

Volume 38, 2001 Speaker and Gavel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/speaker-gavel>



Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2001). Volume 38, 2001 Speaker and Gavel. Speaker & Gavel, 38, 1-65.

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in Speaker & Gavel by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Volume 38, 2001 Speaker and Gavel

Cover Page Footnote

This digitized copy was created from a donated print copy made to the University Archives at Minnesota State University, Mankato by Dr. Kellie Roberts, University of Florida, Director of Forensics in January 2021.

Speaker and Gavel

**The Rhetoric of George Washington's
Farewell Address**

Halford Ryan

**Inside and Outside the Bubble: Forensic and
Non-Forensic Views of Acceptable Humor Forms**

Andrew C. Billings

Identification: Celebrating People with HIV

Kittie Grace

**Discord and Harmonia: Kenneth Burke's
Rhetorical Theory and Kritik Permutations**

Veronica Finkelstein

**A Fantasy Theme Analysis of Four South Dakota
Lottery Advertisements**

Bonnie L. Cooper

Editor's Essay _____

**Loving It, Hating It,
Living with Intercollegiate Forensics**

Kirstin Cronn-Mills

Journal of
DELTA SIGMA RHO—TAU KAPPA ALPHA

Speaker and Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha National Honorary Forensic Society

NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: Vicki Karns, Suffolk University
Vice President: Joann Edwards, University of Mississippi
Secretary: Bruce Wickelgren, The Ohio University
Treasurer, Mike Edmonds, Colorado College
Historian: Robert Weiss, DePauw University

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editors Daniel Cronn-Mills, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Kirstin Cronn-Mills, South Central Technical College

Office Kathy Steiner

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 38 / 2001

Table of Contents

The Rhetoric of George Washington's Farewell Address Halford Ryan	1
Inside and Outside the Bubble: Forensic and Non-Forensic Views of Acceptable Humor Forms Andrew C. Billings	16
Identification: Celebrating People with HIV Kittie Grace	27
Discord and Harmonia: Kenneth Burke's Rhetorical Theory and Kritik Permutations Veronica Finkelstein	37
A Fantasy Theme Analysis of Four South Dakota Lottery Advertisements Bonnie L. Cooper	49
Editor's Essay	
Loving It, Hating It, Living with Intercollegiate Forensics Kirstin Cronn-Mills	63

Journal of
DELTA SIGMA RHO—TAU KAPPA ALPHA

Speaker and Gavel

Published by Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society

EDITORS

Daniel Cronn-Mills
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Mankato, MN 56001
507.389.2213
daniel.cronn-mills@mnsu.edu

Kirstin Cronn-Mills
1920 Lee Boulevard
South Central Technical College
North Mankato, MN 56003
507.389.9951
kirstin.cronn-mills@sctc.mnscu.edu

EDITORIAL BOARD

Susan J. Balther, DePauw University
Timothy Borchers, Minnesota State University, Moorhead
Jon Bruschke, California State University, Fullerton
Ann Burnett, North Dakota State University
James Dittus, Highland Community College
Lisa Flores, Arizona State University
David Gaer, Minnesota State University, Moorhead
JanieM. Harden Fritz, Duquesne University
Karla Leeper, Baylor University
Allan Loudon, Wake Forest University
Mark Meister, North Dakota State University
Edward Panetta, University of Georgia
Lisa Perry, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Jeff Pierson, Bridgewater College
Kimberely Powell, Luther College
Warren Sandmann, Minnesota State University, Mankato
David Williams, Texas Tech University

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

S&G publishes refereed articles addressing all aspects of communication theory and practice. Authors should submit three copies of their manuscript prepared according to the latest edition of MLA or APA guidelines. Use minimal endnotes only for exposition or explanation, not as bibliographic citations. Include a cover letter identifying author(s) and affiliation(s). Remove all references in the manuscript to author and affiliation to facilitate blind review. for quicker processing of accepted manuscripts, enclose a computer disk with an accurate copy of your manuscript; clearly label the the disk with OS platform (e.g., macintosh, Windows 3.1) and word processing software.

The Rhetoric of George Washington's Farewell Address

Halford Ryan

As the nation's first president, George Washington was nominally the young country's first orator. But Washington was not eloquent in the classical mold of a Demosthenes or a Cicero, he did not use public speaking to foment rebellion for which Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry spoke, and, unlike John Adams, John Hancock, and James Madison, the general did not gain political power through persuasive prowess. Nevertheless, Washington fashioned several archetypal rhetorical contributions to the nation's historical discourse, one of which is the subject of this essay.

President Washington inadvertently invented a national oratorical genre when he decided to deliver an inaugural address in 1789. His First Inaugural Address carved in stone four traditional topics that still inhere in inaugurals, for he reconstituted the people to witness and ratify the inauguration, rehearsed communal values that invigorated the United States, stated the Constitutional principles that would guide the president, and stressed the powers and limitations of the executive office (Campbell and Jamieson, 203-225). Some citizens might wish that contemporary presidents would model their inaugurals after Washington's Second Inaugural Address in 1793, which holds the record for the most laconic (Wolfarth, 124-132).

Although contemporary scholars usually situate the rise of the so-called modern, rhetorical presidency in President Theodore Roosevelt's administration (Ceaser *et al.*, 158-71), Washington was the prototype for the president's giving speeches to persuade the people and Congress. Washington delivered eight Annual Addresses—today's State of the Union speech, which is the only address required of the president by the Constitution—that were modeled after the British monarch's speech from the throne to a new session of parliament and a royal governor's speech to the colonial assembly. Then, as now, the Annual Address or State of the Union was *pro forma*, but Washington's most famous was his Sixth Annual Address delivered in 1794 when he attacked the Democratic Societies for fomenting the Whisky Rebellion in western Pennsylvania (Lucas and Zaeske, 3-17).

Washington also relied heavily on speech writers—today's pejorative term is “ghostwriter”—to compose his addresses, and the problem of ghostwriters will be addressed in a later section (Einhorn, “The Ghosts Unmasked: A Review of Literature on Speechwriting,” 41-47). Two writers figured prominently in helping Washington as word-smiths, particularly so in the production of his Farewell Address, and they had classical educations in the liberal arts. Alexander Hamilton, whose two year education [1773-75] was at King's College, now Columbia University, helped Washington to compose and polish speeches while a general and president

Halford Ryan (Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1972) is a professor of public speaking at Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA 24450-0303.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 38 (2001), 1-15

(Aly, 24-51). James Madison received his B.A. degree in 1771 from the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University.

A classical education in the mid-eighteenth century with regard to oratory was in transition. Originally preoccupied only with style and delivery, a revival of classical rhetoric was underway. Students studied Greek and Latin orators, such as Demosthenes and Cicero, and Warren Gutherie observed that "Cicero's *De Oratore* [55 B.C.] became one of the most popular works on speech in mid-eighteenth century America" and "Quintilian also was in wide circulation" (Gutherie, 54). Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* was published around 95 A.D. With Washington's sparse education, it is doubtful that he read these sources. But Hamilton probably and Madison undoubtedly had, which made them invaluable helpers in matters oratorical. Too, all three men likely heard or read other colonial orators, such as John Hancock, John Adams, and Patrick Henry to name a few, who had something of a classical training in public speaking.

Finally, Washington added the Farewell Address to presidential rhetoric. This address is important for various reasons. James Humes noted that Washington's Farewell Address "is the only speech that an act of Congress requires to be read annually" (Humes, 12). The address was first read to both Houses of Congress on February 22, 1862, the anniversary of Washington's 130th birthday, to remind lapsed Southerners of their sin of secession; in the 1880s the address was read in regular legislative sessions in the House and Senate; the House stopped reading the address in 1984 but the Senate continues the practice (*Washington's Farewell Address*, ii). The address also figured prominently in the debate on the Union prior to the Civil War and it served as the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy until the eve of World War II. In the conclusion of this essay, some vestiges of Washington's rhetoric on these issues will be traced in orators who upheld the first president's vision that he articulated in his Farewell Address.

In order to treat this important state document *in situ*, the critic must first ground Washington's speech making in the rhetorical milieu of the eighteenth century. The purpose is to demonstrate Washington's adeptness (1) in organizing a speech for effect and (2) in polishing its language for elegance. Neither of these purposes have been demonstrated heretofore.

Eighteenth-Century Rhetoric

Washington's oratorical practices were grounded in how eighteenth-century practitioners, such as Hamilton and Madison, and Washington by observation, understood classical rhetoric. Broadly conceived, rhetoric was the art of persuasive discourse for effect. The tenets were neo-Aristotelian, which were relayed through Cicero and Quintilian. Colonial speakers practiced Aristotle's three genres of oratory, which still inhere in today's political discourse. Deliberative or legislative rhetoric, such as that spoken in the House and Senate, aimed for expedient action in the future. Forensic or courtroom advocacy sought justice for past actions. Epideictic or ceremonial speaking, such as the 4th of July oration, praised or blamed in the present.

Washington synthesized deliberative and epideictic rhetoric to change patterns in belief and action in the present and future. For example, his Annual Ad-

dresses praised American democracy while persuading the legislative branch for the year's political agenda, and the inaugural addresses ceremonially praised American political institutions and practices in the context of political purposes. Too, his Farewell Address fused the deliberative and epideictic genres, for it praised Americanism while subtly detailing a course of expedient, American action.

Neo-Aristotelianism also recognized three modes or means of persuasive proof. *Ethos*, ethical appeal, denoted what today we would label "character." The idea was that the people more likely would be persuaded by the speaker who possessed the better ethos, which was evidenced by how they perceived the orator's goodwill, good sense, and good moral character. *Logos*, logical appeal, denoted facts, evidence, and argument that targeted a listener's reasoning or mind. *Pathos*, emotional appeal, excited the passions, such as fear and hate, in order to move the crowd's emotions or to stir its heart. Washington, like many Enlightenment figures, eschewed emotional appeals and relied instead on logical appeals and his own established ethos to persuade his auditors. Or, as John Witherspoon, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and president of Princeton University, urged his pupils, among whom was Madison, with regard to public address: "Ne'er do ye speak unless ye ha' something to say, and when ye are done, be sure and leave off" (Einhorn, "James Madison," 44).

Eighteenth-century speakers more or less employed a classical model called the Five Canons of Oratory in speech-making. The following Latin terms are Cicero's. *Inventio* was the first canon and covered the invention or coming-into-being of a speech. *Dispositio* advised how to organize an address for effect. Classical speeches typically had an introduction, narration, confirmation, refutation, and conclusion. Washington's speeches do not illustrate a classical arrangement; rather, their structure tends to have a perfunctory beginning, middle, and end. *Elocutio* was the speech's style or word choice. The Romans recognized three kinds of style: the plain, middle, and grand.

Washington's presidential speeches were cast mainly in the grand style. The Latin word is *gravis*, which can denote "grand," but it also means heavy, weighty, ponderous, which is exactly how one would term Washington's style. Two questions about eighteenth-century *elocutio* naturally arise. Did other speakers of the late eighteenth century speak that way? Patrick Henry and Benjamin Franklin are relatively easy to read by today's standards. John Hancock and James Madison are more tedious. Thomas Jefferson's sentences are long but comprehensible. George Washington and John Adams are difficult to read. So, a ponderous style was not so much a function of the era as the person himself. Why, then, did Washington speak in such a heavy style? One suspects that he believed the nation's president should communicate with a ponderous diction, which inferentially reflected the distinction of the office to the president's audiences.

The fourth and fifth canons were *actio* or delivery, and *memoria*, which implied that the orator memorized the oration. Washington was not a dynamic speaker. He was aware of his shortcomings and did not like to speak in public. His voice was characterized as undistinguished, he spoke slowly, and he seldom gesticulated for force or emphasis and when he did, his gestures were awkward and stiff (Lucas and Zaeske, "George Washington," 6). Moreover, Washington did not master

his speeches, rather he delivered them from manuscript. If one has endured a manuscript speaker, one can draw his or her own conclusions. But at Newburgh, New York, March 15, 1783, facing a threat of mutiny by unpaid officers, Washington delivered a famous speech and then pulled out his glasses—a great thespian gesture—from his pocket to read a Congressman's letter. If one desires a twentieth-century analog to Washington's delivery and mastery of the speech text, General and President Dwight Eisenhower comes immediately to mind. With this brief classical overview in mind, one now has the rhetorical terminology in hand to understand the rhetoric of George Washington's Farewell Address.

Epidictic-Deliberative Rhetoric

At first glance, the Address appears to be epidictic, for it was situated in the present and purported to celebrate Washington's last eight years in office. But such a reading is superficial. What Washington really accomplished, probably unknowingly, was a modification of classical theory to satisfy his specific ends. Whereas epidictic oratory was traditionally praise *or* blame, Washington creatively transmuted the genre into praise *and* blame.

Washington had at least three immediate reasons for persuading his national audience. First, he wanted to justify his quitting the presidency after two terms by giving his reasons for doing so. This part of the speech was an *apologia*, which classicists would define as a speech of defense. His was a pre-emptive *apologia*, for the address presented a *fait accompli* as it precluded Congress or the people from asking him to change his mind. A second apologetic reason was to defend his foreign policy of neutrality. In 1793, France had declared war on Great Britain. From 1793-95, American public opinion bifurcated: One was a Jeffersonian Republican who favored France, or a Hamiltonian Federalist who supported England. Washington had proclaimed neutrality in 1793, which riled the pro-British public and rankled the pro-French populace. In this instance, when his concurring with one faction would automatically alienate the other side, Washington sensed that a good defense is often a strong offense, which indicates his last purpose.

His third reason blamed Americans who would favor the French or British as being un-American. This part of the speech was a *kategoria*, a classical speech of accusation (Ryan, "*Kategoria and Apologia: On Their Rhetorical Criticism as a Speech Set*," 254-261). He attacked the rampant sectionalism of New England, British, Capitalism versus Southern, French, Agrarianism. He condemned both extremes, for this sectionalism threatened to divide the country, which must remain neutral in order to develop its own national character that was neither British nor French but American.

Thus, Washington fused in the speech two kinds of speeches and two classical forms. As an epidictic address, he judiciously combined apology with attack. The president's assault on the sectionalists illustrated Washington's sagacity or *ethos* in defending his policy of neutrality, which cleverly implicated through *logos* the sectionalists as supporters of an un-American policy. Washington also astutely combined epidictic rhetoric to deliberative oratory by praising American unity and blaming the incipient rise of political parties. This remarkable melding of the two genres established the groundwork for Washington to address the future expe-

diency of no political parties, which he subdivided into domestic and foreign issues. All of these means and ends were generated in a canonical sequence.

Washington's *Actio* and *Memoria*

Although they are the fourth and fifth canons, the critic should here dispense with delivery and memory. Washington's Farewell Address was not a speech, so it was not delivered nor did Washington have to master its oral presentation. Since the president could not speak to the nation, he instead sought an efficient means of reaching the mass audience. He chose to have his address printed in newspapers and it first appeared in David C. Claypoole's *American Daily Advertiser*, no. 5444, on September 19, 1796, in Philadelphia (Paltsits, 55-56). In handling the publication of his address, one senses Washington's rhetorical resourcefulness, for in a modern sense he wanted his message distributed to the whole people, whom Madison thought were Washington's "only constituency" (Wills, 88). Note Madison's early sense of the rhetorical presidency. Madison had also suggested to the president, when he determined not to run in 1792, that Washington should deliver a valedictory address in September, 1792. This timing would allow candidates enough time to present their candidacies to the Electoral College. The timing of the 1796 address followed the same logic (Humes, 3).

Washington's *Inventio*

The first canon of invention, how the speech came-into-being, has already been treated extensively, so only a brief overview is in order (Paltsits, 25-54). In 1792 when Washington considered not running for a second term, James Madison composed a first draft that was based on Washington's dictation. The 1792 draft attacked sectionalism and division, which converged on domestic issues. This draft was not used and lay dormant until Washington turned to it again in 1797 when he determined not to run for a third term. With Madison's 1792 draft as a departure, Washington incorporated Madison's draft into his own speech written in the president's hand. The president asked Alexander Hamilton to look at the draft and Hamilton obliged. Hamilton made a list of Washington's "Sentiments" and recast the address. This draft became known as Hamilton's major draft. It was amended by Washington as it passed back and forth between ghost and author. Finally, Washington took Madison's draft and Hamilton's major draft, and composed anew a speech in his hand. Washington emended this handwritten draft and eventually sent it to the printers for the final text of the address.

Washington's *Dispositio*

The second classical canon of disposition recognized that content, to be effective, could not be listed wily-nilly but rather had to be presented in some cogent, reasonable form for persuasive effect. Hamilton had recast Washington's speech in what Hamilton thought was a better order. Paltsits did not discuss the address's arrangement, which was Washington's handiwork.

The Greek term for the Latin *dispositio* is *taxis*. *Taxis* originally indicated how the military commander deployed the troops for battle. The term was adapted by rhetoricians to denote how the orator arrayed the parts of a speech for effect.

The militarism of *taxis* is relevant to Washington, for he evidently understood how the communicator should marshal language for persuasive triumph. The commander-in-chief's *taxis* had a strategy and tactics.

The president's organizational strategy was not a frontal assault but more like guerrilla attacks that had worked so well against the British in the Revolutionary War. Rather than engaging the enemy straightaway, he captured persuasive ground in unfolding forays. The tactic was to gain acquiescence in small degrees rather than with one massive strike. His *taxis* unfolded in four phases. [The labeling of the underlined phases below is mine, not Washington's.]

1. Will Not Run Washington's gambit was innocent enough, as it did not divulge his strategy or tactics. Washington used the opening salvo of his address to announce and defend his decision not to stand for a third term. The persuasive function of this opening section, other than to announce his decision, was to demonstrate to his audience his *ethos* or goodwill, for he no longer had a persuasive or political axe to grind. Concomitantly, he also had to entice his audience to listen to his advice because he would no longer be president.

2. The Union Washington next sought common ground with his audience by praising the union in an epideictic fashion. But this posture quickly turned to deliberative overtones, for he encouraged his readers to maintain union over sectionalism at all costs. The preservation of the union, an important part of Madison's 1792 draft, figured even more prominently in 1797. This second section on the union revealed Washington's *ethos* of good sense, for thoughtful Americans would perceive the rationale for maintaining union in order to preserve their liberty. This was also a *logos* argument, as Washington demonstrated that liberty could not exist without union. For Washington, liberty and union were inextricably bound. Thus far, Washington really had said nothing to which most Americans could take exception to or, said in another way, he had not yet alienated his enemies. But the ground was now prepared for a new advance.

3. Attack on Sectionalism Washington finally confronted his enemies, but even here, the tactic was not so much a frontal charge as an oblique attack. Assuming that he had the audience's acquiescence on union, he cleverly used antithesis to polarize the people. The antithesis of union was sectionalism. Washington blamed the rise of political parties on sectionalism. Hence, he forced his listeners to conclude that because they valued union, they must abhor sectionalism. At this juncture, Washington wisely fused his attack to deliberative actions. His *logos* was clear. Since Americans should be committed to union, they should constrain factions. Washington adduced additional logical proof through practicing what he preached. By inviting Madison and Hamilton to contribute to his address, Washington demonstrated that political enemies, such as Hamilton versus Madison, could play a propitious part in advising the president. Washington himself had constrained factions for the greater good of union. His rhetoric also displayed his *ethos* of good sense and good will toward both men by optimizing their talents for the greater good.

4. Neutrality Having stigmatized the minority, Washington charged his audience to side with him and union versus the enemy and sectionalism. In a clearly deliberative fashion, the president urged courses of action that were cleverly de-

signed to bolster unity and to minimize divisiveness. He urged the unifying goals of prosperity, religion, and morality. The president deftly invited his audience to use its *logos* to infer that sectionalists would sabotage these goals for regional ends whereas union implied national benefits. He recommended “institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge” that would benefit all Americans;¹ he advocated taxation: “towards the payment of debt there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant”; and he entreated neutrality in thought and action toward foreign powers: “Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world” (*Washington’s Farewell Address*, 21, 21-22, 27. Hereafter, citations for the speech text will be given as *WFA*). Contemporary readers would have had little trouble in inferring Washington’s side-swipe of the “Democratic Societies he held accountable for the [Whiskey] rebellion” and “an implicit rebuke of Democratic-Republican leaders in the House of Representatives for their conduct in the battle over the Jay Treaty” (Lucas and Zaeske, 14).

