

Motive and New Rhetorics

The last few years have been years of conflict in America. The conflict has created new coalitions and highlighted contrasts in their ideologies. The civil rights groups emerged in the South to challenge the Southern pattern of segregation. The antiwar activists emerged to challenge American involvement in the tragedy of Vietnam. Then came the hard-hats, the silent majority, the radical groups of various flavors. The drama of conflicting groups became the dominant drama of the era.

The drama has increased realization that human action is social. We find that our reaction to an event is similar to that of others, and very different from still others. Likewise, our use of language is very similar to some and very different from others. These two elements, language and action, overtly mark the commonality and differences among major social groups.

The relationship between these two elements, and specifically the influence of language on social action, is the rhetorician's concern. Joining others who have

turned their study to the conflict among social groups, rhetoricians have given increasing attention to social movements. These studies have been either of the persuasiveness of leaders in attracting followers¹ or of the content of the movement's language.² The former studies employ the traditional speaker-audience model to investigate strategies to achieve the goal of expanded membership. The latter studies characterize the content and strategies of movement rhetoric.

Yet implied in this latter type of study is an additional study of a group's rhetoric—the role of language in the relationship between a group's program and its reaction to the community's situation. Each group suggests its own reaction to a situation and in doing so serves an advisory role to the broader community.³ Their rhetoric contains their program for community action. When a group says, "This is how we should act or will act," they refer to a "we" broader than the group. They imply an invitation to join the group members in their common approach. This study of group rhetoric would concentrate only secondarily on language's role in identifying others with the movement; primary focus would be on language as a tool for encompassing and coping with the situation.

Consider two examples of movement studies that imply the appropriateness of this perspective. Parke Burgess' plea for interpretation of the rhetoric of black power as a moral "call for justice" rather than "a call to arms" implies a very important relationship between rhetoric and action.⁴ Our society, both black and white, has assumed that black power is a rhetoric of physical violence. As we act from the rhetoric we are in danger of embroilment in physical battle. Instead, Burgess argues, we ought interpret black power as a rhetoric of morality arguing for social justice as an end rather than violent opposition as a means. This interpretation permits development of a new rhetoric encompassing the goal of social justice but arguing for peaceful achievement of social justice. Burgess concludes that a "rhetoric of democratic commitment" should arise to counter the "rhetoric of violence." Importantly, Burgess recognizes that the rhetoric we interpret it postures our actions on the issue.

A second example is found in Leland Griffin's study of the New Left.⁵ Griffin characterizes one phase of the New Left program as a rhetorical program for "the substitution in the public mind of 'peace consciousness' for 'war consciousness.'" For America to turn to peace, the mass must learn to deal with its situation with the

4

peace rhetoric of the New Left instead of the war rhetoric of traditional Western politics. The rhetoric with which the mass encompasses their situation will mold their response to the situation.

These two examples are from a genre of studies of "rhetorics" that have blossomed in recent years.⁶ As the authors of these studies look at the diversity among groups they see a vast array of linguistic material and strategies, not just for manipulating others, but for coming to terms with social reality as the group sees it. From these corpora of material and strategy arise the various rhetorics. In one of these studies Parke Burgess explains,

Rhetoric springs from cultural context. The strategies and motives of any rhetoric--say the rhetoric of liberalism or the rhetoric of black power--represent an invitation to a life style, an invitation to adopt a pattern of strategies and motives, verbal and nonverbal, that determine how men and women will function together in culture.⁷

Several implications of Burgess' view of rhetoric are important. First, note that rhetoric springs from cultural context. The individual manipulator of hearer psyches through message management is no longer the inventor of rhetoric. Instead, the social process itself results in the development of a rhetoric. Instead of viewing the speaker as the inventor of the rhetoric

and the audience as reactor to the rhetoric, the group, including speakers and audiences, invents the rhetoric in the ongoing social process and the group reacts through the rhetoric to its ongoing social reality.⁸ Scott and Smith explain the major change in defining rhetoric implied in these studies:

In seeing rhetoric as an amalgam of meaning and method, these writers break with a tradition that takes rhetoric to be a set of techniques of manipulating a message to fit various contexts. Rhetoric has always been response oriented, that is, the rationale of practical discourse, discourse designed to gain response for specific ends. But these writers see response differently. For them, the response of audiences is an integral part of the message method that makes the rhetoric. Thus, rhetoric is shifted from a focus of reaction to one of interaction or transaction.⁹

Second, a rhetoric as a pattern of method and message implies the style of action. The rhetoric of a group entails its program for group action. Participation in the rhetoric will imply participation in patterns of action. The pattern of strategy and motive determines the patterns of social relationship functioning. Our examples of the rhetorics of Black Power and the New Left illustrate this use of rhetoric to designate the relationship between language and action.

