglected and left unsolved.

Seldom does one find a person committed to fighting what appears to be a losing battle. We find in Karl Mundt, then, not only that commitment and persistence, but a willingness to take on unknown and unpopular problems.

From this example, we can reaffirm the originally stated beliefs about Karl Mundt's character. He stood firm in his conviction that the electoral college system needed changing to make our voting system constitutional and insure each U.S. citizen of the power of his vote. We see that as the problem persisted, Mundt persisted in initiating change. He continued to rally numerous sources of support for his cause and did not cease to seek change while in office. But, Mundt, like his peers, was forced to set certain values at higher priority than others. Because his set of priorities did not match with those of

New York, 1961. p. 680.

13. J. Harvie Williams, "Stability in Presidential Elections," (a letter to concerned people). 2 May 1969. Found in Karl Mundt's files at Karl E. Mundt Memorial Library.

14. Karl E. Mundt, "Should The State Electoral Vote Be Cast By The District System?" Congressional Digest, August 1953, p. 200+.

15. Karl E. Mundt, "Electoral Procedure," Congressional Digest, April 1956, pp. 122-28.

16. Karl E. Mundt, Congressional Digest, April 1967, pp. 271-73.

17. Ibid., p. 273.

18. J. Harvie Williams. Congressional Digest, August 1953, p. 202.

19. Current Biography. ed. Anna Rothe (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1948).

20. Ibid.

21. "Seven Senators," U. S. News and World Report, 4 June 1954, p. 70.

22. "After Elections--Changes Ahead," U. S. News and World Report, 14 November 1966, pp. 45-47.

other senators on this particular issue, the bills faced unavoidable defeat. It is only after considering this, that one can see that it was Mundt's persistence to maintain the United States as a country of the people, that was his primary and admirable contribution.

ENDNOTES

1. Richard Nixon, taken from Mundt Library pamphlet. Author unknown.
2. John Milton, South Dakota (W. W. Norton and Co., 1977), p. 124.
3. "Poor Karl Mundt, Poor GOP," Nation, 25 October 1965, p. 261.
4. Fern Volk, Groton, South Dakota, 57445.
5. "Republican Strategist," U.S. News and World Report, 27 April 1951, p. 36.
6. Milton, p. 124.
7. Biographical date compiled by Karl E. Mundt Archival Library, Madison, South Dakota, 57042.
8. "New Liberals--are they really Tories?" U.S. News and World Report, 25 March 1963, p. 108-110.
9. Biography compiled by close friend of Mundt's and published by U.S. Senate office in 1973. John R. Graff, administrative assistant.
10. Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," Speech Criticism, ed. William A. Linsley (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishing Company). Ernest Wraga, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," Methods of Rhetorical Criticism, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1980), pp. 116-24.
11. Robert A. Liston, "The American Political System," Parents Magazine Press, 1972, pp. 92-97.
12. Colliers Encyclopedia, vol. 17. Crowell-Collier Publishing Co:



Speech Theater Department
St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota 55057

LARRY SCHNOOR
107 AGENCY RD
MANKATO MN 56001

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 115
Northfield, Minn.