Washington’s *logos* on the goal of neutrality deserves special mention. Washington propounded the general, deductive premise that the United States should “steer clear of permanent alliances” with foreign powers. Then, in an inductive fashion, he defended his policy of neutrality by demonstrating that it flowed logically from the general proposition. Lest listeners object to his reasoning, or did not assent to his universal principle, Washington offered concrete evidence to support his argument. Whereas the rest of the speech had been general assertions without specific examples to warrant his points, Washington marshaled precise proofs as *logos*. The president reminded his listeners that all quarters supported his plan of neutrality:

Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it. . . I will only observe, that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all (*WFA*, 30-31).

The famous phrase of avoiding “entangling alliances,” which is often and wrongly attributed to Washington’s Farewell Address, was coined in Thomas Jefferson’s First Inaugural Address. However, the third president could easily have appropriated the thought from Washington’s rhetoric: “Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, *entangle* [my emphasis] our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?” (*WFA*, 30-31).

The persuasive organizational strategy was Washington’s. If one examines the four sections of the speech, one will perceive his optimal order. Had he presented the section entitled 1. Will Not Run later in the address, his other sections would have seemed self-serving and hence easily dismissed as partisan. Likewise, he could not have broached the section called 3. Attack on Sectionalism without

first placing the section designated 2. The Union as the preferred hierarchical goal. Likewise, he logically saved 4. Neutrality until last, as this would have been politically out of place any earlier in the address.

Washington's *Elocutio*

The rationale of the classical stylistic devices was to polish a speech, to make it distinctive, and to give it an air of elegance and eloquence. These devices ornamented a speech, which was certainly not every man's style, and demarcated its language according to the station of the speaker. Washington fielded a force of *elocutio* devices that merits discussion. The purpose is not to itemize every one, but to highlight representative examples that illustrate Washington's expertise in *elocutio*.

In a letter—May 15, 1796—to Hamilton on how he should help the president's draft, Washington advised Hamilton that "My wish is, that the whole may appear in a plain stile [*sic*];—and be handed to the public in an honest;—unaffected;—simple garb. . . ." (Paltsits, 33). One cannot determine what kind of a style or *elocutio* that Washington conceived as "plain" or "simple," but the rhetorical reality remains that the address's style was not plain, but was in fact quite sophisticated and polished. The reason was Hamilton's diction. Indeed, Humes held that "The wording of the address was more ornate than Washington's" but that "the president expected a literary man to produce a document more fashionably in tune with the language of the current English essayists" (Humes, 10). How Washington used the following classical *elocutio* devices will demonstrate the point.

Apophasis is defined as affirmation by denial wherein the speaker actually affirms a point by ostensibly denying it, as in "I shall not talk about how he stole the election." Thus, apophasis allows the speaker to make a point without actually stating it. Washington used apophasis effectively in three passages. The first instance occurred in 2. Union where he used apophasis to mask his persuasive intent: "These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel" (WFA, 5. This was Hamilton's apophasis, Paltsits, 182). The sophisticated listener, who understands Washington's apophasis, would cleverly perceive that the president was NOT "disinterested" and that he DID have a "personal motive" in delivering the speech, else why would he bother to offer his sentiments at all? Later in 3. Attack on Sectionalism when he discussed the evils that can arise from rampant sectionalism, he detailed the bleak future, and then cleverly concluded with an apophasis: "Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which, nevertheless, ought not to be entirely out of sight,) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it" (WFA, 17. This was Hamilton's apophasis, Paltsits, 190). Washington invited his audience to contemplate a future beset with party factions without actually asking them to do so and without actually proving with *logos* that such a scenario was forthcoming. The last instance, located in 4. Neutrality, is a textbook example of apophasis, which, by now, needs no explanation: "In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not to hope they will

make the strong and lasting impression I could wish . . .” (WFA, 29. The apophysis was Hamilton’s, Paltsits, 198).

Washington deployed rhetorical questions throughout the speech. Many definitions of a rhetorical question abound, but the one employed here is classical: A rhetorical question is a question so phrased that it elicits from the audience the desired response, which may be vocal or quiet assent to oneself. When discussing Western versus Atlantic sectionalism, Washington concluded his argument with two rhetorical questions that cinched his *logos*: “Will it not be their wisdom to rely, for the presentation of these advantages, on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them to aliens?” (WFA, 12. The rhetorical question was Hamilton’s, Paltsits, 187).² When contending that religion and morality were “indispensable supports,” Washington cut to the core of the issue by beseeching: “Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?” (WFA, 20. The rhetorical question was Hamilton’s, Paltsits, 192.).³ The last instance is several rhetorical questions that he strung together, and the technical name is *plurium interrogationum* or many questions:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own, to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice? (WFA, 27. The *plurium interrogationum* was Hamilton’s, Paltsits, 196).

The ability to coin a metaphor has always been prized in oratory, for metaphors invite audiences to perceive new relationships and to attribute to the speaker a sharp intellect. Washington did not disappoint. He likened political parties to a fire, and graphically portrayed the metaphorical outcome: “A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume” (WFA, 18. The metaphor was Hamilton’s, Paltsits, 191). The metaphor of slavery/freedom was a particularly apt image in the eighteenth century, for the institution was ubiquitous in the new nation. For instance, Halford Ryan noted that the “master/slave metaphor made preeminent good sense” to the Richmond, Virginia audience for Patrick Henry’s famous *Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death* speech on March 23, 1775 (Ryan, *Classical Communication for the Contemporary Communicator*, 126). In one of the very few instances in which he stirred the audience’s *pathos*, Washington effectively played on the emotions of his white audience. He metaphorically alleged they would be like black slaves to England or France: “The nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave” (WFA, 23. The metaphor was Hamilton’s, Paltsits, 194). The metaphor was also a *logos* argument. Since whites would not be slaves, they would eschew a figurative bondage to foreign states.

The president took pains to polish his address with alliteration, but it was not overdone. A few obvious examples are: "Profoundly penetrated with this idea," "Toward the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state," and "diffusing and diversifying" (WFA, 4, 15, 28. All of the alliterations were Hamilton's, Paltsits, 181, 188, 197).

Tricola is the placing of phrases, clauses, words, in a unit of threes. Why three seems to work so well has never been established, but two seems not enough and more than three seems too much. Washington interspersed tricolos throughout his Farewell. In one instance, he combined tricola with alliteration: "to the applause, the affection, and adoption" (WFA, 5. The tricola and alliteration were Madison's, Paltsits, 162). Other examples were regular tricolos—"common dangers, sufferings, and successes," "stifled, controlled, or repressed," "recommended by policy, humanity, and interest," "moderation, perseverance, and firmness," and his very last words, which were cast in tricola, "mutual cares, labors, and dangers" (WFA, 7, 16, 28, 30, 32. All, except one, of the tricolos were Hamilton's, Paltsits, 183, 189, 197, 181. Washington added the tricola—"moderation, perseverance, and firmness"—Paltsits, 157).⁴

"Maxims," Aristotle noted, "make one great contribution to speeches because of the uncultivated mind of the audience; for people are pleased if someone in a general observation hits upon opinions that they themselves have about a particular instance" (Aristotle, 186). Indeed, Washington twice in his speech identified his wise sayings as maxims (WFA, 18. The maxim was Hamilton's, Paltsits, 190). President Washington's adages were grounded in the belief that isolationism best suited the new nation, which he pithily stated in several memorable maxims:

- Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another (WFA, 18. The maxim was Hamilton's, Paltsits, 190).
- It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government (WFA, 20. The maxim was Hamilton's, Paltsits, 192).
- Such an attachment of a small or weak nation, toward a great and powerful one, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter (WFA, 25. The maxim was Hamilton's, Paltsits, 195).
- There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation (WFA, 29. The maxim was Hamilton's, Paltsits, 198).

The Address's most famous maxim, "Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world," began as Hamilton's—"Tis our true policy as a general principle to avoid permanent or close alliances"; Washington himself added the famous nautical metaphor and a concrete prepositional phrase: "Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world" (WFA, 27. For Hamilton, see Paltsits, 197, and for Washington, see Paltsits, 156).

How the critic accounts for Washington's *elocutio* devices is a matter of taste.

He did not overdo them as the devices did not detour his message and unadorned diction seemed unfit for such an address. He was a prototype for polished presidential persuasions, such as those by Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt, and John Kennedy. Washington created expectations that the chief executive should not address the nation as every man would, but neither should the message's diction distract the audience from its core communication.

The Problem of "Ghosts" in the Address

The close reader of the bibliographic citations for the previous section would naturally observe that almost all of the *elocutio* devices were Hamilton's inventions. How, in any meaningful sense, can one attribute them to Washington?

The president's handwritten draft of the final address is the sticking point. Its existence can imply that Washington meant to deceive posterity. A furor arose in the 1820s when it became known that the authorship of the address was certainly not attributable to Washington alone and especially was at least some of Hamilton's handiwork (Paltsits, 75-94). An analogous example in the twentieth century is Franklin Roosevelt's famous First Inaugural Address. FDR wrote out in long hand a so-called first draft, when in fact he copied out Raymond Moley's draft, as Washington did with Hamilton's draft. This copying led Kenneth Davis to conclude that the procedure "was done with deliberate *intent* [emphasis in original] to deceive posterity" (Davis, 102). Hence, one could infer analogously that Washington meant to deceive.

Yet, exculpatory evidence exists. With regard to FDR's First Inaugural Address, the president made his own emendations as he copied Moley's draft (Ryan, "Roosevelt's First Inaugural: A Study of Technique," 138-39). Washington did so with Hamilton's draft, in fact, significantly more so. Moley told the president-elect, after FDR had finished copying Moley's draft, "This is your speech now" (Moley, 114). Much the same transpired between Hamilton and Washington, for Hamilton wrote the president: [I]n short if there be anything further in the matter in which I can be of any [service], I will with great pleasure obey your commands" (Paltsits, 53). James Flexner held that "[T]he Farewell Address was a much Washington's as any Presidential paper is likely to be that has been drafted by an intimate aide" (Flexner, 307). Hence, Washington's final, handwritten manuscript was definitely the president's:

In the last analysis he was his own editor; and the Farewell Address, in the final form for publication, was *all* in his own handwriting. It was then in content and form what *he* had chosen to make it by the process of adoption and adaption in fulfillment of what *he* desired. By this procedure every idea became his own without equivocation" (Paltsits 54. Emphasis is in the original).

Ghostwriters were from the start and continue to be a political given in presidential persuasions. However troubling that fact might be for the ultimate answer of whether Washington's speeches were his or his ghostwriters, an expedient maxim was coined by Arthur Larson—a speech writer for Dwight Eisenhower, another

general-turned-president: “[T]he President’s speech is the President’s speech” (Larson, 150).

The Persuasiveness of Washington’s Address

Washington’s rhetoric in the Farewell Address achieved divers results (Paltsits, 56-74, inventories eighteenth-century newspaper reactions to Washington’s Address). The short-run effect of his defending 1. Will Not Run was successful. Immediately after he announced, contenders started to position themselves for the presidency. Democratic newspapers denounced Washington for quitting, because, they scurrilously claimed, he could not be re-elected. Although not a direct result of this address, Washington set the precedent for two terms that Franklin Roosevelt broke in 1940 when he ran for a third term.

Washington’s military experiences equipped him to deal on terms of future expediency with regard to 4. Neutrality. He realized that the United States should not be a pawn of any European power, that it had to stand militarily on its own, and that therefore the nation would need considerable time to reach a par with England or France. It is tenuous to suggest that Washington’s address had a direct effect on American neutrality or isolationism that remained strong until World War I, that surfaced again in the peace movement of the 1930s, and that lasted until Pearl Harbor. Nevertheless, Washington’s address empowered several orators. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge [R-MA] argued that the United States should eschew the League of Nations in a speech on August 12, 1919, by appealing to “Washington’s declaration against our interfering in European questions” (Lodge, 3778-3784). Lodge’s partner in the eventual defeat of the League was Senator William Borah [R-ID] who waxed eloquently in the Senate by entreating fellow senators to remember Washington’s Farewell Address: “The puny demagogue, the barren editor, the sterile professor now vie with each other in apologizing for the temporary and commonplace expedients which the Father of our Country felt constrained to adopt in building a republic!” (Borah, 8784). In a speech entitled the Menace of the World Court, January 27, 1935, Father Charles Coughlin, the Radio Priest, implored “the fatherly admonitions of Washington and Jefferson which still ring in our ears” and “let us bow our heads in shame for desecrating the final words bequeathed to us by the Father of our Country—‘no European entanglements’ [emphasis in original]” (Carpenter, 158, 169).⁵ Even as late as 1939, Washington’s neutrality figured prominently in President Franklin Roosevelt’s rhetoric. In FDR’s Fireside Chat on war in Europe, September 3, 1939, the thirty-second president echoed the first president’s dictum on neutrality: “This nation will remain a neutral nation” (*The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1939*, 463).

Washington’s domestic prowess was less prescient with regard to 3. Attack on Sectionalism and political parties. His plea against them was still-born and naive. Political parties were a fact of life late in his administration, witness his address that attacked them, and they would not die. Parties thrived under John Adams’s presidency and were solidified by the time of Thomas Jefferson.

Washington’s stance on 2. The Union was used by slavers and anti-slavers before the Civil War. In the famous Senatorial debates in the Compromise of 1850, Northerners appealed to Southerners to remember Washington’s plea for

national unity. Senator John C. Calhoun of South Carolina caustically reminded Northerners that Washington was a Southerner and a slaveholder: "Nor can the Union be saved by invoking the name of the illustrious Southerner whose mortal remains repose on the western bank of the Potomac. He was one of us a slaveholder and a planter" (Calhoun, 454).⁶

Conclusion

Perhaps the lasting legacy of George Washington's Farewell Address was its prescient sagacity. President Dwight Eisenhower, in his famous Farewell Address, January 17, 1961, detailed the perils of the military-industrial complex: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. . . . We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes."⁷ The first president presaged the thirty-fourth president's wise words: "Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican government" (WFA, 10).

Washington perceived and communicated the great maxim of the United States: Americans cannot have liberty without union. Senator Daniel Webster perorated the maxim most memorably in his Second Reply to Hayne, January 26-27, 1830, when the Massachusetts senator ended his oration: "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable" (Webster, 80). The first president's rhetoric was the prototype: "In this sense it is that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other" (WFA, 10. The maxim was Hamilton's, *Paltsits*, 144).

Endnotes

¹ As he was retiring from the presidency and putting his words into action, Washington gave 100 shares of James River Company stock, valued around \$50,000, to Liberty Hall Academy in Lexington, Virginia; grateful trustees changed the school's name to Washington Academy, which eventually became Washington and Lee University.

² Did the reader perceive Washington's, really Hamilton's, apophysis about "advisers, if such there are, who would sever. . . ." He affirmed this point by appearing to deny it.

³ Incidentally, this passage also illustrates *asyndeton*, which is leaving out the connective, and *tricola*, which is casting a grammatical member in threes: "for property, for reputation, for life."

⁴ It is interesting to note, with regard to *dispositio*, that Washington lined out the tricola of "mutual cares, labors, and dangers" on Hamilton's draft, *Paltsits*, 140, and replaced the tricola at the very end of his address, *Paltsits*, 159.

⁵ The keen reader will observe that Father Coughlin misquoted Washington, but the padre did manage to present the gist of the first president's maxim.

⁶ Of all the Virginia slaveholding dynasty of presidents, Washington was the only one to emancipate his slaves upon his death.

⁷ The term "military-industrial complex" was not Eisenhower's but Malcolm

Moos's, a speech writer for President Eisenhower (Crabbe, 119).

Works Cited

- Aly, Bower. "Alexander Hamilton." *History and Criticism of American Public Address*. Ed. Marie Kathryn Hochmuth. Vol. 3. New York: Russell and Russell, 1955.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Borah, William. *Congressional Record*, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., vol 58, pt. 9, 8784.
- Calhoun, John C. "Constitution and Union." *Congressional Globe*, 31 Cong., 1st Sess., vol. XXI, pt. 4. Washington, D.C.: John C. Rives.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs and Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. "Inaugurating the Presidency." *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*. Ed. Herbert W. Simons and Aram A. Aghazarian. Columbia: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1986. An earlier version of this essay was published in *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 15 (1985): 394-411.
- Carpenter, Ronald H. *Father Charles E. Coughlin: Surrogate Spokesman for the Disaffected*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Crabbe, Richard E. "Dwight David Eisenhower." *American Orators of the Twentieth Century: Critical Studies and Sources*. Ed. Bernard K. Duffy and Halford R. Ryan. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Davis, Kenneth S. "FDR as a Biographers Problem." *American Scholar* 53 (Winter 1983-84): 100-108.
- Einhorn, Lois J. "The Ghosts Unmasked: A Review of Literature on Speechwriting." *Communication Quarterly* 30 (1981): 41-47.
- Einhorn, Lois J. "James Madison." *U. S. Presidents as Orators*. Ed. Halford Ryan. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Flexner, James Thomas. *George Washington: Anguish and Farewell (1793-1799)*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1969.
- Humes, James C. *My Fellow Americans: Presidential Addresses that Shaped History*. New York: Praeger, 1992.
- Larson, Arthur. *The President Nobody Knew*. New York: Scribner's, 1968.
- Lodge, Henry Cabot. "In Opposition to the Proposed League of Nations." United States Senate, August 12, 1919, *Congressional Record*, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., vol. 58, pt. 4, 3778-3784.
- Lucas, Stephen E. and Zaeske, Susan. "George Washington." *U. S. Presidents as Orators*. Ed. Halford Ryan. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Moley, Raymond. *The First New Deal*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1966.
- Paltsits, Victor Hugo. *Washington's Farewell Address*. New York: New York Public Library, 1935.
- The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1939*. "Fireside Chat on War," September 3, 1939. Ed. Samuel I. Rosenman. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941).
- Ryan, Halford. *Classical Communication for the Contemporary Communicator*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1991.

- Ryan, Halford Ross. "Kategoria and Apologia: On Their Rhetorical Criticism as a Speech Set." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 254-261.
- Ryan, Halford Ross. "Roosevelt's First Inaugural: A Study of Technique." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (April 1979): 137-149.
- Washington's Farewell Address. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Document No. 105-22. Washington: GPO, 1998.
- Webster, Daniel Webster. "Second Reply to Hayne." *Register of Debates in Congress*. Vol. VI, Part I. Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1830.
- Wills, Garry. *Cincinnatus: George Washington and the Enlightenment*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1984.
- Wolfarth, Donald L. "John F. Kennedy in the Tradition of Inaugural Speeches." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 47 (1961): 124-132.

Inside and Outside the Bubble: Forensic and Non-Forensic Views of Acceptable Humor Forms

Andrew C. Billings

Everyone claims to have a sense of humor; yet, much like a fingerprint, no two senses of humor are alike. Nonetheless, armed with an individualized cognitive taxonomy of what is and is not funny, people regularly assess the humor levels of a joke, comment, or television show. While no one can seem to agree on someone or something that is universally funny, we increasingly try to do so, creating cognitive dissonance not only for the people attempting to assess the humor but also for the people attempting to be funny. Within the realm of this humor debate, a smaller nebulous area remains: what makes a certain form of humor offensive? Both in forensics and in everyday social interactions, decisions regarding acceptable humor are murky at best, making communication apprehension regarding humor a common phenomenon. This paper attempts to explicate the issue of potentially offensive humor in both the speech and non-speech worlds. In doing so, both people within and outside the forensic community can gain a better understanding as to where many people mentally “draw the line.” Moreover, comparisons between acceptable humor within the two venues can be illuminated.