Third, a rhetoric functions as an "invitation to a life style." It suggests rejection of the old pattern as

of language and action for new patterns. To join the group is to understand and believe in the new patterns, and to those not in the group the rhetoric always serves to "invite" their participation.

Human society is above all an "acting together."¹⁰ Traditional rhetorical studies have stressed the effect of language on inducing the together. The studies of rhetoric stress the effect of language on both the acting and the together. This compels a perspective beyond exclusive concern with method to concern with both message and method, and the unique mix of message and method in the various groups gives rise to the rhetorics.

A method of rhetorical study that expands the examples of Burgess and Griffin along the lines suggested by Burgess in the later article promises a solid contribution to the study of the role of social groups in social action. We now need to find a method that illuminates the rhetorical difference between groups and the influence of their different programs on community action.

Motives

The essential argument of the rhetorics is that action and language are invariably linked. Burgess

speaks of this link residing in motives and strategies. The former of these terms offers a method for studying the link. Consider Walter Fisher's view of motives. He writes:

The view of this essay is that a communicator perceives a rhetorical situation in terms of a motive, and that an organic relationship exists between his perception and his response to that circumstance; his perception determines the characteristics of his discourse and his presentation. Rhetorical communication is as much grounded in motives as it is in situation, given that motives are names which essentialize the interrelations of communicator, communication, audience(s), time and place.¹¹

Fisher's adaptation of linguistic motives to rhetoric results in an apparently exhaustive list of four motives generated by the speaker's desired audience response. Taken in this light motives become mere description of speaking situation in terms of purpose. Realize, however, that it is not the speaker-audience characteristic that creates the rhetorical situation. Indeed, if the speaker is allowed to address himself all communication involves a speaker-audience relationship and all situations involving communication and perhaps even thinking become rhetorical. Rather the rhetorical situation emerges from the social reality of the situation calling forth response in language and action.¹²

If we take Fisher's treatment of the concept of

3

motivation not as a physiological but as a linguistic process and modify his view of rhetorical situation as suggested above, we have a theory of motives recognized by other students of language and social phenomena. Kenneth Burke's theory of rhetoric rests on linguistic motives as strategies for encompassing situations. On this concept, as on many others, however, Burke's writing is rather translucent. In addition, the symbolic interactionists have dealt with this perspective on motives in their sociological studies. Let us attempt to take motives as discussed by Burke and the symbolic interactionists and use the concept to extend the study of rhetorics.

Reconceptualizing Motive

The concept of motive arises from the assumption that humans have an internal ability to escape the automatic motion of the external universe. Theories of motive attempt to explain this process of "internal control." Currently the most frequent interpretation of motive is behaviorism's reduction of motive to intervening physiologically derived drives.¹³ The first aspect of the present project is a reorientation of the term "motive" to abandon the physiological formulation while maintaining motive's role as the human element in action.

9

The linguistic theory of motive assumes initially that man is by nature a chooser of action. There are really two aspects to this assumption, man is by nature active and action is different than motion because the element of human choice is included. John Dewey ties affirmation of this assumption with rejection of the behaviorist viewpoint of motive.

The whole concept of motives is in truth extra-psychological. It is an outcome of the attempt of man to influence human action, first that of others, then of a man to influence his own behavior. . . . It is absurd to ask what induces a man to activity generally speaking. He is active being and that is all there is to be said on that score. But when we want to get him to act in this specific way rather than in that, when we want to direct his activity that is to say in a specified channel, then the question of motive is ~~perhaps~~ pertinent.¹⁴

This assumption leads into the two reorientations necessary to understand this view of motive. First, motive is not stimulus to act, but part of the act itself. As Dewey explains, "A motive does not exist prior to the act and produce it. It is an act plus a judgement upon some element of it."¹⁵ To argue that motives are prior causes created by drives approaches a type of determinism denied by the assumption that choice is involved.¹⁶

The second reorientation to motive asserts that motives are linguistic and not physiological. Choices are formed not through man's characteristics as animal,

but through his characteristic as symbol-using animal.¹⁷

C. Wright Mills observes, "Rather than fixed elements 'in' an individual, motives are the terms with which interpretation of conduct by social actors proceeds."¹⁸

This view transforms man into a creator of motives and motives into linguistic structures of interpretation and action. ^A Kenneth Burke writes, "A motive is not some fixed thing, like a table, which one can go and look at. It is a term of interpretation, and being such it will naturally take its place within the framework of our Weltanschauung as a whole."¹⁹ This orientation centers study of motives on man's invention and use of symbolic language. Studies of a group's rhetoric will search for the group's use of symbols to discuss its reality.