Related Literature

Discerning acceptable humor has been an issue scholars have attempted to explicate for years. Young and Frye (1966) note that “laughter is one of a few universal forms of emotional expression” but that it has rarely been addressed in communication literature. Over three decades later, the research has improved, but still be sparse when compared to the importance of analyzing humor. O’Connell (1960) was the first to categorize and define three broad humor genres: humor, wit, and nonsense. Young and Frye (1966) added a fourth dimension: sex humor. The researchers found marked differences between the way a group responded to sexual humor as compared to the other three genres.

Categories of humor were deconstructed into smaller categories, with Winick (1976) using eighteen genres of humor for his analysis. Winick noted that while sexual and ethnic humor dominated culture, many other forms of humor were emerging. A quarter-century later, these forms of humor have been sub-divided into even more distinct categories. More topics have become subject to jokes that were considered off-limits previously. The result is that while humor is designed to skewer societal norms, more humor is found to offend and demoralize culture. The need to analyze offensiveness ratings of humor forms has never been more needed.

Andrew C. Billings (Ph.D., Indiana University, 1999) is an Assistant Professor and the Director of Forensics, Clemson University. His forensic research focus often examines after-dinner speaking and identity issues within individual events.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 38 (2001), 16-26

McGhee (1979) argues that there is both a cognitive and symbolic nature of humor, while Lorenz (1963) views humor as a risky yet valuable rhetorical tool that can have a highly persuasive function. In his seminal speaker evaluation studies of humor effects, Gruner (1967, 1978) found that speaker credibility can alter greatly dependent on the type of humor and the perceived wit of the person performing it.

Yet, little research has addressed perceptions of what is considered to be obscene. Most of the literature is more than two decades old, but potentially offensive humor has been analyzed in terms of race (LaFave & Mannell, 1976), gender (Chapman & Gadfield, 1976; Cantor, 1976), and social context (Winick, 1976). Fine (1976) did actually conduct a study addressing obscene jokes, but focused on the role of in-group and out-group status across cultures. Still, Fine's work yielded an important finding for this particular study in noting that the demographic make-up of the audience can significantly impact the potential offensiveness of the humor. One can logically follow this finding through making a sample comparison of a White speaker espousing racist humor and a Black speaker espousing racist humor—the way the audience responds to the humor could fluctuate greatly depending on the in-group status of the speaker and the audience.

In arguing for a four-function humor model, Meyer (2000) refers to the dilemma as a “double-edged sword” as he claims that humor often serves as both a unifier and a divider (p. 310). The uniting functions of humor, according to Meyer are identification and clarification; the divisive functions are enforcement and differentiation. Because this study focuses on the humor that divides (labeling as “offensive” or “non-offensive”), focus on the latter two facets of the model is warranted.

The first of these two divisive functions of humor is labeled as enforcement. Meyer used the example of Ronald Reagan to explain this concept, as Reagan was often able to make jokes about issues he did not agree with to persuade people to his side of a social or political cause. In doing so, Reagan not only got some laughs, but also avoided being seen as the angry, disillusioned critic (Meyer, 1990).

The second function of humor that often divides an audience is what Meyer terms “differentiation” (p. 321). Meyer argues that this form of humor invokes both alliances and distinctions. Using Bob Dole's humorous rhetoric in the 1996 presidential campaign as exemplar, this function of humor attempts to contrast differences. For instance, Bob Dole claimed that President Clinton was attempting to be a good Republican, but then showed differences between himself and his Democratic opponent. In essence, Dole used humor to show just how different the presidential candidates were, fulfilling a function of differentiation.

The Forensic Laboratory

One of the basic justifications for forensic research postulates that, as an entity, the forensic environment can be used to study real-life communication. Proponents of this mindset argue that findings we learn in competitive forensics can be applied to the outside world—a forensic laboratory, so to say. Yet, over the past few decades, the concept of the forensic laboratory seems to have disintegrated, in what Swanson (1992) terms a “disturbing trend...to become more isolated from

the mainstream speech communication curriculum" (p. 49).

Many have argued that forensics can be a much-improved educational environment if the laboratory concept took root again today. Friedley (1992) applied forensics to interpersonal communication, arguing that situations such as the coach/competitor dyad could speak volumes within the discipline. Zeuschner (1992) used the forensics as laboratory mindset to explore small group communication, analyzing the forensic discipline through the application of Mills' (1967) six models of small group communication. Swanson (1992) argued for the organizational communication realm, arguing that issues such as organizational skills training and organizational climate directly related to the skills and climate in which a forensic competitor must live at a given tournament. Dreibelbis and Gullifor (1992) implemented the mass media mindset to incorporate their view of forensics as laboratory. In doing so, they found that students learn audience analysis and speech writing skills that would directly benefit them in mass media. The parallels between the skills learned in forensics and their application to career and societal skills are endless.

Standards and Assessment

In determining the formula for acceptable after-dinner humor, one must first understand the struggle to define a formula for after-dinner speaking as a whole. No individual event struggles for definition in the same manner as after-dinner speaking. The ideal balance between research and humor has been the discussion of debate for years. Andrews, Andrews, and Williams (1999) indicate that the purposes of after-dinner speaking should be to stimulate enjoyment, use humor effectively, deliver in an engaging style, and convey a meaningful message. However, anyone within the forensic community can notice that the after-dinner speaking textbook and competitive definitions are indelibly different. Scholars have attempted to find a representative criteria for after-dinner speaking (Swanson & Zeuschner, 1983; Mills, 1984; Dreibelbis & Redmon, 1987; Hanson, 1988; Holm, 1993; Billings, 1997). The studies offered insight into the variables judges claim to employ when judging a competitive after-dinner speech, yet underscored the problem inherent in contemporary after-dinner speaking: the evaluation criteria judges use for after-dinner speaking is more inconsistent than the criteria for any other individual event. Students have countered this problem by trying to be all things to all people; the prospect of such an achievement is nearly impossible.

Within the attempt to fulfill increasingly broadened judging criteria, after-dinner speeches have suffered in many ways—none more than humor. In a pair of papers exacting the problems with being funny in an after-dinner speech, Richardson (1999) and Hall (1999) argued that the implied after-dinner success formula was too stringent and placed humor and originality low on a relative scale of importance. Richardson (1999) writes that after-dinner speaking should offer creativity that no other event can match:

It is forensics outside the box, ideally. Unfortunately, current trends in the event threaten to stifle the very creativity that makes after-dinner unique. Narrow judging paradigms and paint-by-number, cookie cutter approaches re-

ward imitation over imagination. Forensic convention is forcing ADS inside the box. (p.1)

Also noting humor-related problems in after-dinner speaking, Hall (1999) notes that irony and other more subtle forms of humor are undervalued. Writes Hall:

Although we vehemently deny that after-dinner speaking resembles stand-up comedy, we do little to encourage the distinction. We call it whatever we want to...but the only real difference between this year's national ADS champion and Denis Leary is that one uses biting, driven humor and one cites the *Wall Street Journal*. (p. 1)

Clearly, part of the reduced humor in after-dinner speeches can be attributed to an increasingly sensitive public, monitoring what is or is not acceptable humor. The age of political correctness alters the way students construct speeches, opting for safe humor over edgy humor, impeding creativity and the no-holds-barred nature of humor itself. As Richardson (1999) argues, "We don't necessarily tell the same jokes year after year. We tell the same kind of jokes" (p. 6).

Pinpointing what goes into a model after-dinner speech has been the focus of scholars for years. Many researchers have made attempts to ascertain so-called after-dinner speaking "formulas". Mills (1984) notes content and style as the main categories of judging criteria that should be employed. The fact that Anderson and Martin (1983) argue that the implied definition of competitive after-dinner speaking was a speech that makes a humorous point implies that the overall purpose of the speech should be persuasive in nature. Yet, these scholars differed as to what the added criteria should be for the ideal after-dinner speech.

Billings (1997) conducted the most recent survey of attitudes regarding after-dinner speaking. Using the responses from 115 coaches and students, Billings noted several important findings. First, humor and research were found to be almost equally important in constructing the proper after-dinner speech balance. Thirty-five percent of all students and coaches surveyed noted humor is the most important element for success; 28% argued that research is more important; 37% argued they are equally important. Additionally, Billings found that overdone topics were a significant concern of 96% of all respondents. The study also found students particularly concerned with the lack of uniform judging criteria; 35% of all students surveyed listed it as the biggest problem facing after-dinner speaking. Billings concluded that attention should be paid to noting the difference between a set of event *criteria* and a judges' *formula* for a successful speech, arguing that the guideline of "a speech that makes a point through the use of humor" should be a common criteria, but that judges should abstain from invoking their own success formulas on each after-dinner speaking contestant. Writes Billings:

One of the strengths of after-dinner speaking is its lack of a "success formula." A final round can witness a speech with two sources followed by a speech with twenty. Speeches can employ different types of humor, from slapstick to deadpan. While preferences for certain humor formats will always be a matter of taste, this diversity makes the event stronger. (p. 48)

Billings, in a future study, examines the concept of humor within the success formula, finding that countless forms of humor could result in a lowered score from an offended judge. Billings (in press) writes:

After-dinner speaking does have a responsibility to the “thought police” to discern what is decent and what truly offends. However, when so many forms of humor become potential pitfalls that drop students to the bottom of a round, entertainment becomes a secondary function of after-dinner speaking—a prospect that should never come to fruition. (n.p.)

Because of findings such as these, the analysis of acceptable humor both within and outside of the forensic community must be examined. Billings (in press) noted that the way to assess such humor genres is in terms of two terms: offensiveness and tolerance. Billings argues that for the sake of clarity within such analyses, these terms should be viewed as one, because both serve as measuring sticks that determine where a person cognitively draws “the line.”

Research Questions

While several studies within the communication discipline have addressed various forms of offensive humor (see Fine, 1976; Lafave and Mannell, 1976; Chapman & Gadfield, 1976). Additionally, Meyer (2000) recently argued that humor can serve two broad dimensions, one of which was devisiveness—a concept strongly related to offensive humor as well. Still, no study has examined differences between the forensic audience and the non-forensic audience when assessing potentially offensive humor genres. Through comparing humor evaluations of both forensic judges and people not involved in forensics, conclusions can be drawn as to the similarity between the forensic (lab) scores and the non-forensic (“real world”) scores. Thus, two key research questions must be postulated for this study:

- RQ1: Will ratings of potentially offensive humor forms differ significantly between forensic judges and people not involved in forensics?
- RQ2: Will the amount of agreement on each humor form (as determined by standard deviations) differ significantly between forensic judges and people not involved in forensics?

Method

As reported in Billings (in press) focus groups were used to determine forms of humor potentially judged to be intolerable by segments of the forensics judging community. Three groups with four persons each brainstormed humor genres used in after-dinner speaking. These groups then narrowed the list of humor genres by determining which forms of humor fit most closely with questions of potential offensiveness. Based on the findings of these groups, a total of 14 humor genres were deemed to be valid areas for measurement of potential offensiveness. Two humor genres (forensic-related humor and tangential humor) were eliminated from

the sample because they lacked a non-forensic equivalent. One additional item (pertaining to humor related to people in the "audience" was adapted to become humor about people "in the room"). In all, fourteen items (found in Appendix A) were placed into semantic differential format, with two different sentences being used. Forensic respondents were given the items as they fit into the sentence: "I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of _____ humor in after-dinner speeches." Non-forensic respondents were given the items as they fit into the sentence: "I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of _____ humor." Semantic scales ranged from (1) agree (tolerant), to (7) disagree (not tolerant).

Forensic-oriented surveys were distributed to judges at three prominent individual events tournaments in the 1999-2000 academic year. Surveys that were geared toward non-forensic participants were distributed to students at a large southeastern university in the spring and fall of 2000. Because many of the judges were in their twenties, and the large majority of students were in their twenties, these two groups provided an accurate comparison for analysis. After surveys were completed, results were calculated using SPSS for Windows 9.0 (1999). The items were tested for reliability; a relatively high alpha (.8081) calculated. Consequently, no items were deleted from the analysis.

Results

A total of 140 surveys were completed for use in the study. 71 were forensic judges; 69 were people not involved in forensics at all. The gender of the respondents was fairly balanced: 67 men; 73 women. Ethnically, Caucasians represented the majority of the sample (111/79%). Eleven of the respondents indicated they were African-American; four self-identified as Hispanic; four more indicated Asian descent. Respondents were asked to rate their tolerance of a given after-dinner speaking humor genre on a seven-point semantic differential scale. Table 1 indicates the overall means and standard deviations derived from the humor tolerance scales of both forensic and non-forensic respondents.

Table 1 indicates large differences between the two respondent groups. Because 4.00 was a statistical center for the items, any averages of 4.01 or higher were deemed intolerable to a significant segment of judges. Almost the same number of humor forms were found to be offensive by both groups (Forensics = 7; Non-forensics = 6). However, the differences on a single-item basis indicated significant differences between the groups. Forensic respondents were significantly more offended than were the non-forensic respondents on five of the items. These items included homophobia (+1.27), profanity (+1.18), slapstick (+.92), sexism (+.85), and sexually explicit humor (+.68). However, two forms of humor were deemed to be significantly more offensive for the non-forensic respondents. These included humor about people in the room (-.47) and especially humor related to diseases and/or disorders (-1.29). In fact, while diseases and/or disorders was the sixth most offensive humor genre for the forensic group, it became the most offensive humor genre in the non-forensic group. The other major difference in the rank-ordering of offensiveness was jokes pertaining to the audience/people in the room. Forensic respondents found that form of humor to be fairly mild (ranking 12th), while non-forensic respondents were more likely to be offended by

the genre (ranking 6th). Because half of the scales yielded significant differences between forensic and non-forensic respondents, research question #1 is answered by saying that forensic respondents were more offended in five key areas, while non-forensic respondents were more offended in two key areas.

Research question #2 pertained to the amount of agreement within each of the two study groups. There was significantly less agreement within the forensic

Table 1
Overall means of humor-genre tolerance scales by condition

<i>Humor Genre</i>	Forensics			Non-Forensic			<i>Net Diff</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. Dev.</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. Dev.</i>	<i>Rank</i>	
Age	2.87	1.81	(13)	2.76	1.61	(12)	+.11
People in Room/Audienc	3.67	2.42	(12)	4.14	1.87	(6)	-.47*
Diseases/ Disorders	4.26	1.61	(6)	5.55	1.51	(1)	-1.29*
Gender	4.24	2.09	(7)	3.39	1.75	(7)	+.85*
Homophobic	4.61	2.10	(4)	3.34	1.81	(8)	+1.27*
Mentally Handicapped	5.09	1.96	(1)	5.29	1.60	(3)	-.20
Physically Handicapped	5.05	2.08	(2)	5.42	1.60	(2)	-.37
Political	1.98	1.23	(14)	1.63	0.98	(14)	+.35
Profanity	3.99	1.87	(8)	2.81	1.99	(11)	+1.18*
Racist	4.87	2.04	(3)	4.88	1.85	(4)	-.01
Religious	3.36	1.81	(11)	3.27	1.97	(9)	+.09
Sexually Explicit	3.85	2.11	(9)	3.17	1.97	(10)	+.68*
Slapstick	3.09	2.00	(12)	2.17	1.50	(13)	+.92*
Violence	4.38	1.65	(5)	4.64	1.64	(5)	-.26

* = Significant difference at .05 level.
Rankings: From most offensive (1) to least offensive (14)

1.0 = Highly Tolerant
7.0 = Not Tolerant

respondents than there was within the non-forensic respondents. Half of the items for the forensic group resulted in high standard deviations of 2.00 or larger. None of the items for the non-forensic group yielded a standard deviation as high as 2.00. As a result, research question #2 is answered in the fact that the forensic community has very little agreement on acceptable humor in after-dinner speeches, while the non-forensic community appears to have more consistent standards for tolerable and intolerable humor.

Discussion

Contributions to the communication discipline and the concept of the forensic laboratory can be explicated from the findings in the study. First, this study confirms the work of Winick (1976) who found that the social context of a situation can alter whether dialogue is assessed as humorous or not humorous. Additionally, the findings fit Meyer's (2000) model closely, as the categories show that humor is inherently divisive in its nature. The high standard deviations within the study indicate that most all of the humor formats, while yielding significantly different overall ratings, still can be seen as a hit-or-miss proposal.

Second, the results indicate that levels of humor tolerance are clearly not the same in the lab (after-dinner speaking round) as they are in the field (outside community). Five forms of humor were considerably more likely to offend if told in competition, indicating that either forensic judges were much more touchy about these issues, or that there are certain forms of humor that may not be acceptable for formal competition, but which may be acceptable in a less formal environment. The fact that these genres of humor that were considerably more offensive included identity issues such as homophobia and sexism lead one to conclude that identity issues are the largest potential minefield for a person attempting to be funny. The fact that profanity was considerably less accepted in formal competition may be the best example of how formal and informal humor can vary considerably.

The two forms of humor that inversely were more offensive to the general population than to the forensic community were the issues of humor directed at someone in the room and jokes pertaining to disorders and diseases such as Alzheimer's disease. The forensic community's willingness to award the use of jokes about people in the room because they indicate a higher level of audience adaptation could explain the former finding. The latter, on the other hand, requires future investigation. While forensic respondents clearly did have some problems with jokes about diseases and disorders (4.26 rating), it clearly did not offend nearly as much as for the general population (5.55 rating). Future research should explore how such a large inequity in taste could exist.

The second research question pertained to the standard deviations as they relate to perceived agreement on these fourteen humor formats. Significant differences existed again within this measure. As many after-dinner speakers could guess, constructing a speech in which all judges find the humor to be acceptable must be a monumental task, as tolerable humor ranges much more greatly from judge to judge than it does from person to person in the general population. One reason why the general population is in more agreement on acceptable humor forms could be that there have simply been more opportunities for checking the standards. The general population discerns where the rest of the society draws the line in everyday interaction; the forensic community usually cannot discern what is acceptable humor within the activity unless they are at the tournament itself. Still, future research must strive to uncover the reason for this lack of judging consistency. If it were only a matter of taste, the ratings should vary just as much as they do for the general population. Because this is not the case, some other variable must also be interacting in this humor equation.

Finally, it is important to address the limitations within the current study. First, this study only analyzed sixteen genres of humor. Obviously, one could concoct a list of over a hundred different forms of humor to test, making the results of this study limited only to the humor forms in question. Additionally, subjects were not exposed to the text of actual jokes; rather, they were asked how they felt about the humor genre in its entirety. This obviously could alter ratings, as one person could be mentally imagining much harsher jokes within a genre than another person would. Future research needs to examine more genres of humor and also needs to take the next step in the forensic laboratory process by providing respondents with actual humor stimuli to assess. This study can provide an appropriate heuristic for such an analysis.

Conclusion

While the forensic laboratory is intended to provide real-world applications of issues, this study found that telling a joke within the competitive environment is quite different from telling a joke in other forms of the public domain. Forensics as laboratory is an important concept, if for no other reason than for “checks” such as this study. If the pedagogical goal of forensics is in the laboratory aspect, students and coaches alike should embrace these results as an important learning tool. We now know that humor tastes differ within the forensic community. We should all now pursue the more interesting question of why they exist. If we, as a community, can uncover the answer, surely the pedagogical process is alive and well in competitive forensics.

Appendix A

- 1.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of religious humor (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
 AGREE : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : DISAGREE
- 2.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of racist humor (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
 AGREE : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : DISAGREE
- 3.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of political humor (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
 AGREE : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : DISAGREE
- 4.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of sexually explicit humor (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
 AGREE : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : DISAGREE
- 5.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor that disparages men or women (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
 AGREE : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : DISAGREE
- 6.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of slapstick humor (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
 AGREE : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : DISAGREE
- 7.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant humor pertaining to violent acts (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).

- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 8.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor using obscene or profane language (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 9.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of homophobic humor (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 10.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor pertaining to the mentally handicapped (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 11.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor pertaining to the physically handicapped (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 12.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor pertaining to diseases/disorders such as Alzheimer's or Epilepsy or (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 13.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor pertaining to age (*Forensic*: in after-dinner speeches).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE
- 14.) I would say that, on the whole, I am tolerant of humor that makes fun of (*Forensic*: audience members/fellow contestants in after-dinner speeches) (*Non-forensic*: people in the room).
- AGREE :____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____: DISAGREE

References

- Andrews, J.R., Andrews, P.H., and Williams, G. (1999). Public speaking: Connecting you and your audience. New York, NY: Houghton-Mifflin, 1st edition.
- Anderson, D. & Martin, P. (1983). After dinner speaking: a descriptive analysis of evaluation criteria. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.
- Billings, A.C. (in press). Offending none, entertaining none: acceptable humor in after-dinner speeches. *National Forensic Journal*.
- Billings, A.C. (1997). When criteria becomes formula: The search for standardization within competitive after-dinner speeches. *National Forensic Journal*, 39-50.
- Cantor, J.R. (1976). What is funny to whom? The role of gender. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 164-172.
- Chapman, A.J. & Gadfield, N.J. (1976). Is sexual humor sexist? *Journal of Communication*, 26, 141-153.
- Dreibelbis, G.C. & Gullifor, P. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in mass media. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 77-82.
- Dreibelbis, G. & Redmon, K. (1987). But seriously folks...suggestions and considerations for writing the competitive after-dinner speech. *National Forensic*

Journal, 5, 78-95.

Fine, G.A. (1976). Obscene joking across cultures. *Journal of Communication*, 26(3), 134-140.

Freidley, S.A. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in interpersonal communication. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 51-56.

Gruner, C.R. (1978). *Understanding laughter: The working of wit and humor*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Gruner, C.R. (1967). Effect of humor on speaker ethos and audience information gain. *Journal of Communication*, 17(3), 228-233.

Hall, B. (1999). Funny, but not 'ha, ha' funny: The lack of irony in competitive after dinner speaking. Paper presented at the National Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Hanson, C. (1988). Judging after-dinner speaking, identifying the criteria for evaluation, *National Forensic Journal*, 6, p. 29.

Holm, T.T. (1993). Hey coach, I want to do A.D.S.: What do I do? Paper presented at the A.F.A. workshop, Largo, MD.

LaFave, L. & Mannell, R. (1976). Does ethnic humor serve prejudice? *Journal of Communication*, 26, 116-123.

Lorenz, K. (1963). *On aggression*. New York: Harcourt.

McGhee, P.E. (1979). *Humor: Its origin and development*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Meyer, J.C. (2000). Humor as a double-edged sword: Four functions of humor in communications. *Communication Theory*, 10(3), 310-331.

Meyer, J.C. (1990). Ronald Reagan and humor: A politician's velvet weapon. *Communication Studies*, 41, 76-88.

Mills, N. (1984, Spring). Judging after dinner speaking competitor style and content, *National Forensic Journal*, 2, p. 12.

Mills, T. (1967). *The Sociology of Small Groups*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

O'Connell, W. (1960). The adaptive functions of wit and humor. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 61, 263-270.

Richardson, R.R. (1999). Problems in after-dinner speaking: Ranting into a new millennium. Paper presented at the National Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Suls, J.M. (1977). Cognitive and disparagement theories of humor: A theoretical and empirical synthesis. In Chapman, A.J. & Foot, H.C. (Eds.), *It's a funny thing, humor*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Swanson, D.R. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory in communication studies: Introduction. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 49-50.

Winick, C. (1976). The social contexts of humor. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 124-128.

Young, R.D. & Frye, M. (1966). Some are laughing; some are not—Why? *Psychological Reports*, 18, 747-754.

Zeuschner, R.B. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in small group communication. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 57-64.

Identification: Celebrating People with HIV

Kittie Grace

Abstract

The “Life Masks: The Many Faces of HIV/AIDS” is an exhibit created by Michelle Milne to celebrate the lives of individuals with HIV. The exhibit consists of stories, pictures, and plaster masks of individuals who are living with HIV. These stories and images are designed to create identification with the HIV community and with other observers of the exhibit. Through looking at Burke’s concept of identification one can see how this exhibit works to unify and faction the audience in order to promote identification.

Introduction

I encourage anyone with HIV/AIDS or any other terrible disease, negative health affliction or handicap to live each day to the fullest. God gave EACH of us in our lives 24 hours in a day no more, no less. We can either choose to sit and mope about our sorrows in life, or we can choose to make each day count with a positive attitude and gratefulness of all the good things we do have in life –Anonymous. (Milne, 1999, p. 2)

In 1993 we discovered that our entire family had AIDS. My husband whom I had been with for seven years, our four-month-old son and myself. ‘But we had never been sick, how could we have AIDS?’ We were and are devastated –The Shavers: Ted, Barb, and Logan. (Milne, 1999, p. 6)

Dear friend, as you look at my face and wonder, ‘Who is this person?’ know that I am a man, a spouse, a son, a brother, a nephew, an uncle, and a friend. I love, and am loved in return. My name is Chuck Comstock. I was born on June 22, 1962. I have celebrated over ten years of knowing I am HIV positive, and now have AIDS. I thank God for each day that I awaken, and for the angels surrounding me in the forms of family, friends, and strangers who listen. (Milne, 1999, p. 7)

The previous quotations embody the purpose of the “Life Masks: The Many Faces of HIV/AIDS” exhibit. This exhibit of plaster masks allows individuals to identify with the stories of people living, and who have died with AIDS. Unlike the AIDS quilt, the masks expose the observer to not only the stories and the pain, but to the person himself or herself captured in a plaster mask for eternity. As Americans become more saturated with the word “AIDS,” the virus loses media attention (Waggoner, 2000). People start to think that AIDS is a disease of the past due to new drug treatments. Individuals become apathetic, and the disease strikes

Kittie Grace (BA, Hastings College, 2000) is a master’s student in the Department of Speech Communication and Theatre at Kansas State University.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 38 (2001), 27-36

more Americans when least expected. The overall number of people living with HIV/AIDS continues to grow annually (Smith, 2001). In America, almost 3 million people have AIDS, and it is unknown how many Americans are HIV positive (Clark, 2000). The number of AIDS deaths by the end of 1998 was 410,900, the equivalent of over seven Vietnam War Memorials, a wall that would stretch on for two-thirds of a mile (Smith, 2000). Over 391,000 men, women, and children have died of AIDS in the United States since 1982 and over 50% of all new HIV infections occur in 13-24 year-olds (Office of National AIDS Policy, 2000). These statistics alone make the "Life Masks" exhibit worthy of analysis. In this essay I argue that the "Life Masks: The Many Faces of HIV/AIDS" exhibit is designed to create identification between the AIDS community and the public. To understand how this exhibit intends to create identification, I will introduce the exhibit and develop a methodology from Kenneth Burke's theory of identification. I will then apply Burke's theory to the "Life Masks" exhibit, and offer conclusions in order to answer the research question: Does the design of "Life Masks" help to create identification for individuals dealing directly and indirectly with HIV/AIDS?

The Exhibit

The "Life Masks" exhibit came to life December of 1998 (Davis, 1998). Michelle Milne (2001), the artist behind the masks, is a thirty one-year-old woman who has a degree in psychology from the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire. After obtaining her degree, Milne moved to Tempe, Arizona and took art classes at Mesa Community College. With her background in psychology and interest in art, Milne came up with the idea of using plaster life masks to spotlight those who are HIV positive or suffering from AIDS (Davis, 1998). Milne's (2001) interest in those people suffering from HIV was intensified during a Peace Corps mission in the African nation of Zambia. While in Zambia, Milne watched men, women, and children dying of AIDS. In Africa alone, over 23 million people have been diagnosed with AIDS and over 13.7 million have died (Dowell, 2000). In a school in Lusaka, Zambia, over half of the 250 pupils are AIDS orphans (Whitelaw, 2000).

When Milne returned to the states, she continued to experience the pain of this disease as she watched a relative died from complications due to AIDS. With all of the death around her, Milne decided to show the many faces of the disease (Davis, 1998). She proposed this idea to her ceramics professor at Mesa Community College, Professor Linda Speranza. Speranza favored the idea and the two women set out to acquire funding for the project. Their quest was productive, as they received a \$25,000 grant from Maricopa Community College District. Milne is in charge of the volunteer-run project and is finally seeing her idea come to life. Milne says of the project, "I wanted to do something more interactive that would combine art and service together, and then there is the disease" (Davis, 1998, p. 6).

The "art" of the artifact takes a fairly small amount of time to accomplish. The mask molding process takes approximately one hour. Milne first rubs a seaweed derivative onto the participant's face. She then places plaster bandages on top of the derivative. Once the mold hardens, Milne removes the bandages and plaster is poured into the mold where it stiffens. She finally removes the mold to

reveal the mask. Milne then checks the mask for imperfections and readies the mask for display (Milne, 1999). The masks are accompanied by the stories of the people behind the plaster. These stories are told through the person behind the mask via an audio player (*Life Masks*, 1998).

Each has a photograph, biography, and the name of the participant beside the corresponding mask. The artifact is a ground breaking multi-layered project that will create a permanent HIV/AIDS awareness display. The project, once completed, will include over 1000 masks representing the 1592 people in the United States who contracted HIV every day in 1996. The masks range from young faces to old. Mounted in dark glass, 496 masks will be covered to represent the number of people who died each week in 1996 from complications due to AIDS (*Life Masks*, 1998). "Life Masks" was at Arizona State University for World AIDS Day (Holt D1). Recently, the exhibit has traveled to different museums around the Arizona area. A website and pamphlet about "Life Masks" tries to educate others, around the nation and around the world, about how to get involved with the project. The artifact will travel continuously over a period of years yet to be determined. This exhibit is designed to capture the feelings and emotions of people suffering from the disease (Masks give AIDS a face, 1999).

The "Life Masks" exhibit is designed to allow identification for the audience regarding individuals who have HIV. People with and without the virus can relate to the pain, joy, life, and death exposed through every mask (Milne, 1999). Masks, in some instances, are used to cover up the identity of a person (Young, 2000). "Life Masks" has a different purpose as it capture the faces of people living with HIV. These masks are more like the masks used in a Mardi Gras party. They are used to celebrate existence. Milne gives the masks justification by saying, "Masks have been used as a method of capturing the soul from prehistoric times into the present. In ancient times, masks were made to commemorate the memory of a person who had died. In contemporary mask making, technology allows masks to be made before death...a way of celebrating life" (*Life Masks*, 1998). Katrina Pereira, a high school student from Hudson High who experienced the exhibit, felt as if she could identify with the people behind the masks. She said, "This is so sad. You really get a sense of how young they are – how old they are" (Miller, 1999, p. 3). The exhibit touches people as they see the human behind the plaster.

Not only does the exhibit touch the lives of those that experience it, but the exhibit also touches the lives of those who are a part of the artifact. Joe Serrano, 41, of Mesa, Arizona, had his mask made and felt cleansed by the project. Serrano said, "It was very healing to be a part of the project. And sometimes humorous. After the mask was finished I thought, 'Oh my God! My mother'" (Davis, 1998, p. 6). Caesar Perez, 54, of Phoenix, Arizona, tested positive for HIV 16 years ago and is now living with AIDS. Caesar is another participant of the exhibit, and he believes that "Life Masks" captures "life essence," not "death essence" (Davis, 1998).

The masks honor life differently than other HIV exhibits or memorials used to commemorate death. The AIDS quilt, for example, is one exhibit that captures the essence of people who have died from the virus. Those who loved and who miss a victim of the virus create quilt panels (NAMES Project Foundation, 1999). Much

work goes into the panels to represent the life of someone who died with the virus. The observer also sees what was ripped away from the creator of the panel. The quilt helps loved ones mourn and acts to honor the dead.

Maureen Kennedy created another exhibit, which attempts to commemorate those who died from AIDS as well. The exhibit is entitled, "People With AIDS." This exhibit includes shoes and sneakers of the 391,000 men, women, and children who have died of AIDS in the United States since 1982 (Miller, 1999). The exhibit is viewed as a memorial. The observer feels the loss of those whose feet once filled the shoes. The "Life Masks" exhibit's purpose is entirely different. The purpose is to celebrate the life of those living with HIV. The purpose is to see that behind the plaster there are real people who go about their daily routines much like anyone else. The purpose of the exhibit is to celebrate their strength to live life.

Beyond inviting people to identify with the AIDS community, the artifact works to unify people and motivates some individuals to help with the fight against AIDS. The project is designed to educate people that the disease is still out there and no one is invincible to its powers. When the exhibit unifies observers, they are then often times motivated to take action against the disease (Milne, 1999).

HIV positive individuals are asked to help with the fight against AIDS through the exhibit as well. Their call to action is to become a model for the exhibit (*Life Masks*, 1998). HIV infected individuals are asked to share their face and story with the exhibit, allowing their voice to be heard.

People who lost a loved one due to the disease are also called to action, as Milne (2001) encourages those individuals to "adopt" one of the masks to honor the loved one that was lost due to the virus. While the mask is not the face of the deceased individual, the support for those suffering with the virus is seen through the "adoption." To ensure that lost loved ones are not forgotten, Milne puts a photo of the deceased person and a statement about their life in the exhibit's catalog. The documentation acts as a reminder to others about the life celebrated by those who are now gone.

The exhibit calls to anyone who wants to volunteer to help with the project as well. Milne (2001) gives her phone number, email address, and regular address on the pamphlet that is available at the exhibit and at her website, which allows for greater accessibility. The design of the exhibit calls people to unite and find identification within and outside of the AIDS community.

Method

To answer the rhetorical question posed, Kenneth Burke's theory of identification will be used. According to Rybacki and Rybacki (1991) Burke's theory of identification is based on the principle that, "Rhetoric must be viewed as identification rather than persuasion because its function is to proclaim unity" (p.74). Burke (1969a) chooses identification rather than the traditional notion of persuasion because persuasion refers to the use of language that "comes from a common spirit" that works to accomplish a speaker's purpose (p. 21). Identification deals less with the concept of deliberate language and more with the purpose behind the language. Identification is what makes things "unique"(Burke, 1969a, p. 21). All

humans are unique due to different values, beliefs, opinions, and experiences. This uniqueness is overcome through the use of symbols. These symbols “represent a common core of interests, needs, and experiences” (Burke, 1969a, p. 21). Identification is the use of symbols to unite people and induce their cooperation. In other words, persuasion deals with the language alone, and identification not only deals with language but other symbols to unite people. Both persuasion and identification influence people to feel or believe a certain way. Action is often a result of identification because a united audience feels compelled to act together proving their unity.

There are three components to creating identification. First, identification occurs only when substance is overcome. Substance is what distinguishes one person from another (Burke, 1969a, p. 21). The language used must alter the attitudes of the observer so that their interests are joined with those of the rhetor. Substance makes a person unique. Overcoming substance, or finding common ground, creates unity (Griffin, 1997, pp. 312-313). Therefore, to achieve identification, the rhetor must find common ground with the observer.

Second, the rhetor attempts to create one of three types of identification. The identification “may be used as a means to an end” (Foss, Foss & Trapp, 1985, p. 158). This type of identification is a deliberate act used to create unification (Burke, 1969a). Identification may also “involve the operation of antithesis when identification is created among opposing entities on the basis of a common enemy” (Foss, Foss & Trapp, 1985, p. 159). In other words, a group finds identity through having the same enemy. Antithesis identification is used to faction a group apart from others. The group finds identity within themselves by rallying around a common enemy. Burke (1969a) states that both unification and faction “‘cooperate’ in the building of an over-all form” (p. 23). Burke (1969a) gives an example of this “cooperation” through the analogy of a victim of a “neurotic conflict.” Burke (1969a) states:

Rhetorically, the neurotic’s every attempt to legislate for his own conduct is disorganized by rival factions within his own dissociated self. Yet, considered Symbolically, the same victim is technically ‘at peace,’ in the sense that his identity is like a unified, mutually adjusted set of terms. (p. 23)

Identification is found within each individual through using either unification (means to an end identification) or faction (antithesis identification). Unification draws people together in one unified mass, and faction, makes a select group aware of a common identity that separates them from all other groups in society (Rybacki & Rybacki, 1991, pp. 74-75).

The third type of identification is unconscious identification. Unconscious identification “derives from situations in which it goes unnoticed” (Burke, 1969, p. 23). This identification is subtle and hard to determine. Therefore, to knowingly create identification, the rhetor must either generate unification or faction with the audience targeted. Third, identification occurs when the audience accepts and rejects the same things that the rhetor does (Burke, 1969a, p.23). Burke (1969a) states:

It (rhetoric) too has its peaceful moments: at times its endless competition can add up to the transcending of itself. In ways of its own, it can move from the factional to the universal. But its ideal culminations are more often beset by strife as the condition of their organized expression or material embodiment. Their very universality becomes transformed into a partisan weapon. (p. 23)

In other words, rhetoric must allow identification for not just one individual but for many (as identification can be universal). The observer must relate to the rhetor before identification, unification, and (often times) action results. One must keep in mind that identification is never total, but some form of identification is needed in order for unification to take place. Once unification is achieved, identification is completed.

Application

In the "Life Masks" exhibit, language works to align attitudes of the observers with those of the rhetor. The rhetor works to overcome substance by using stories about real people. Through these stories the observer can identify with the experiences of the people in the exhibit. Patricia Honey, a woman behind one of the masks, identifies language that alters the attitudes of the observers so their interests are joined with the purpose of the exhibit (or the rhetor):

I have been waiting a long time for someone to show that there is no one face that can completely epitomize HIV/AIDS. HIV not only infects some of us, but it affects all of us. I think that it is about time that everyone opens their minds and their hearts to those of us who are infected. I pray that by actually seeing some of our faces, people will realize that we are also people, not a disease. (Milne, 1999, p. 10)

Patricia's quotation echoes what the rhetor is saying. She uses language that includes everyone when she says, "all of us." Using the word "us" puts a personal touch to the statement. Patricia is not talking to people with HIV only, but she is addressing anyone who could become infected or affected, this includes everyone. This language helped Patrick Gallagher, a freshman at Hudson High, alter his attitude to parallel interests with the rhetor. Gallagher states, "It (the exhibit) helps you understand that people of all different races and ages can get it. They're no different from us" (Miller, 1999, p. 3). Gallagher even uses the same language that Patricia does by using the word "us," which helps to achieve the first component of identification.

Even if the experiences are different, the fact that both the observer and the people behind the stories are human unifies the rhetor's purpose with the observer. The pictures of people living with AIDS acts as a type of "language" that allows the observer to see a human face behind the disease. The masks work in the same way, giving the observer a concrete image of life behind the virus. The observer not only sees through a single-dimension picture what the person celebrating life with the virus looks like, but they can see the contour of the individual's face. The

masks bring the individuals behind them to life. Through the language of the plaster, observers realize that the people behind the masks are real and they too are human (*Life Masks*, 1998). One observer, Freddy Torrey, aligned his attitude with the rhetor after understanding the language behind the masks. He states, "You can actually see their pain. It makes you want to do something about it" (Miller, 1999, p.3). Both rhetor and observer realize that anyone can become infected with the virus. Through images that alter attitudes, observers relate to those individuals with HIV.

The second component, creating a state of unification or faction, is also achieved through the "Life Masks" exhibit. Both means to an end identification and antithesis identification are present making the exhibit unique. Unification (means to an end identification) is achieved because people who experience the exhibit identify and empathize with the faces behind the masks. As Patrick Gallagher said, "They're no different from us"(3). Observers can identify no matter what their race, sexual preference, or experience. The spectator can identify because "Life Masks" is not a memorial used to capture the dead but is a living exhibit used to celebrate life. The observer knows what life is and can celebrate along with the exhibit creating unification. Joel E. Serrano is a person behind the mask that helps exemplify unification. He says:

The most important part of my life today is to live in the moment. Valuing each one as the most incredible opportunity for love. After all the challenges of a day, the only thing left is—love. This is a wonderful life and I am most grateful to be a part of it. Returning the love has been my greatest accomplishment and I now am most excited about every day. Love & Light. (Milne, 1999, p. 2)

Spectators can identify with the concepts of "love" and "life." Observers learn that people with HIV feel the same emotions and work to live life like everyone. The audience learns that people with HIV are human just like they are, and through the masks the observers learn to celebrate life (Milne, 1999).