Definition of Motive

A motive may be considered a symbolic^{*}meaning system." To argue a motive is a system implies that it has greater meaning than the simple sum of the meaning of its words--the meaning of the words is modified by their context. Hall and Fagan, general systems theorists, define a system as, "A set of objects together with relationships between the objects and between their attributes."²⁰ The sets of objects or components of the system are the overt signs of the system, but it is the ^{*}relationships between the objects^{*} that make the notion

of 'system' useful.²¹ The relationships make the system dynamic, and explain how the objects modify each others' meaning.

The motive has a characteristic vocabulary that is the corpus of components in the system. The relationship between the terms of the vocabulary constitute the pattern of the motive. The vocabulary chosen for the motive and patterns of the motive tie the reality of social experience to its symbolic counterpart. Both the vocabulary and the pattern form the meaning through which the motive functions.

The motive functions in three ways. First, it functions as a frame for interpretation. Burke writes:

Motives are distinctly linguistic products. We discern situational patterns by means of the particular vocabulary of the cultural group into which we are born. Our minds, as linguistic products are composed of concepts (verbally molded) which select certain relationships as meaningful. Other groups select other relationships ~~xxxxxx~~ as meaningful. These relationships are not realities, they are interpretations of reality--hence different frameworks of interpretation will lead to different conclusions as to what reality is.²²

This symbolic variant of the Heisenberg principle argues that the vocabulary we employ in describing our experience influences the "reality" that we see.²³

The motive also functions, however, to name the alternative responses to the experience and the consequences of the responses. C. Wright Mills explains:

The choice of lines of action is accompanied by representations, and selection among them, of their situational termini. Men discern situations with particular vocabularies, and it is in terms of some delimited vocabulary that they anticipate consequences of conduct. Stable vocabularies of motives link anticipated consequences and specific actions.²⁴

Finally, the motive functions to apply values to approve or disapprove of the experience and to select the proper response to it. It is the application of values that gives the motive its role in choice.

The key thing about these three functions is their unity in motive. The motive is present in the "now" with the act and it is the glue that binds the past and the future to the now, permitting choice and thus action. In sum, motives are linguistic systems that provide a framework for interpreting experience, for approving and disapproving of experience, and for selecting proper reaction to the situation.

Before we move to the implications of this view on rhetoric, we need to consider the stability of motives. Motives are open systems and as such they evolve and change but within the framework of a stable structure.²⁵ Motives are not individual possessions but shared community possessions. As Mills writes, "Motives are common grounds for meditated behaviors."²⁶

The socialized nature of motives does not simply restrict the individual to asserting his identification

with the group. It also permits him to assert his identity. Yet again in the assertion of identity is the invitation to identification on new terms. Both identification and identity become social functions. This is a fundamental shift in rhetorical perspective and Mills concludes, "We must approach linguistic behavior, not by referring it to private states in individuals, but by observing its social function of coordinating diverse activities."²⁸

Motives and Rhetorical Study

The theory of motives explained above is a rhetorical theory. Motives are symbolic arbiters of behavior. Certain types of rhetorical studies are likely to emerge from symbolic motives and the changing assumptions about rhetoric that they bring.

First, students of rhetoric need to discover the motives that may be operative among various groups. These motives are easier to find because they are in the rhetoric. As Burke writes,

There is no need to "supply" motives. The interrelationships themselves are the motives. For they are his situations; and situation is but another word for motives. The motivation out of which he writes is synonymous with the structural way in which he puts events and values together when he writes.²⁹

Thus rhetoricians must isolate the vocabulary and relationships that form the motive.

Second, rhetoricians need to look at the ways these motives serve to interpret reality, to assign values to experience, and to decide on proper action. The integration of specific experiences into the motive, ~~that~~ the key process in the use of the motives, poses a number of questions. How is the one proper motive selected for reaction to the situation? Are specific motives restricted only to appropriate situations? The adaptation of motive to social reality must be studied.

Third, students of rhetoric need to investigate methods of evolution in the motives. How can motives be modified? How are they imposed? How are they reinforced? We are arguing that a community has a rhetoric. The questions of how the community maintains its rhetoric become important to the critic.

Several types of past study offer promising answers to these questions. Myth seems to be a common vehicle for the propagation of motives.³¹ The studies of fantasy also may explain this process.³² Just as the common metaphor expands the meaning of a word, the interpretive metaphor may serve to transform situations by applying new motives to interpretation of them.³³ All of these methods recognize the same essential model of rhetoric that encompasses motive studies.