While unification occurs, faction also occurs. Those who are HIV positive realize, through the exhibit, that they have a common identity that separates their group from all others in society. This group identifies through the exhibit's call to action. An observer who is HIV positive, or who is living with full-blown AIDS, is called to become a model for the exhibit. These observers are called to form their own community by not only celebrating life but also through sharing their stories, and their faces with others. Only people who are HIV positive fit the criterion to become a participant in the exhibit. HIV positive individuals faction into a "select group aware of a common identity that separates them from all other groups in society" (Rybacki & Rybacki, 1991, p. 75). HIV positive individuals create antithesis identification because they rally around one common enemy—HIV. They are a unique group that separates from anyone else in society due to a virus. Their common identity allows the exhibit to exist. Through "Life Masks," the HIV positive community uses masks to send a factionalizing message (as well as a unified message). The masks tell observers that while everyone in the room

is the same because they are all human (the unified message) the virus still separates individuals (the factionalizing message).

The "Life Masks" exhibit also achieves the third component for identification: the audience accepts and rejects the same thing the rhetor does. By participating in the exhibit, the observer accepts the notion that people with HIV should celebrate life and rejects the notion that HIV is a death sentence (Milne, 1999). The audience also must accept responsibility for their own actions. Many of the stories represented in the exhibit act as a call to action for observers to identify with those living with the virus, and then do something about it. Diane Kohler is one story that exemplifies the call to action. She says:

It's important to me that we raise the compassion and tolerance level, for those of us infected with HIV. Volunteering and speaking about living with HIV is my way of bringing awareness to as many as possible. Education is our only hope to slow this virus. If we can't stop teenage pregnancy, we won't stop HIV! (Milne, 1999, p. 14)

From the stories and masks, the audience learns to accept people with HIV and, if so compelled, the audience is asked to help fight the virus. Right now, prevention through education is the key to stopping the virus (Whitelaw, 2000). The audience is given a call to action to help increase education about the virus. The audience understands the feelings and emotions people with HIV go through and may even help others to understand (Masks give AIDS a face, 1999). As observer Tiffinie Bartosavage stated, "It certainly puts you more in touch with it (HIV). It's so sad" (Miller, 1999 p. 3). The rhetor's intent is understood and accepted.

Analysis

Does the design of "Life Masks" help to create identification for individuals dealing directly and indirectly with HIV/AIDS? The answer to this question is "yes." Both the HIV community and the audience of the exhibit can gain identification through the "Life Masks" exhibit. The rhetor's purpose is complete. Milne founded an AIDS awareness display that celebrates those living with the virus (*Life Masks*, 1998). Spectators of the exhibit can see this purpose as they identify with the people behind the masks. People are people, and when observers see faces that resemble their own they are often compelled to identify with those masks. The observers usually want to know more about those individuals so they study the catalogue, look at the pictures, and read the stories of the people behind the masks. The observers are pulled in, as the stories presented could be stories from any of their lives. Each observer can relate to the exhibit by finding a mask with which to identify. Milne (2001) is successful in creating identification because she has a variety of people represented through the masks, allowing the factioned group to create unification with the observers.

The exhibit is unique because the masks cause unification and faction identification. Milne (2001) achieved her purpose of creating an AIDS awareness display, but the people behind the masks create the "Life" of the exhibit through

fostering identification. The variety of people represented allows the observers to find a person that has the same hobbies or interests as they do, making identification stronger. The observer finds common ground with the person behind the mask, becomes unified with that person, and rejects and accepts the same things the person behind the mask accepts and rejects. In other words, the rhetor achieves her purpose through the people behind the masks themselves.

The exhibit is also unique because it celebrates life and commemorates death at the same time. The focus of "Life Masks" is on life. This helps Burke's notion of identification to come to fruition because the observers can identify with people that are still alive. The masks provide a sense of hope for the observer and help to educate the observer about the virus. Repeatedly, the stories behind the masks say that life is great, everyone should appreciate life, and should protect himself or herself from the virus (Milne, 1999). As Chris A. Kohler, husband of Diane Kohler, a couple who has been infected with the virus for over thirteen years, says, "Treat every relationship as though the other person has HIV and maybe you won't get HIV. Love yourself enough to say NO" (Milne, 1999, p. 14). The stories shared call the observers who have identified with the exhibit to educate themselves, to protect themselves from the virus, to commemorate friends and relatives that have died from the virus, and to volunteer to help educate others through helping with the "Life Masks" exhibit. Once identification occurs, healthy life style choices are more likely to follow (Haignere, 1999).

The purpose of this manuscript was to determine if "Life Masks" promotes identification. The purpose was accomplished. Milne (2001) achieved her goal; she created an exhibit that commemorates and celebrates the lives of those suffering from HIV. Still, it is unknown how long the identification lasts. However, Milne will keep with her work and help to educate others. Milne (1999) sums up her work by saying, "My heart has been filled again and again with love from their (the individuals behind the masks) and tears and countless hours of work. I was amazed every day at the commitment and determination every one has had" (p. ii). Milne helps all that encounter her exhibit to celebrate life, if only for a little while.

References

- Burke, K. (1969a). *A rhetoric of motives*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Clark, C. (2000, March 7). Too few kids get shots for deadly hepatitis B; Today's teen-agers were immune to state's rule requiring vaccinations. *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, B-1.
- Dowell, W. (2000, January 24). Addressing Africa's agony. *TIME*, 7.
- Davis, M. (1998, May 3). Many faces of HIV/AIDS to become exhibit. *The Arizona Republic*, 6.
- Foss, K., Foss, S. & Trapp, R. (Eds.). (1985). Kenneth Burke. In *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 153-88.
- Griffin, E.M. (1997). *A first look at communication theory* (3rd ed). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Haignere, C.S. (1999). Adolescent abstinence and condom use: Are we sure we are really teaching what is safe? *Health Education and Behavior*, 26, 43-54.

- Holt, L. (1998, December). 24 Hours. *The Arizona Republic*, D1.
- Life Masks: The Many Faces of HIV/AIDS*. (1998). Mesa: Maricopa Community College.
- Masks give AIDS a face. (1999, February 9). *The Arizona Republic*, EV2.
- Miller, M. (1999, February 3). Face to face with AIDS. *St. Petersburg Times*, 3.
- Milne, M. (2001, January 9). *Life Masks: The Many Faces of HIV/AIDS* [Online]. Available: WWW: <http://mcweb.mc.maricopa.edu/users/speranza/about.htm>
- Milne, M. (1999). *Life Masks: The Many Faces of HIV/AIDS*. Mesa: Maricopa Community College.
- NAMES Project Foundation. (1999, September). *The AIDS Memorial Quilt*. San Francisco, CA: Author.
- Office of National AIDS Policy. (2000, October). *AIDS statistics*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Rosenstock, I., Strecher, V., & Becker, M. (1994). *The health belief model and HIV risk behavior change*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Rybacki, K., & Rybacki, D. (1991). *Communication criticism: Approaches and genres*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Smith, R. A. (2001, January). The big picture. *Art & Understanding*, 27.
- Smith, R.A. (2000, April). Seventy-six miles of wall. *Art & Understanding*, 64.
- Waggoner, D. (2000, December). 'Twas the silence about AIDS. *Art & Understanding*, 9.
- Whitelaw, K. (2000, February 14). AIDS in the classroom. *U.S. News & World Report*, 32-33.
- Young, P. (2000, October 24). Lone Ranger garb for sale. *Daily News (New York)*, 3.

SPEAKER AND GAVEL 2001

**Discord and Harmonia:
Kenneth Burke's Rhetorical Theory
and Kritik Permutations**

Veronica Finkelstein

Abstract

While the debate community has been open to new forms of argument (such as the kritik), there is a noticeable resistance to questioning deeply held notions of debate itself. One example of this is manifest through the unwillingness of debaters to "kritik" the very nature of "kritiks" themselves. One method of questioning "kritiks" is through a study of permutations. Kenneth Burke's theory of perspective by incongruity is a new way to approach the conceptualization of permutations. A study of perspective by incongruity highlights new ways of answering kritiks as well as raises questions about our understanding of knowledge and reality.

Introduction

"A sound communicative medium arises out of cooperative enterprises. And the mind, so largely a linguistic product, is constructed of the combined cooperative and communicative materials. Let the system of cooperation become impaired, and the communicative equipment is correspondingly impaired, while this impairment of the communicative medium in turn threatens the structure of rationality itself."

Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and Change*

"Opposition brings concord. Out of discord comes the fairest harmony."

Heraclitus of Ephesus

With "kritiks" now commonplace in academic debate, many within the community wonder if there is anything new. As Pat J. Gehrke points out "while critique arguments were once rare in academic debates, today they are part of nearly every debater's experiences" (18). This deep integration within the framework of policy debate is not limited to the collegiate level. On the contrary, Roger Solt proclaims, "the critique has undergone a process of rapid popularization in both college and high school debate" (A9). Kritiks emerged as a fundamentally unique form of argument. William Shanahan argues "locating the kritik in the thinking behind policy debate allows us to view both from a different perspective. Placing both at the site of thinking... turns us... towards rigorous thinking ways" (A6). Thus the kritik is an attempt to locate new ways of thinking and multiple perspectives. If kritiks were meant to "shake up" academic debate, what happened? Some

Veronica Finkelstein is an undergraduate student at The Pennsylvania State University majoring in English and Speech Communication.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 38 (2001), 37-48

argue that the very fact that these “revolutionary” arguments have been subsumed by the debate community at large proves that debate has stagnated.

While the debate community may have accepted kritiking, this does not signal a complete turn in thought. Unusual and different arguments still meet with resistance and fear. As Maxwell Schnurer suggests, the paranoia of the unknown has led “the activity of debate as we [know] it... for a death knoll.” In “Unsettling the Settlers: The Challenge of Critiquing Evidence,” Schnurer reinforces the extent to which the debate community resists change. He states “the primary lesson has been the tenacity that the debate community clings to its’ notions of evidence... [with] fear of alternative kinds of evidence.” With the primacy of “kritik” now established in the debate realm, we must ask ourselves whether we’re willing to go *beyond* this mode of argumentation. Are we willing to accept *more* radical and counter-intuitive claims? Are we willing to accept that the kritik has accomplished its goals? Are we willing (or able) to *kritik* the “kritik”?

Kritiks have become commonplace in academic debate, but that does not necessarily indicate a movement towards radical thought. Quite the opposite, we have now become as reliant on kritiks as we previously have been on disadvantages or topicality arguments. A scan of any basic debate textbook would indicate the extent to which kritiks have become engrained in debate. Before we can examine why Burke’s concept of perspective by incongruity is so useful, we must understand the nature of the kritik.

As Jinks explains, “Critiques attempt to invalidate the affirmative case by undermining one or more of its fundamental assumptions” (A12). A kritik is an objection to a given action based upon an ethical or moral belief. Kritiks raise moral and ethical questions to a given plan of action. For example, no act is morally neutral. Even a seemingly good action, such as donating food to poor countries, has potentially negative moral implications. Food donation, for example, can reinforce a dependency mindset in those who receive it. Meanwhile, giving aid can foster an air of superiority in donor countries. As this example shows, all acts are supported by values and moral judgments, be they good or bad. The kritik attempts to expose these undercurrents and point out their flaws.

As value-objections, kritiks occupy an unusual “space” in debate rounds. Most debaters argue that kritiks are “pre-fiat” and must be evaluated “a priori.” To understand this claim, it is necessary to understand the nature of policy debate itself. Policy debate is resolutional debate, which simply means that an affirmative team must uphold or defend a given resolution. For example, an affirmative team might be asked to defend the following resolution: “The United States Federal Government should lift all sanctions against Cuba.” The affirmative team would have the burden of defending a specific proposal for removing sanctions, and would have to invoke an action or “plan.” The debate would center on the proposed benefits of the proposal. For example, lifting sanctions against Cuba might prevent the explosion of the Juragua nuclear power plant, as international inspectors could oversee the construction of the plant. The affirmative team is required to defend a particular plan of action that they believe would produce benefits.

However, as a lowly college student, a debater would hardly have the power actually to overturn sanctions. Thus, since the debate community recognizes the

debater's limited power in the realm of policy making, the fiat is employed. Fiat is simply the assumption that the proposed plan has already been implemented. Then, once the judge has already "enacted" the policy, she/he can evaluate the positive and negative consequences of the action. A fiat is not a "magic wand" that allows debaters to change an unlimited number of naturally occurring events. For example, a debater could not declare by fiat that Fidel Castro would resign as leader of Cuba, nor could one declare that every human on earth will overthrow patriarchy. A fiat is simply the assumption that the affirmative's proposed plan has been approved. It allows the debate to focus on "real-world" consequences rather than on the minute details of whether a plan would get passed.¹

Nearly all arguments in a debate are post-fiat. For example, if an affirmative debater argued that the U.S. government should lift all economic sanctions against Cuba, a negative debater could argue that this would prop up Castro's regime. The consequence of this action, therefore, could be a military coup and increased political repression. Note that this action *only* occurs *if* the plan is implemented. It happens post-fiat, after the assumption that the affirmative plan happens. Likewise, the benefits of the affirmative plan also occur post-fiat. The affirmative might argue that food imports would flow into Cuba once sanctions are lifted, improving the economy and preventing starvation. Again, the consequences of the action occur post-fiat.

Kritiks, on the other hand, have a pre-fiat implication. As Lake explains, "unlike the conventional value objection which identifies the negative consequences of taking action or stance in the hypothetical world created by the resolution, critiques are said to focus more directly on the actual language practices of an opponent" (17). Rather than undermining the affirmative plan by pointing out negative consequences of a given action, the kritik instead functions on a different level. Most debaters who advance kritiks argue that they must be evaluated prior to any policy implications. Since kritiks are more fundamental and are concerned with action that actually takes place (rather than with the hypothetical events post-fiat), they must be resolved before other issues can be addressed. Thus, kritiks are said to be "pre-fiat" and must be resolved before substantive issues.

Why must kritiks be evaluated before other arguments are evaluated? The answer lies in the view of "reality" articulated by the kritik. According to the kritik, language has a noticeable impact on the world.² While the benefits and consequences of a given "plan" are only conjectural, the negative language that occurs in a debate round has real effects. For example, once a debate round is over, no real policy action occurs. All "plans" occur in the hypothetical. However, in a debate round where one debater calls another by a racial slur, there are real-world consequences. That racial slur can significantly affect an individual's view of himself or herself and can offend all who hear it. While the policy of the debate has little or no affect, the language has a lasting one. Thus, since language is the only "real" action in a debate round, it must be evaluated first.

In addition, kritiks question the very notion of fiat itself. As Shors and Mancuso explain, "the Critique rejects many of the assumptions of traditional policy debate, and posits [that] 'fiat' is a meaningless construct. Affirmative plans are never really implemented and voting for a plan to gain an advantage is illogical" (A15).

Thus, if fiat is useless, questioning assumptions is a preferred method of analysis. According to the kritik, questioning the assumptions underlying given actions is more useful than “buying into” these assumptions. Rather than pretending to be the federal government, we ought to question the legitimacy of our government’s past actions. According to the kritik, one should focus on questioning assumptions rather than on evaluating conjectural consequences. This is an additional reason why kritiks should be evaluated first in any round.³ While there are differences between types of kritiks, one of their most fundamental similarities is their pre-fiat function in the round.

While kritiks seem very radical in nature, since they question the use of fiat, they have now become somewhat repetitive and respectable. Our embrace of the kritik does *not* prove that the debate community has significantly changed. In order to fully grow as a community, we must embrace new modes of thought. One way to accomplish this goal is to seek out new and instructive forms of argument. We must take kritik debate one-step further. We must question the very nature of our kritiks.

One method of analyzing our reliance in kritiks is through an examination of kritik permutations. Most notably, Kenneth Burke’s “perspective by incongruity” provides a unique method for reconceptualizing kritiks. In order to fully understand the significance of the “perspective by incongruity” permutation, we must first closely examine the notion of kritik permutations, then explore and develop Burke’s analysis, so that finally we can gain new insight from the application of Burke’s radical method.

In order to fully understand the significance of Burke’s theories, we must begin by understanding the creature known as the “kritik.” David M. Berube explains the fundamental difference between kritiks and other arguments in his article “Kritiks: The Attitude of the Diet Explained.” He states “A kritik is an argument that has special disposition. Presumably, a critic resolves a kritik prior to any substantive issues in a debate (a priori)... critiques are not a priori and are resolvable by substantive claims and counterclaims” (13). Thus kritiks can have implications on several levels, both within the debate round and within the policy realm. As a debater, one often hears kritiks that encourage a “mindset shift” or attempt to “educate.” Kritiks are varied in their form and content.

Derek Jinks outlines the three main types of kritiks utilized in policy debate, “first are critiques of the system of thought employed by the affirmative... critiques of language are the second type... the third type is the ‘ethical imperative’ critique” (A12). On a most fundamental level, kritiks either question an affirmative’s methodological biases, misuse of language, or reliance on inappropriate models of thought. Kritiks can vary in form and manner and can be answered in a variety of different ways. While there are many viable strategies for answering a kritik, including the counter kritik, one particularly interesting response to the kritik is a permutation. Unlike “non-uniques,” “no links,” and other defensive answers—the permutation is a truly offensive way of responding to the kritik.

In “Critique Permutations,” Greg Schnippel discusses the various ways in which a kritik might be attacked. In particular, he identifies the permutation as an ideal method for affirmative teams. He states, “The affirmative should attempt a

mixture of the affirmative and the alternative framework. For example, consider an affirmative that provides better education for inner-city children to decrease crime. In this scenario, the negative runs a 'statism critique' indicting statist assumptions and discourse as increasing the rise of nuclear war... the smart affirmative could respond with 'Perm: dismantle the statist military infrastructure and do the plan.' This would avoid the harmful aspects of a statist framework while still allowing the adoption of the affirmative" (3). Indeed, this permutation strategy has become quite commonplace in academic debate. On the current development assistance topic, many affirmative cases themselves begin to resemble kritiks. These affirmative teams cannot run "kritik bad" arguments without contradicting their own advocacy. Thus, a permutation becomes an excellent argumentative strategy for the affirmative team and allows them to capture the advantages of the kritik as well as the advantages of the plan.

Although the kritik permutation is a generally accepted argument, serious questions arise from this strategy. Is it truly possible to re-think a kritik simply by permuting it with a policy plan? Some authors question the legitimacy of this type of permutation. As Daveed Gartenstein-Ross and Brian Prestes point out "I constantly hear teams 'perm' [kritiks], but have NO IDEA how this is conceptually done. It's usually passed off as something asinine, like 'We'll recognize the flawed assumption and do the plan with that thought in mind.'" (A9). Indeed, it seems counterintuitive that the criticism of a flawed system could truly be embraced at the same time as that flawed system is perpetuated. As Gartenstein-Ross and Prestes point out, kritik permutations seem illegitimate because they are antithetical and cannot be easily visualized.

These criticisms however, are not reasons to reject the utility of the kritik permutation. On the contrary, they simply highlight the need for more study and articulation of the *nature* of kritik permutations. If the purpose of the kritik is truly to increase critical thinking and broaden knowledge, then a kritik permutation that assumes these goals as well as others would be preferable to the kritik alone. Given the current stasis of kritik debate, it becomes clear that a new method of understanding and arguing kritiks is long overdue. If, as Kevin J. Ayotte suggests "kritik as an argument in competitive debate often seems to remain rather insulated from the critical reflexivity upon which [it] is founded" then it becomes clear that a new method of kritiking kritiks is necessary. For this reason, investigations of Kenneth Burke's theories are essential.

To date, there has not been much use of Kenneth Burke's theories in the realm of academic debate. One of Burke's most interesting concepts is his "perspective by incongruity". Stephen Bygrave explains "the concept of 'perspective by incongruity' embodies the assumption that certain clusters of terms spontaneously exclude certain other clusters of terms; and these clusters tend to be kept apart... unless a thinker who is in some respect 'perverse' suddenly bridges the gap" (64). This "planned incongruity that violate[s]... uncriticized assumptions would be a kind of 'impiety' that produce[s] new perspective by joining the 'naturally' disjunct. It would jolt our expectations" (64). Perspective by incongruity is a method through which diametrically opposed forces can be brought together. Perspective by incongruity is more than simply a new way of reconciling difference; it is a

fundamentally enlightening way to glean new knowledge.

In *Permanence and Change An Anatomy of Purpose*, Burke explains the “atom-cracking” force of perspective by incongruity. He states “when [one] changes the nature of [one’s] interests, or point of view, [one] will approach events with a new ideality, reclassifying them, putting things together that were in different classes, and dividing things that had been together” (106). Perspective by incongruity, then, is a unique method of garnering knowledge. It questions the very assumptions of dichotomy and difference that typical arguments reside upon. It is a novel and refreshing technique for interpreting the world. Perspective by incongruity brings together discordant phenomenon. It bridges “mutually exclusive” ideas and oppositional thought. It questions the very notions of clash and opposition that belie so many commonly accepted debate arguments. It is, perhaps, the most radical kritik of all.

Perspective by incongruity is not only a method of gathering knowledge; it is inherently a *better* method of “kritik” than the kritik itself. Perspective by incongruity not only indicts the idea(s) that the kritik indicts, it also problematizes and questions the notion of opposition *itself*. As Greig E. Henderson adds, “perspective by incongruity... would liquidate belief in the absolute truth of concepts... it is a method for gauging situations by verbal ‘atom cracking.’... By allowing us to translate back and forth between conceptual schemes that are traditionally kept apart, [it] is both a methodological device... and a rhetorical technique for subverting a given hegemonic discourse from within” (20). Thus the perspective by incongruity permutation can be seen as a more radical form of the original kritik that also includes the affirmative advocacy.

Furthermore, as Burke explains, the kritik itself must always be in question without the application of perspective by incongruity. As Burke states, the implicit “knowledge” behind the kritik itself is partial and biased because the kritik *fails to reconcile difference*. Burke imagines an argument between two individuals. One insists that function determines structure and the other insists quite the opposite. As Burke points out “the [person] who settles the issue in favor of structure or function will have massively solved a pseudo-problem resulting purely from the fact that one can assemble and classify data from many points of view” (*Permanence and Change* 93-94). The negative debater who argues the kritik without acknowledging that it can coexist with the affirmative plan has set up a false dichotomy. The negative debater speaks from a framework that cannot tolerate difference.

Indeed, the value of combining “mutually exclusive” theories is readily apparent in daily life. For example, Physics teaches us that light is both a wave and a particle. Any knowledge of physics based upon just one of these assumptions would necessarily be partial and incomplete. Yet it *seems* antithetical for light to be *both* a wave *and* a particle. How can something be two distinct and seemingly opposite things *at the same time*? One could imagine a debate in which the affirmative argues that light is a wave while the negative counters that it is a particle. They would both be right, but (more importantly), they would both be *fundamentally wrong*. A post-colonial kritik of development assistance to Ethiopia has merit, but is *fundamentally flawed* because it fails to examine the colonialist elements of the

kritik itself as well as the discord between the kritik and plan. Perspective by incongruity must occur if debaters truly intend to examine the fundamental assumptions that underlie knowledge. To dismiss or ignore difference is to be fragmented and sheltered from knowledge.

It seems fairly plausible that perspective by incongruity functions as a sort of permutation, an explanation of how the plan and the kritik can co-exist simultaneously. As Henderson explains:

By allowing us to translate back and forth between semantic schemes that are traditionally kept apart, perspective by incongruity is both a methodological device for giving us a handle on the bewildering diversity of interpretations with which we are bombarded and a rhetorical technique for subverting a given hegemonic discourse from within. (123)

As Henderson observes, perspective by incongruity is a method or a device that can be utilized to create harmony. This is identical to the traditional function of a permutation. Both perspective by incongruity and permutations are methods of reconciling two supposedly competing ideas in order to produce a harmony. While it is different from traditional permutations, it fulfills the basic role of permutation by bringing together two distinct ideas into one synthesis.

For example, suppose an affirmative team advocated donating computer technology to Rwanda. A negative team might counter with a kritik of technology. This kritik might state that relying on technology to solve the problems of the world ignores non-technical solutions. The affirmative team might counter with perspective by incongruity as a permutation. They might argue that the problems identified in Rwanda (lack of computer access, reliance on outdated medical technology, etc.) are technological problems. Thus, they ought to have technological solutions. However they might agree in principle with the kritik, that non-technological solutions are sometimes possible. Thus, they would advocate a permutation that is a new perspective on the issue. Rather than simply assuming that technology can solve everything, the affirmative team would combine the perspectives of the plan and kritik into a new, unified perspective. The affirmative team might argue that technology should be used in cases where the problems themselves are technological (such as in Rwanda) but that technology ought to be questioned as a solution for non-technological problems. Through perspective by incongruity, the affirmative team can do the action of plan as well as adopt the critical perspective of the kritik through the new perspective they have adopted. The permutation is a new perspective representing a compromise between the two "oppositional" perspectives of the kritik and plan.

Perspective by incongruity is an inherently better method for understanding the complicated issues surrounding a very abstract problem than the kritik alone because it allows for new types of knowledge and broadens the realm of discussion. On complicated issues, such as those argued in debate rounds, there are often more than two oppositional viewpoints. On the issue of racism, there are more points of view than simply that "it is bad" or "it is good." Furthermore, there are more ways to respond to the proposition that racism is bad than simply by

saying, “it is good.” Perspective by incongruity encourages debaters to think past easy oppositions and to create new, more sophisticated perspectives on issues. Perspective by incongruity is useful because it brings new perspectives and combinations of perspectives into the discussion.

Also, perspective by incongruity is useful because it is a fresh method that can suggest unusual and effective solutions. Since perspective by incongruity permutes two ideas that have (presumably) never been permuted before, it can raise important questions and yield new information about the kritik itself. For example, against a plan to increase diplomacy with North Korea, a debater might advocate a kritik of U.S. policy making because it often ignores the voices and desires of women. According to this perspective, ignoring women is a great wrong. However, this is not the only perspective through which U.S. policy can be examined. Perhaps the policy is flawed because it ignores the feminine in general, rather than women in particular. Perhaps American action is bad because it is “masculine”; it relies on weapons, hegemony, and force rather than on diplomacy and cooperation.

Thus, a better perspective than the kritik alone is the one raised by a combination of the plan and kritik. Through a permutation of the two, a new viewpoint becomes apparent—one that questions whether the viewpoint of the original kritik was radical enough. Thus, perspective by incongruity provides a way of finding new viewpoints and perspectives that the original kritik may have ignored.

Perhaps the most novel aspect of the perspective by incongruity permutation is that it explains the difficulty in “visualizing” kritik permutations. As Burke argues, distinctions are merely the remnants of language systems and truly *can* be reconciled. Perspective by incongruity forces us to combine opposition and discover harmony. In *Permanence and Change*, Burke adds, “we do make distinctions between various parts of reality... the great syntheses of the metaphysicians have been schemes for cosmically joining logical or conceptual distinctions which were not justified by the nature of the universe at all” (92-93). Thus, perspective by incongruity explains the method of permutation at the same time as it encourages radical thought. Our notions of “mutually exclusive” and “oppositional” are fundamentally constructed by language. The permutation allows us to examine the ways in which we are shaped by communication. To use the physics analogy, the permutation *is* the particle *and* the wave, together and coexistent in the same moment.

In *Perspectives by Incongruity*, Burke explains “the metaphorical extension of perspective by incongruity involves caustic stretching, since it interprets new situations... it is not ‘demoralizing’... it is not negative smuggling, but positive cards-face-up-on-the-table. It is designed to remoralize” (95). By questioning fundamental assumptions such as opposition, perspective by incongruity allows us to expand and reveal our knowledge. In the case of policy debate, the perspective by incongruity permutation exposes the flaws of the negative *and* the affirmative at the same time. It is a holistic and enterprising action that ought to be weighed and evaluated fairly. Perspective by incongruity is challenging to conceptualize, but it is *innovative*. As a debate tool, it ought to be afforded adequate respect.

Perspective by incongruity is a new method by which we can extend the kritik and truly question our assumptions. Perspective by incongruity purposely performs a contradiction, and from this contradiction bridges true knowledge. The perspective by incongruity permutation is not only possible, *it is necessary*. As Joseph P. Zompetti points out "the performative contradiction can be used as an argument form in itself" (2). We ought to examine the benefits of contradiction within the realm of academic debate. In an activity predisposed toward "clash" perhaps the most *fundamental* notion to question is the notion that underlies the activity itself.

Now that kritiks have become almost commonplace, we must question whether or not they continue to achieve their goals. To break the stasis of academic debate, we *must* kritik the very notion of kritik. The perspective by incongruity permutation is a novel and intriguing method through which the very notion of kritik and debate can be broadened and rethought. In "Unsettling the Settlers: The Challenge of Critiquing Evidence," Maxwell Schnurer reminds "many of us are repeating research paths we've been down before like hikers traveling through a many-times-beaten snow path" (6). Kritiks have become part of this well traveled path. Perspective by incongruity provides a new framework from which to kritik the kritik. Not only does perspective by incongruity provide a conceptual understand of the kritik permutation, it also encourages new knowledge and insight. Embracing discord could be the means of pushing debate one step further.

Endnotes

¹ Without the use of fiat, debate would become extremely repetitive and detailed. Rather than debating whether a given plan is good or bad, one would debate whether there would be a filibuster in Congress that day, or whether one Republican might go to the bathroom in the Senate, thus allowing the Democrats to pass the plan while she/he was away, or whether there could be enough funding raised to implement the plan, etc.

² This is usually articulated as "language shapes reality," and is based on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.

³ It is significant that topicality is also evaluated pre-fiat. It is not yet fully clear how topicality and kritiks should be evaluated together.

Works Cited

- Ayotte, Kevin J. *Critical Erasure: Permutations of Kritiks and the Deconstruction of Knowledge*. Proc. of National Communication Association Conference, 1999, Chicago. 1-13.
- Bahm, Ken. "Meaning as language use: The case of the language-linked value objection." *CEDA Yearbook* 12 (1991): 67-78.
- Berube, David M. "Criticizing Kritiks: Textual Analysis Re-examined." *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 18 (1997): 68-81.
- Berube, David M. "Kritiks: The Attitude of the Diet Explained." *Southern Journal of Forensics* 1 (Spring, 1996): 13-30.
- Biesecker, Barbara A. *Addressing Postmodernity Kenneth Burke, Rhetoric, and a Theory of Social Change*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997.
- Bile, Jeffery Thomas. "Communication Advocacy, Argumentation and Feminisms:

- Toward a Dialectical Partnership." *Speaker and Gavel* 32 (1995): 55-70.
- Brownlee, Don and Crossman, Mark. "Advocacy, Values and Cost/ Benefit Analysis." *CEDA Yearbook* 10 (1989): 1-11.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Permanence and Change An Anatomy of Purpose*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Perspectives By Incongruity*. Ed. Hyman, Stanley Edgar and Karmiller, Barbara. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Burke, Kenneth. *The Philosophy of Literary Form Studies in Symbolic Action*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Bygrave, Stephen. *Kenneth Burke Rhetoric and Ideology*. London: Routledge Press, 1993.
- Cater, C. Allen. *Kenneth Burke and the Scapegoat Process*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.
- Crenshaw, Carrie. "The Arguer's Identity: A Feminist Perspective on the Practice of Argumentation Theory." *Speaker and Gavel* 32 (1995): 13- 25.
- Fulkerson, Richard. "Transcending Our Conception of Argument in Light of Feminist Critiques." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 32 (Spring, 1996): 199- 217.
- Gartenstein-Ross, Daveed and Prestes, Brian. "Answering Critiques: Strategies and Tactics." *Renewable Energy A Sustainable Debate*. Wake Forest University, 1997: A7- A13.
- Gehrke, Pat J. "Critique Arguments as Policy Analysis: Policy Debate Beyond the Rationalist Perspective." *Contemporary Argument and Debate* 19 (1998): 18-39.
- Gehrke, Pat J. "Teaching Argumentation Existentially: Argumentation Pedagogy and Theories of Rhetoric as Epistemic." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 35 (Fall, 1998): 76-86.
- Harris, Scott L. "Post-Modernism, Argumentation, and praxis: A Case Study of Academic Debate. " *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge* Ed. McKerrow, Raymie E., Bjork, Rebessa S., Jackson Sally, Lake, Randall A., Sillars, Malcolm O. Annandale, Speech Communication Association, 1993: 31- 35.
- Hasian, Marouf Jr. and Edward M. Panette. "The Promise and perils of 'The Critique' in Academic and Competitive Debate." *Speaker and Gavel* 30 (1992-1993):46-56.
- Heath, Robert L. *Realism and Relativism*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986.
- Henderson, Greig E. *Kenneth Burke and Language as Symbolic Action*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998.
- Holland, Laura Virginia. *Aristotelianism in the Rhetorical Theory of Kenneth Burke*. Michigan: University of Illinois Press, 1954.
- Hovden, Jan. "Permutations and Kritiks: An Affirmative Defense." *West Coast Juvenile Crime Handbook* : 9-10.
- Jameson, Fredric R. "The Symbolic Inference; of, Kenneth Burke and Ideological Analysis." *Representing Kenneth Burke*. Ed. White, Hayden and Brose, Mar-

- garet, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
- Jinks, Derek. "Rethinking Critique Arguments." *Health Care Policy: Debating Coverage Cures* Debaters Research Guide (1993): A12- A14.
- Katsulas, John. "The Irrelevancy of the Critique to Policy Debate: A Response to Morris." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 35 (Fall, 1998): 37-41.
- Knox, George. *Critical Moments: Kenneth Burke's Categories and Critiques*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1957.
- Lain, Brian. "Liberation Pedagogy: Addressing Oppression Through Debate Arguments." *Argument in a Time of Change, Definitions, Frameworks, and Critiques*. Ed. Klumpp, James F., Thomas A. Hollihan, Rebecca S. Bjork, Malcom L. Sillars, Pat Ganer, Scott Jacobs, Catherine Palczewski, Charles Arthur Willard. United States of America: National Communication Association, 1998. 420-425.
- Lake, Randall A. "Debate Against itself: post-Modernism, Academic Debate, and the Public Sphere." *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge*. Ed. McKerrow, Raymie E., Bjork, Rebessa S., Jackson Sally, Lake, Randall A., Sillars, Malcolm O. Annandale, Speech Communication Association, 1993: 17-24.
- Mitchell, Gordon R. "Pedagogical Possibilities for Argumentative Agency in Academic Debate." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 35 (Fall, 1998): 41- 60.
- Morris, Eric. "The Relevance of the Critique to Policy Debate." *The Forensic Educator* 11 (1996/ 1997): 29- 35.
- Panette, Edward M. "Argument in a Technical Sphere: Incommensurate Rhetorical Visions." *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge*. Ed. McKerrow, Raymie E., Bjork, Rebessa S., Jackson Sally, Lake, Randall A., Sillars, Malcolm O. Annandale, Speech Communication Association, 1993: 25-30.
- "Permutation." *Merriam-Webster OnLine Dictionary*. 2001. *Webster-Webster OnLine Language Center*. 2001 < <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary> >.
- Schnippel, Greg. "Critique Permutations." *CDE National Institute* (1996).
- Schnurer, Maxwell. *Conservative Critiquing*. Proc. of National Communication Association Conference, 1997, Chicago: 1-8.
- Schnurer, Maxwell. "A Terrorist Education: A Response to the Fear of Deconstruction in Educational Debate." *Argument in a Time of Change, Definitions, Frameworks, and Critiques*. Ed. Klumpp, James F., Thomas A. Hollihan, Rebecca S. Bjork, Malcom L. Sillars, Pat Ganer, Scott Jacobs, Catherine Palczewski, Charles Arthur Willard, United States of America: National Communication Association, 1998.
- Schnurer, Maxwell. *Unsettling the Settlers: The Challenge of Critiquing Evidence*. Proc. of National Communication Association Conference, 1999, Chicago. 1-8.
- Shanahan, William. "Kritik of Thinking." *Health Care Policy: Debating Coverage Cures* Debaters Research Guide (1993): A3- A8.
- Siemens, Matt. *Phenomenology: At the Beginning*. Proc. of National Communication Association Conference, 1995, San Antonio: 1- 16.
- Solt, Roger. "Demystifying the Critique." *Health Care Policy: Debating Coverage Cures* Debater's Research Guide (1993): A8- A12.

- Tucker, Robert E. "An Archaeology of Argument: post- Structuralism and Inter-collegiate Debate." *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge*. Ed. McKerrow, Raymie E., Bjork, Rebessa S., Jackson Sally, Lake, Randall A., Sillars, Malcolm O. Annandale, Speech Communication Association, 1993: 36- 42.
- Wess, Robert. *Kenneth Burke Rhetoric, Subjectivity, Postmodernism*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Zompetti, Joseph P. *(Per)formative Contradictions: Misunderstanding and the Importance of Action*. Proc. of National Communication Association Conference, 1999, Chicago:1-9.

A Fantasy Theme Analysis of Four South Dakota Lottery Advertisements

Bonnie L. Cooper

Lotteries have existed in the United States since the colonists settled (Clotfelter & Cook, 1991, pp. 34-35). When the original 13 colonies needed to increase their earnings, they began running individual lotteries (Costello, 1968). The money the lotteries took in was used, in part, to lay the foundation for institutions of higher learning such as Dartmouth and Princeton University (as cited in The Council of State Governments, 1973, p. 6). By 1986, 140 territories or nations allowed legal gambling; 100 of them allowed legal lotteries (Clotfelter & Cook, 1991, p. 21).

Worsnop (1990) explained that one reason lotteries are popular today is that they are seen as a "voluntary tax" (pp. 633-634, 640). When lotteries are used as a voluntary tax, other taxes do not have to be raised for states to obtain money. David Gale, the executive director of the North American Association of State and Provincial Lotteries, clarified how lotteries were helping citizens: "Every dollar raised by the lottery is a dollar you don't need to get from taxes" (Shenk, 1995, p. 23). State lotteries were described as "one of the main services produced by state governments. In terms of state products that citizens purchase directly, the lottery ranks second, right after higher education (Clotfelter & Cook, 1991, p. 30).

A. C. Szakmary and C. M. Szakmary (1995) concluded, "The lure of a mechanism which raises significant revenue, without coercion, and without destabilizing overall state revenues, is powerful and difficult to resist" (p. 1181). There are 37 states that have legalized state lotteries; the District of Columbia also has a lottery (Shenk, 1995, p. 23). Of the 39 states that have had the issue of running a lottery on the ballot, the voters in only two states, Oklahoma and North Dakota, turned down the politicians' proposed method of increasing state revenues (Greenberg, 1994, p. 25).

Recently, various lotteries and their corresponding ads have been quite controversial. This controversy has increased, in part, because lotteries have grown in number and size. Some lottery advertisements have been criticized because certain facts (i.e., odds of winning) are not given or are offered in a manner that individuals are unable to easily understand (Stearns & Borna, 1995, p. 46; Clotfelter & Cook, 1991, pp. 11, 186-187; Shenk, 1995, p. 22).

Lottery advertising is not regulated by the Federal Trade Commission or state laws because lotteries are run by the states. Lottery ads are also exempt from policies put forth by the Council of Better Business Bureaus, a branch of the National Advertising Division (Camire, 1995, par. 6). A *La Fleur's Lottery World* poll found that only 3 of the 38 states with lotteries, Wisconsin, Virginia, and

Bonnie L. Cooper (MA, North Dakota State University, 1998) is the disquisition editor for the NDSU Graduate School and interim director of the NDSU Center for Writers. The article is based on Cooper's master's thesis titled *Lottery Advertising: A Rhetorical Analysis*, adviser Robert S. Littlefield.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 38 (2001), 49-62

Minnesota, had regulations for promotional lottery advertisements included in their state laws (DePledge, 1998, p. 2A). As a result, the ads are often misleading in terms of prizes and the actual odds of winning (Shenk, 1995, p. 24; Selinger, 1993, pp. 22-23; Simon, 1995, p. S 11472; Perlman, 1996, p. 18). Advertising lottery games on radio or television was illegal until Congress changed federal laws in 1974 (Shenk, 1995, p. 25; Calonijs, 1991, p. 112; Simon, 1995, p. S 11473). When the law was changed, television began playing an increasingly important role in states' marketing strategies for their lottery games.

States are motivated to keep the money generated by lottery games at steady or rising levels. A decrease in revenues can lead to major headaches and problems for legislators who have to find other ways to generate the income. One method of keep sales high is advertising the state lottery. Because the frequency and messages of lottery ads are continually changing, the advertisements merit analysis. This study is subsequently justified because of the need to obtain information about how lottery ads appeal to individuals. South Dakota utilizes a variety of frequently run advertisements to promote its lottery. Communication scholars can justify an examination of the South Dakota Lottery and its ads because of the media coverage that this lottery and a few of its games have received. Some coverage has cast doubts on the 1987 legislature's initial approval of the games (Woster, 1997a, pp. 1A, 5A; Woster, 1997c, pp. 1A, 5A; Associated Press, 1998a, p. 1A). Other media exposure has been critical of the video lottery (Associated Press, 1998b, p. 1A; Associated Press, 1998c, p. 7A; Associated Press, 1998d, p. 1A). Citizens and lawmakers have debated the lottery's moral and economic impacts on the state and its residents. The present study explored rhetorical strategies used to encourage individuals to participate in South Dakota's lottery.

Context of the Study

Voters decided to modify South Dakota's constitution so that a lottery would be legal in November 1986. The bill creating the South Dakota Lottery was approved by the legislature and signed by the governor in 1987 (South Dakota Lottery, 1997a, par. 1-2). The sale of instant scratch tickets began on September 30, 1987. Multi-state lotto participation began in 1990. The first in-state lotto, Dakota CA\$H, was initiated in April 1993 (South Dakota Lottery, 1997a, par. 2, 4).

In 1995, the state took in \$161.3 million that individuals spent on its lottery games. This figure portrayed a 147.8% increase in sales between 1990 and 1995 (Keating, 1996, pp. 144-145). In 1996, the South Dakota Lottery listed its mission as "to market lottery games that provide a fun, light form of entertainment and to conduct its operations with the utmost security, integrity and efficiency in maximizing revenues to the state" (South Dakota Lottery, 1996, par. 1).

"The South Dakota Lottery is recognized as one of the most successful state lotteries in the nation" (South Dakota Lottery, 1993, p. N. pag.). Video lottery games amassed the largest profits for the state. Between October 16, 1989, and June 30, 1997, over \$406 million were generated. When the video lottery games began in 1989, the state received 25% of the profits; in 1995, the state's percentage was augmented so that it received 50% of the proceeds (South Dakota Lottery, 1997b, par. 3; Nixon, 1998, p. 1A). The profits remaining after the state received

its cut went to the businesses and individuals that own the video lottery machines (Aamot, 1998, p. 4A).

Because increased ticket sales and revenues are the goal of the lottery, advertisements are used to motivate more participation. This study investigates the fantasy themes reflected in advertisements run by the South Dakota Lottery. It identifies the fantasy types, rhetorical vision, and rhetorical community found in each ad under analysis. Identifying these characteristics will illustrate how people may chain the fantasy themes found in the four advertisements. The conclusion will also show how the rhetorical strategy of omitting information, a common tactic, could enhance the rhetorical vision.

Lottery is defined as “[a] chance for a prize for a price . . . game of hazard in which small sums of money are ventured for chance of obtaining a larger value in money or other articles” (Black, 1990, p. 947). The South Dakota Lottery is the agency that plans, runs, and oversees the distribution of the lottery games offered in the state. In this study, advertisements are operationalized as the 30-second television messages that Media One Advertising/Marketing produced to promote the South Dakota Lottery’s various games. Games refers to instant scratch tickets and the in-state lotto.

Clotfelter and Cook categorized ads utilized by state lottery marketers to include themes and information. Thematic ads utilized fantasy and multiple messages to sell lottery tickets. On the other hand, information-based ads told consumers about new games and how they could participate (1991, pp. 203-208).

McCaffery (1994) illustrated that the number of individuals who wanted change in the rules regarding how the states’ lotteries could be advertised increased when lottery reform became a political issue (p. 74). Stearns and Borna (1995) said that “lottery advertisers can be criticized because of the nature of their advertisements *and* [emphasis in original] because they choose to omit pertinent information” (p. 43).

Fantasy Theme Analysis

Fantasy theme analysis was chosen since the elements of the individual South Dakota Lottery ads and the commonalities between the four ads in the sample can be seen when the messages are analyzed for their themes and effects. The elements of a fantasy theme analysis have a hierarchical structure; fantasy themes lead to fantasy types, and the types lead to fantasy chains. Finally, a rhetorical vision is created when all of the elements are considered together. Bormann (1983) said that “[f]antasy theme analysis is a humanistic approach to the rhetorical criticism of human communication” (p. 445). He defined fantasy as the “creative and imaginative interpretation of events that fulfills a psychological or rhetorical need” (p. 434). It was imperative that individuals reacted to a fantasy in a way that matched the sender’s intentions if they were going to transmit the fantasy to others (Bormann, Koester, & Bennet, 1978, p. 318). If an influential solicitation was going to have favorable results, audience members needed to take the fantasy dramas used in a campaign and turn them into fantasy chains that then created rhetorical visions (Bormann, 1972, p. 398). Fantasy chains were defined as “values and attitudes” that are “tested and legitimized as common to the group” (Bormann,

1972, p. 398). A rhetorical vision was described as “a symbolic reality” held by “a large group of people” (Bormann, 1977, p. 130).

A fantasy theme was clarified as “a *ë*recollection of something that happened to the group in the *past* [emphasis in original] or a dream of what the group might do in the *future* [emphasis in original]” (Bormann, 1972, p. 397). A fantasy theme was also described as “[t]he content of the dramatizing message which sparked the fantasy chain” (Bormann, 1983, p. 434). Fantasy themes support fantasy chains and bring them to life. Fantasy themes were seen as useful tools in explaining how individuals could be persuaded to alter their beliefs and actions. This elucidation was possible because every “rhetorical movement contains small group fantasy chains, public fantasy events, and a rhetorical vision in a complex and reciprocal set of relationships” (Bormann, 1972, p. 399).

Fantasy types were defined as “stock scenarios which might appear in a number of different rhetorical visions” (Bormann, 1977, p. 130). When fantasy types are beginning to form, individuals frequently state the type and gave several references that fit into particular category (Bormann, 1982, p. 295). Researchers discovered a variety of fantasy types, including restoration, conspiracies, and the American Dream, that existed in the United States (Bormann, 1983, p. 446). Fantasy types are situations that can be identified in a number of rhetorical visions.

A rhetorical vision was described as a “blend of discursive material, *ë*here and now’ events, and fantasy themes which are woven together to form a drama that is credible and compelling” (Cragan, 1975, p. 5). Bormann further explained a rhetorical vision as “a unified putting-together of the various shared scripts that gives the participants a broader view of things” (1983, p. 435).

A rhetorical community was illustrated as a group of people who participated in specific rhetorical visions. These people subsequently shared certain fantasy themes that were used as the basis for judging an action’s justifiability (Bormann, 1972, p. 400).

Fantasy theme analysis was selected for this analysis because the various components of the individual advertisements can be drawn out while permitting an analysis of how the ads worked together to create an overall message. Four television advertisements were obtained from Media One Advertising/Marketing in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, on November 20, 1997. Double Dollars was created in 1988 to promote an instant scratch game. Cash Package was created in 1989 to promote an instant scratch game; the ad also mentioned that tickets could be purchased as holiday gifts. Dakota CASH was created in 1992 to introduce South Dakota’s new in-state lotto game. Ticket to Ride was created in 1997 to promote the “instant scratch game” that was giving away three Ford Expedition XLTs (LeAnn Holler, personal communication, November 20, 1997).

The ads were reviewed several times to identify the fantasy types, “stock scenario[s] repeated again and again by the same characters or by similar characters,” used to promote the South Dakota Lottery (Bormann, 1983, p. 434). Three major fantasy types were identified. The gambling is fun fantasy type illustrated the entertainment aspect of the lottery games. The gambling is easy fantasy type showed people that the games were accessible and simple to play. The gambling produces profit for players fantasy type illustrated what could be

won. Each type was supported by fantasy themes. The types were then chained into rhetorical visions.

Analysis

Double Dollars

This ad featured Williams and Ree, a popular comedy duo from South Dakota. They were dressed in colonial costumes and wore white wigs. When they were shown, they were smiling. The ad began with a picture of a one dollar bill and flute music in the background. The music continued throughout the entire ad. The center of the bill was open, and Ree was in it. "DOUBLE DOLLARS" was printed where "ONE DOLLAR" would be on a normal dollar bill. As Ree began talking, the camera zoomed in for a close-up. He said, "When you play Double Dollars, the new game from the South Dakota Lottery, the chances of you taking home a few of me are much greater because Double Dollars is easy to win." Then, Williams entered the right side of the center of the bill and said, "Excuse me, but I think you'll like Double Dollars because it's got more of what you asked for. It's more fun to play." Ree pushed Williams out of the picture and said, "Easy to win with \$10,000 prizes." Williams came back into the picture, put his arm around Ree, and said: "And more fun to play because of the new doubler feature." Ree grabbed Williams by the shirt collar and said, "Easy to win." Williams said, "Nice breath." They laughed. Ree sprayed his mouth with breath spray. Still holding Williams's shirt, Ree proclaimed, "Easy to win." The picture changed to a white background with the Double Dollars logo on top and the South Dakota Lottery logo (including the words "Fun for the Future") on the bottom. The announcer said, "Best odds ever. Your favorite playing method, Double Dollars, is twice the fun. Are you playin'?" Ree was shown in the dollar bill as the ad ended, and he was laughing.

The ad contained a fantasy type that said gambling is fun. It was sustained with two fantasy themes and two rhetorical strategies. The words "fun to play" that Williams kept repeating were used as a fantasy theme. Because people are more likely to remember things they hear often, the repetition made it more probable that individuals who saw the ad would pick that element out and possibly even give it more weight and merit. Laughing was also used as a fantasy theme. When viewers saw Williams and Ree laughing, they might have assumed that the comedians were having fun and enjoying themselves. This fantasy theme was enhanced further by the rhetorical strategy of selecting Williams and Ree to appear in the ad. Portraying them in a comical way to illustrate that they were having fun seemed logical since they are well-known comedians with widespread popularity and fame in South Dakota.

Gambling is easy was the second fantasy type. The fantasy theme explained that winning Double Dollars was easy; it was part of Williams and Ree's "debate." Ree said that the game was "easy to win" several times. The repetition made the fantasy chain easier to identify and expand. The announcer enhanced the theme of winning by stating, "Best odds ever."

A related fantasy type was that gambling produces profit for players. It was supported by the fantasy theme of double prizes. The phrases "doubler feature"

and “twice the fun” implied that players could win more money because of how the game was structured. This fantasy type and its fantasy theme were enhanced by the easy to win fantasy theme.

Another fantasy type was that gambling is consistent with American values. A patriotic fantasy theme was created. It was supported by the use of the dollar bill, Williams and Ree’s attire, and the flute music. The major difference between this dollar and real money was who was pictured in the center. Instead of a president’s picture, Williams and Ree were shown. Since they were wearing white wigs and colonial-type clothing, they made the dollar bill appear more authentic because they were dressed to resemble presidents and were positioned where George Washington was on the one dollar bill. The tune that the flute was playing sounded like patriotic music that could be heard during patriotic holidays such as the Fourth of July.

Two fantasy themes worked together to support the gambling is fun and participation fantasy types seen in the “debate” that Williams and Ree had. First, the lottery was portrayed as “fun to play.” Second, it was described as “easy to win.” These statements were repeated several times during the ad and made the chain easier to identify.

One rhetorical community created by this ad included people who wanted to be entertained, have fun, and win big prizes. A second rhetorical community was made up of individuals who wanted to pursue the ad’s rhetorical vision, the American Dream. Using a patriotic fantasy theme in conjunction with a product that was described as “easier” or “easy” alluded to the reasons that many people immigrated to the United States. The rhetorical vision was strengthened with the allusion to great American presidents.

Cash Package

This ad began with a man sitting at a table and smiling while counting lottery tickets. He was wearing a red sweater and sitting in front of a Christmas tree. There was a jingle playing in the background during the entire commercial. The announcer said, “Buying Cash Package lottery tickets for someone else is easy.” The man pictured in the ad responded: “These are for Aunt Margaret. A bunch for the gang at work.” At this point, he laughed and said, “Just a few for Santa.” He laughed some more as the announcer interjected: “You could be giving someone a \$10,000 cash prize.” The camera showed a close-up of a Cash Package ticket and a South Dakota Lottery gift tag for the ticket that had “Just For You: ___” printed on it. While the ticket and “wrapping” were being shown, the man exclaimed, “\$10,000 for my brother-in-law. Some for Uncle Earl.” The man laughed some more and said, “10,000 bucks.” He held a ticket up to a burning candle to try and see through it. For the rest of the commercial, his facial expressions appeared to show happiness and/or excitement. The announcer added, “Lottery tickets . . . easy to buy but not so easy to give away.” A pile of money wrapped in a red ribbon and bow was shown. The man concluded, “Maybe Aunt Margaret should get these. I know she’ll share.” As he began scratching off a ticket and laughing, the South Dakota Lottery symbol was shown on the lower right-hand corner of the screen, and the ad was over.

Gambling is fun was used as a fantasy type. The actor's continuous laughter and smiling implied that he was having fun. The upbeat, positive nature of the ad was a fantasy theme that strengthened the fantasy type; it was most prominent in the ad's jingle.

Gambling is easy served as a fantasy type in the Cash Package ad. It was enhanced by the announcer's description of giving tickets as gifts. At the beginning of the ad, he said, "Buying Cash Package lottery tickets for someone else is easy." Near the end, he said, "Lottery tickets . . . easy to buy but not so easy to give away."

Gambling produces profit was established as a fantasy type in several ways. The top prize, \$10,000, was mentioned several times and served as a fantasy theme. The actor illustrated another fantasy theme by making it seem as if it were easy to win. He was afraid to give the tickets away since they could result in large prizes. His repeated laughing allowed people to speculate as to why he was so jubilant; one answer could be that he had won something.

Dakota CASH

This ad began by showing a lake with hills and a sunrise in the background. The sunrise continued throughout the ad. An owl could be heard in the background. Other animal and nature sounds were playing in the background during the entire duration of the commercial. This nature scene was used as the backdrop for the entire commercial. At certain points, text was printed on the screen in front of the lake, hills, and sunrise.

The announcer said, "South Dakota. Simply Beautiful. Dakota CASH. Beautifully Simple." The words "Simply Beautiful" appeared in white letters on the bottom left of the screen when the words were spoken. Likewise, "Beautifully Simple" appeared in white letters on the bottom right of the screen when those words were mentioned. Saxophone music began playing. It crescendoed and decrescendoed in the background; the music ended at the conclusion of the ad. The announcer said, "Dakota CASH. The lottery's new in-state cash lotto game." At the same time, the Dakota CASH logo was superimposed over the lake scene. The announcer continued, "It's Easy to Play." These words were also printed in white letters inside a blue box on the bottom right of the screen. While the announcer said "Just pick 5 of 35 numbers," a blue box appeared in the upper left-hand corner of the screen with "Pick 5 of 35" written in white letters inside it. The announcer elaborated, "Drawings every Saturday with four ways to win." As these words were spoken, a blue box appeared in the center of the screen with white lettering that said "Drawings Every Saturday With 4 Ways to Win!" That box faded out as another one appeared slightly below it and said "Simply the Most Winnable Cash Lotto Game Around." The same words were uttered by the announcer while this box containing white letters was displayed on the screen. For the remainder of the ad, the Dakota CASH logo was seen on the top of the screen, and "South Dakota's very own Cash Lotto Game." was printed in white letters below the logo; the words "very own" had a green line below them for emphasis. The announcer said, "Dakota CASH. South Dakota's very own cash lotto game. Are you playing?"

The ad contained a fantasy type that said gambling is easy. One fantasy theme supported this type and illustrated that people could win because Dakota CASH was “simply the most winnable cash lotto game around.” This fantasy type was also chained by using several forms of the words “simple” and “beautiful” as fantasy themes. The notion of simplicity, a fantasy theme, was also seen in the announcer’s phrase and on-screen text “Easy to Play.”

The phrase “Are you playin’?” was utilized as part of the gambling is easy fantasy type. It attempted to encourage more individuals to purchase Dakota CASH tickets. It helped create the rhetorical community composed of people who played Dakota CASH with the hopes of winning a jackpot. The ad also explained how people could participate in the Dakota CASH game, furthering the gambling is easy fantasy type. The directions were given by the announcer and with the on-screen text. The announcer’s statements and the written words served as part of the ad’s rhetorical strategy.

Ticket to Ride

A fast-paced jingle was playing during the entire commercial. The ad began with Esther Stratton sitting in the back of a Ford Expedition XLT. She said, “I got my ticket from the lottery. Won a Ford Expedition XLT.” The camera view changed to show her getting into the driver’s seat of the white vehicle. She said, “Now, I’m riding high with my winning Ticket to Ride.” A side view of the vehicle was shown with Esther waving. The words “Esther Stratton” were printed in white. Under that line, “1st Winner of a FORD EXPEDITION XLT” was written in smaller white letters. The announcer said, “That’s Esther Stratton of Sioux Falls, winner of the first Ford Expedition XLT from the South Dakota Lottery.” When the words “Ford Expedition XLT” were stated, the Ford emblem on the grill of the vehicle was pictured. As the announcer said “South Dakota Lottery,” Esther and others were shown saying “Yeah” and raising their arms into the air. As the announcer went on to say “You could be next ěcuz it’s a whole new game,” a man, who appeared to be Esther’s husband, was shown shining the hood of the vehicle. The shot switched to show the others standing in front of the Ford Expedition XLT. The announcer said, “We’re starting over, so play the instant scratch game Ticket to Ride and get re-entered for the next drawing September 5th.” When these words were uttered, the Ticket to Ride logo was shown as Esther was driving the vehicle and then as she stood behind it. The next picture showed Esther behind the wheel with the words “Next drawing: Sept. 5” printed on the screen in white. The announcer added, “Get your Ticket to Ride wherever you see a sign for the South Dakota Lottery.” As he made this statement, Esther was shown in the back of her Ford Expedition XLT; she was holding yellow balloons, smiling, and saying, “I won.” Then, another picture of Esther driving the vehicle was shown; the South Dakota Lottery logo was in the lower left-hand corner of the screen. The final shot showed Esther in front of the vehicle. Esther ended the commercial: “Now, you could be riding high with your own Ticket to Ride.”

Gambling is fun, a fantasy type, was illustrated by Esther and her friends and/or family members. The people’s attitudes, statements, and actions supported this fantasy type. The element of fun was depicted when they said “Yeah.” The yellow

balloons that Esther held added to the gambling is fun fantasy type. The phrase “riding high” alluded to the fun that Ticket to Ride players could have.

The gambling is easy fantasy type was illustrated when Esther and the announcer described the steps that needed to be taken in order to participate in the Ticket to Ride game. Esther’s instructions to follow her lead served as a fantasy theme that enhanced the gambling is easy and produces profit for players types. This rhetorical strategy was intensified through the spoken words and the printed date of the next drawing that appeared on the screen.

The gambling produces profit for players fantasy type was also seen. The prize that could be won was shown to enhance the fantasy type; the Ford Expedition XLT played a prominent part in the ad. It was shown from different angles. Several close-ups of the vehicle were shown, too. Some camera shots showed Esther enjoying her new vehicle. This component of the ad influenced the options that people had when chaining themes and creating fantasy types because viewers saw how a winner was utilizing her prize.

Gambling is consistent with promises that South Dakota residents will win was part of the gambling produces profit for players fantasy type. The fantasy theme that strengthened it was that an actual winner, Esther Stratton, was featured. The visual images and dialogue indicated that the Ford Expedition XLT had been won by one of the people in the ad and that viewers could be next.

The fantasy types, fantasy themes, and rhetorical strategies created the rhetorical vision, the dream of winning. The dream was realistic since Esther was telling people how they could have a chance to win a prize like she did.

One rhetorical community consisted of individuals who had won prizes from the South Dakota Lottery. The second rhetorical community was composed of people who purchased lottery tickets with the dream to win and hopes of realizing that dream. Members in the second rhetorical community wanted to participate in both rhetorical communities; instead of just being players, they wanted to be winners, too.

Discussion

The three major fantasy types found in this set of ads were that gambling is fun, gambling is easy, and gambling produces profit for players. Each type was supported by several themes. Several rhetorical strategies were utilized to enhance the fantasy types. The South Dakota Lottery was conveyed by the use of entertaining, humorous, or relaxing dialogue and visual images. Repetition was also used as a rhetorical strategy to convey the fantasy types and themes.

There were two major fantasy themes that enhanced the gambling is fun fantasy type. First, two ads contained laughter or people enjoying themselves. These characteristics were evident in Double Dollars and Cash Package. One of the repeated lines in Double Dollars claimed that the game was “more fun to play.” By having Williams and Ree pictured in the center of a dollar bill arguing about the game’s characteristics, the advertiser was able to take advantage of their reputation and ability to entertain audiences. The roles that Williams and Ree took enhanced the entertainment fantasy theme. Their “debate” was typical of discussion that they have during their comedy routines. As a result, the humor used in

the ad was easy to chain out into the gambling is fun fantasy type. The actor in Cash Package was scratching off instant tickets and laughing; these actions gave viewers the impression that he was having fun. The individuals in Ticket to Ride were smiling and laughing while they enjoyed Esther's prize.

The gambling is easy fantasy type had one major fantasy theme, winning was easy. The ads made it seem that participation led to winning. The ease with which individuals could participate in the games and win prizes played a prominent role in the ads; it was mentioned in Double Dollars, Cash Package, and Dakota CASH. Ticket to Ride went one step further and showed an actual winner who told viewers how easily they could win a vehicle from the South Dakota Lottery.

The gambling produces profits for players fantasy type had several fantasy themes that supported it. The possibility of doubling the prize amount was implied in Double Dollars. The \$10,000 top prize for the Cash Package game was mentioned several times. Dakota CASH was described as the "most winnable cash lotto game." The benefits that family members shared with lottery winners were illustrated by the elated individuals in Ticket to Ride.

Elements of the three major fantasy types were identified as lottery advertising themes in the literature. For example, ads depicted participating in the lottery as a fun, exciting activity (Clotfelter & Cook, 1991, p. 207). This general characterization coincides with the gambling is fun fantasy type in this study. Broadcasting drawings for lotto games is a technique to encourage people to purchase tickets (Abt, Smith, & Christiansen, 1985, p. 62). This promotional approach shows how gambling is easy. Some ads illustrate how the profits players receive from playing the lottery could be used (Shenk, 1995, pp. 23-25). This strategy corresponds with the gambling produces profits for players fantasy type found during this investigation.

One rhetorical strategy seen in several ads sought to increase the number of individuals who participated in lottery games. Even though this strategy is used in all ads, it is noteworthy here because of the longevity of a particular slogan. The rhetorical strategy was exemplified by illustrating how easy it was for people to participate. It was further illustrated by the fact that two ads, Double Dollars and Dakota CASH, asked viewers "Are you playin'?" in an attempt to spur more individuals to purchase lottery tickets. This particular fantasy type dated as far back as September 30, 1987, when T-shirts with the phrase "Are you playing?" were distributed to people who witnessed the sale of the first South Dakota Lottery ticket (Woster, 1997b, p. 4A). Since this fantasy type was utilized over an extended period of time, the likelihood that people had chained it into a rhetorical vision was greater than with some of the other fantasy types used in the four ads.

Media One Advertising/Marketing created ads to appeal to particular audiences. Two rhetorical visions emerged. The first one was the desire to win a prize and achieve the American Dream of material wealth; it was seen in the patriotic characteristics of Double Dollars. Second, the opportunity to obtain a great deal with little effort was illustrated by using variations of the word "easy" in Double Dollars, Cash Package, and Dakota CASH. Dakota CASH relied on forms of the word "simple" to convey its message and heighten people's awareness of and interest for the new game. Even though the element of winning played a more domi-

nant role in Ticket to Ride, all four ads mentioned winning.

A rhetorical community composed of lottery players with dreams to win was created, in part, because the four ads implicitly and explicitly informed audience members how easy it was for them to win. A second rhetorical community was comprised of people who believed that they had a chance to win a prize from the South Dakota Lottery. A more specific rhetorical community created by Ticket to Ride was lottery winners; these individuals had similar feelings and experiences after winning a variety of prizes.

Conclusion

Like ads outlined in the literature review, pertinent information (i.e., odds of winning) was omitted in all four South Dakota Lottery ads. This rhetorical strategy was used for one simple reason: telling people the astronomical odds of winning a large prize would discourage them from participating. General information, rather than specific facts, was utilized most of the time. As other scholars (i.e., Clotfelter & Cook, 1989, pp. 186-187) have illustrated previously, this rhetorical strategy could lead viewers to draw inaccurate assumptions and conclusions. Consequently, they may make impulsive, misinformed product purchasing decisions.

This analysis showed that some of the controversial themes illustrated in the literature review can be found in South Dakota Lottery ads; these themes have consequences for each side of the lottery debate. Critics of state lotteries and lottery advertisements see such ads as unethical. Understandably, lottery officials from across the nation have said that lotteries are simply fun and entertainment. The officials also stand behind the content of their ads and see the ads as ethical.

In future studies, ads could be compared with advertising codes of ethics to measure their strengths and weaknesses in terms of ethicality. At one point, a code was created for lottery ads; it was never enforced or followed (Karcher, 1989, p. 81). This code could be used in conjunction with others to see what changes have been made since the lottery advertising ban was lifted in 1974. This study only analyzed four of the television ads produced for the South Dakota Lottery. Investigations that scrutinize different messages could yield different results. Future research should also examine other advertising mediums (i.e., the internet; *Lottery Link*, the official newsletter; and radio ads) used by South Dakota Lottery officials.

References

- Aamot, G. (1998, January 18). Hunoff to propose video lottery repeal. [*Sioux Falls*] *Argus Leader*, p. 4A.
- Abt, V., Smith, J. F., & Christiansen, E. M. (1985). *The business of risk: Commercial gambling in mainstream America*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Associated Press. (1998a, January 5). Lottery was a mistake. Despite lawmakers' beliefs, few of them think video gambling will disappear. *Aberdeen American News*, p. 1A.
- Associated Press. (1998b, January 15). Video lottery opposed by lawmakers:

Cutler says he'll co-sponsor bill to get rid of games that were a mistake. *Aberdeen American News*, p. 1A.

Associated Press. (1998c, February 6). Churches unite against video lottery. *Aberdeen American News*, p. 7A.

Associated Press. (1998d, February 6). Video lottery repeal endorsed. *Aberdeen American News*, p. 1A.

Black, H. C. (1990). *Black's law dictionary* (6th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Bormann, E. G. (1972, December). Fantasy and rhetorical vision. The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (4), 396-407.

Bormann, E. G. (1977, April). Fetching good out of evil: A rhetorical use of calamity. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63 (2), 130-139.

Bormann, E. G. (1982, August). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: Ten years later. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68 (3), 288-305.

Bormann, E. G. (1983). Fantasy theme analysis and rhetorical theory. In J. L. Golden, G. F. Berquist, & W. E. Coleman (Eds.), *The rhetoric of western thought* (3rd ed., pp. 432-449). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Bormann, E. G., Koester, J., & Bennet, J. (1978, November). Political cartoons and salient rhetorical fantasies: An empirical analysis of the 1976 presidential campaign. *Communication Monographs*, 45 (4), 317-329.

Calonius, E. (1991, March 25). The big payoff from lotteries. *Fortune*, 123 (6), 109-110, 112-114.

Camire, D. (1995, March 13). Lawmaker wants state lotteries to be truthful [17 paragraphs]. *USA Today* [Online: The Electronic Library].

Clotfelter, C. T., & Cook, P. J. (1991). *Selling hope: State lotteries in America* (1st paperback ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cooper, B. L. (1998, July). *Lottery advertising: A rhetorical analysis*. Unpublished master's thesis, North Dakota State University, Fargo.

The Council of State Governments. (1973, January). *Gambling: A source of revenue*. Lexington, KY: Iron Works Pike.

Cragan, J. F. (1975, Spring). Rhetorical strategy: A dramatic interpretation and application. *The Central States Speech Journal*, 26 (1), 4-11.

DePledge, D. (1998, March 16). Lotteries most visible form of American gambling. *Aberdeen American News*, p. 2A.

Duffy, M. (1997, Winter). High stakes: A fantasy theme analysis of the selling of riverboat gambling in Iowa. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 62 (2), 117-132.

Greenberg, P. (1994, October). Gambling issues and the ballot box. *State Legislatures*, 20 (10), 25.

Karcher, A. J. (1989). *Lotteries*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Keating, P. (1996, May). Lotto fever: We all lose! *Money*, 25 (5), 142-145, 147, 149.

McCaffery, E. J. (1994). Why people play lotteries and why it matters. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 1, 71-122.

Media One Advertising/Marketing. (1988). *Double Dollars* [Television advertisement]. (Available from Media One Advertising/Marketing, 3918 S. Western Avenue, Sioux Falls, SD 57105)

Media One Advertising/Marketing. (1989). *Cash Package* [Television advertisement]. (Available from Media One Advertising/Marketing, 3918 S. Western Avenue, Sioux Falls, SD 57105)

Media One Advertising/Marketing. (1992). *Dakota Cash* [Television advertisement]. (Available from Media One Advertising/Marketing, 3918 S. Western Avenue, Sioux Falls, SD 57105)

Media One Advertising/Marketing. (1997). *Ticket to Ride* [Television advertisement]. (Available from Media One Advertising/Marketing, 3918 S. Western Avenue, Sioux Falls, SD 57105)

Nixon, L. (1998, January 17). Lawmaker says video lottery was a bad mistake. Governor suggests legislature move carefully, study issue. *Aberdeen American News*, p. 1A.

Perlman, E. (1996, December). Lotto's little luxuries: You can win some huge prizes in a state lottery. But many players are more interested in the smaller ones. *Governing*, 10 (3), 18.

Selinger, I. C. (1993, May 10). The big lottery gamble. *Advertising Age*, 64 (20), 22-23, 26, 28.

Shenk, J. W. (1995, July-August). Everyone's a loser: How lottery ads entice the wrong people to gamble. *Washington Monthly*, 27 (7-8), 22-25.

Simon, P. (1995, August 4). *Congressional Record*, 141 (129), S 11472-S 11474.

South Dakota Lottery. (1993). *South Dakota's lottery started from scratch: 1992 annual report*. N. p.: Author.

South Dakota Lottery. (1996, June 6). South Dakota Lottery [5 paragraphs]. *The South Dakota World Wide Web site* [Online]. Available at HTTP: <http://www.state.sd.us/state/executive/lottery/lottery.html> (version on November 14, 1996).

South Dakota Lottery. (1997a, September 26). History [5 paragraphs]. *South Dakota Lottery* [Online]. Available at HTTP: <http://www.state.sd.us/state/executive/lottery/history.htm> (version on November 26, 1997).

South Dakota Lottery. (1997b). Where the money goes! [4 paragraphs]. *South Dakota Lottery* [Online]. Available at HTTP: <http://www.state.sd.us/state/executive/lottery/wherethe.htm> (version on December 1, 1997).

Stearns, J. M., & Borna, S. (1995, January). The ethics of lottery advertising: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14 (1), 43-51.

Szakmary, A. C., & Szakmary, C. M. (1995, April). State lotteries as a source of revenue: A re-examination. *Southern Economic Journal*, 61 (4), 1167-1181.

Worsnop, R. L. (1990, November 9). Lucrative lure of lotteries and gambling. *Editorial Research Reports*, 1 (41), 633-646.

Woster, T. (1997a, October 12). Gambling makes state millions, but some ask, "At what cost?": Legal gaming marks 19 years in South Dakota. [*Sioux Falls Argus Leader*, pp. 1A, 5A.

Woster, T. (1997b, October 12). Lottery trailblazer: One regret: Video gaming's

runaway rise, ex-director says. [*Sioux Falls*] *Argus Leader*, p. 4A.

Woster, T. (1997c, October 13). 10 years later, most legislators believe state isn't better off: Only alternative to replace lottery is tax increases. [*Sioux Falls*] *Argus Leader*, pp. 1A, 5A.

Editor's Essay

Loving It, Hating It, Living with Intercollegiate Forensics

Kirstin Cronn-Mills

I happened into college forensics by accident. I was required, as part of an undergraduate degree, to take two credits of college forensics. Little did I know that I would forego that particular degree but meet my future husband. Little did I know I would gain an entirely different family—not just the traditional set of in-laws—thanks to my spouse. The individuals involved with college forensics—coaches and students—are intelligent, interesting, and unique. Some are my best friends. However, my status as spouse and mother is altered each fall as forensics season rolls around. I become the “family at home” until April, and the other forensicators become the family with whom my spouse spends more time. This essay represents my understanding of the paradox of family in this activity: forensics professionals are always torn between their biological families and their forensics families—and each family demands time, energy, and devotion. Forensics professionals are caught in the middle between the two families. I have learned (I think my husband always knew) to regard our forensics family as you would any other family members: you always love them, but sometimes you want them to go away. For me, striking a balance in that love/hate stay-here/go-away relationship can be difficult.

Once the season starts, Fridays and Saturdays are spent with forensics family members. Biological family members are put on hold until Sunday, and sometimes longer if the tournament is a swing. This “on hold” status is not meant (at least in my case) as a penalty. My spouse enjoys being home with us, and when he is here he does everything from child care to housework. However, he is a dedicated member of the District IV family, and has been since his days as a District IV competitor (despite rumors about the District IV mafia, this is not *la famiglia*, notwithstanding my misgivings about its power). In my opinion, my spouse’s passage into “the life” was not conscious—his involvement was complete enough that he saw no other career choice, nor did he want to see another choice, but forensics. Though I understand obligation, and a demanding desire to be a competent professional, there are times I balk at my spouse’s devotion.

When I first became involved with forensics, I quickly understood the care and commitment forensicators have for one another. Coaches can care for one another as brothers and sisters, and they care for their competitors as younger siblings, or even their own college-age children. Even when professionals leave the field, ties remain strong to others in the activity. I am always glad to know Dan

Kirstin Cronn-Mills (Ph.D., Iowa State University, 1997) is an instructor in the General Education Department at South Central Technical College, North Mankato, MN 56003.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 38 (2001), 63-65

is safe and loved while he is on the road. However, the fact my spouse is securely ensconced in the bosom of his other family does not alter my loneliness while he is gone, or alter my desire to have another caretaker for our child so I can take a break. It does not change my worry over icy roads, or the concern when he is later than he thought he might be.

What has had to change is me and my attitude. This paper is titled “Loving It, Hating It, Living with Intercollegiate Forensics” because of how I have learned to view this extended forensics family (“hate” might be too strong, but it’s shorter than “greatly dislike and get annoyed with”). We accord certain levels of respect to family members, and, generally speaking, I have learned to extend that respect to the people with whom my spouse spends his weekends—blood is blood, metaphorical or real. However, as with one’s biological family, there are times when I want my forensics family *Out of My Life*. By the time April, AFA, NFA, and Interstate Oratory roll around, I am ready for all coaches and students to *Stay Away*. I want my spouse back on the weekends, not just Sundays. I don’t want to drive the team to the airport, or listen to stories about pieces, speeches, and who did what at which tournament. I want no more conversations at forensics gatherings about misbehaving students or job-hunting coaches. I want no more trophies floating around in the car or fished out of vans at the end of trips. I want forensics to *Disappear*. But, by September, I have softened up again. I am willing to watch my spouse go back to the activity he loves, and the other family he loves. I am not happy, but I have to let him go. It is part of his life, a fulfilling part, and one I won’t restrict, no matter how much I hate/dislike/get annoyed with it.

This last statement makes it sound like I am the Blessed Martyr of Forensics Living, like I have it rougher than most. I do not. I am sometimes bitter and tired, and dreading another weekend with my almost-preschooler whose favorite question is “why?” But I try to understand. I know a woman whose spouse used to coach; they have three young boys. I always figure if she can understand (and she does, because her husband is/was a “lifer,” too), I can understand. My spouse has exceeded the life expectancy of a forensics professional by double—he is in his fourteenth year of coaching at the college level (nine of those years spent as a director). The average length of coaches’ time in the activity, I believe, is seven years (including years spent coaching as a graduate assistant). His dedication would not continue if he did not receive profound personal and professional satisfaction from the activity; it is thus my responsibility to understand that satisfaction. And, to be honest, I do. The pedagogical rewards of forensics can be phenomenal. Sometimes my spouse needs to be reminded that the biological family is still here and deserves his attention. But he also needs to live this weird, crazy life with his other family, who love him and accept him for who he is. That appreciation of him is worth a great deal to me. This way of life deserves my patience because it is such a large part of my spouse. Love him, love the activity.

My son and I do not have to be left out of the forensics picture. Three years ago, our child was welcomed into the forensics community with all the affection, attention, and gifts we could ever want. At the close of this year’s forensics season, who was the hit of the student party? My toddler. How many offers of childcare did we get? Plenty. Will we take them up on it? Of course—we trust forensics

kids! Often I feel forgotten in the wake of an important conversation, tournament, or practice session, even though I am not. The forensics life is never easy, even for someone who chooses it (or thinks he did), let alone falls into it accidentally. But, with any family, the rewards of family involvement can be greater than the penalties.

I recently attended a retirement party (from forensics) for a very-long-time coach. The love for that coach, from colleagues and former students, was palpable. The man who sat next to me was one of the retiree's former students. That man told me a speech he'd written as a competitor had changed his life and his career direction. Forensics is a powerful activity, and our forensics family members make it so. I cannot turn my back on family, no matter how much I may want to. Love it or hate it, or both—blood is blood. Blood provides us with strength.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha National Council has established a standard subscription rate of \$10.00 per year for *Speaker and Gavel*.

Present policy provides that new members, upon election, are provided with two years of *Speaker and Gavel* free of charge. Life members, furthermore, who have paid a life patron alumni membership fee of \$100, likewise regularly receive *Speaker and Gavel*. Current chapter sponsors and the libraries of institutions holding a charter in the organization receive each issue.

Other individuals and libraries are welcome to subscribe to *Speaker and Gavel*. Subscription orders should be sent to:

Daniel Cronn-Mills
Department of Speech Communication
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Mankato, MN 56001

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them payable to: "The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha."

The membership fee is \$15.00. The official key is \$15.00; the official key-pin is \$17.00. **Prices include Federal Tax.** According to present regulations of the society, new members receive *Speaker and Gavel* for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive *Speaker and Gavel* may subscribe at the standard rate of \$10.00 per year.

SPEAKER AND GAVEL

Daniel Cronn-Mills
Kirstin Cronn-Mills
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University
Mankato, MN 56001

**Forwarding and Return Postage
Guaranteed**

Presorted Standard
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Lawrence, KS
Permit No. 116