A Motive Analysis of
the Attica Prison Revolt

The primary purpose of this study is to use the concept of motive to understand the rhetorical diversity that follows controversial events. In addition, ~~the~~ focusing on the rhetoric that surrounds one event will illuminate the characteristic motives of the social groups involved, and the interpretive-reactive processes of motives applied to social events.

Many events occur every day around us and within the range of our awareness. After George Herbert Mead, Karl Weick describes the complex of events as "enacted environment": "The phrase 'enacted environment' preserves the crucial distinctions that we wish to make, the most important being that the human creates the environment. . . . The human actor does not react to an environment, he enacts it."³⁴ ~~The~~ Enacting these events requires giving them meaning by thrusting ourselves into them. The process of enactment, creation of meaning and ~~human~~ assumption of role in the events, is shaped by motives.

This study focuses on the rhetoric surrounding an important social event--the prison revolt at Attica State Prison in September 1971. Using motive analysis as a method, in this part of the paper I want to examine

the rhetorical efforts to enact the events at Attica, hoping to discover some of the motives behind the diversity of reaction to Attica. Then in the next section I want to look at the similarities among rhetorical treatments to understand in greater depth the process through which we use motives to enact our experience.

The Weekly People

In late September 1971,³⁵ the Weekly People reported the events of Attica and suggested that in response to these ~~the~~ events readers should recommit themselves to socialist revolution. The Weekly People is the official organ of the Socialist Workers Party of the United States, dedicated to the replacement of capitalism with a socialist system. The motive that forms the context for the events and people of Attica is the broader struggle of classes within capitalism.

The People writes that the root of the crisis is capitalism and its tendency to oppression. Capitalism is based on the attainment of individual wealth, the drive toward which makes the "god-fearing, prosperous pillars of the community" into "cold-blooded and ruthless capitalists and business executives." The capitalist state becomes their tool.

In striving to increase their own wealth these capitalists oppress the lower classes. Capitalists have kept the blacks of the lower class in "various stages of slavery, . . . passed laws to prohibit teaching them to read and write, . . . denied them family life, . . . and treated them like barnyard animals." Maintaining the exploited class of blacks and Puerto Ricans spawns "resentment of Negroes on welfare, . . . continued resistance to desegregation, . . . and hate and fear of blacks who may get jobs from the whites."

These oppressive actions create poverty, slums, and conditions that engender in the black and Puerto Rican "victims of society" embittered resentment and hate of the white capitalists. Slum crimes against persons and property inevitably arise from the need to survive in poverty and slum conditions. At the same time the slum criminal is jailed, crimes committed by businessmen in efforts to attain wealth are ignored, and the aggressiveness condemned in blacks is praised in budding young white capitalists.

The capitalist state is charged with keeping domestic order and the response to the slum crime is to imprison blacks, "punishing the social victims while pretending to rehabilitate. So callous, cold-blooded,

massacre consistent with both domestic and foreign capitalist violence. The massacre allows the "execution" without delays of indictment, trial, defense, and appeals of courtroom procedure.

To the People the Attica affair is a continuation of the capitalist oppression. The prisoners are victims of society who are helpless before the inevitable and characteristic violence by the capitalists. The opponents of capitalism must also continue their struggle to build a better world through socialist revolution. Socialists must first take the ballot box and then use unionism to battle capitalism. To do this they must organize, be disciplined, and drill. As an example of capitalist oppression, Attica exemplified the need for and demanded recommitment to the success of the socialist revolution.

Arkansas Democrat

The September 14, 1971, edition of the Arkansas Democrat published an editorial critical of the handling of the Attica revolt by New York state corrections officials.³⁶ That editorial explained the Democrat's view of the meaning of Attica.

To the editors of the Democrat the primary source

of the crisis was the irresponsibility of the convicts. They are described as "fanatical," as "desperate men," and as "hysterical." Their demands were unreasonable and unworthy. They had killed one guard and threatened to kill more.

Furthermore, these convicts became increasingly fanatical as the crisis continued. The Democrat wrote, "Even after four days of rising fanaticism there were still some of the convicts with enough sanity left not to carry out the execution orders of their leaders." The Democrat emphasized the characteristic nature of fanaticism by pointing to its exception, and set the tone of increasing fanaticism characteristic of the crisis.

The Democrat is actually second guessing the New York authorities and their handling of the situation. Looking back on the authorities' decision, the paper argues that the chosen action was inappropriate. The decision to delay action while negotiating permitted the fanaticism to grow. The "procession of thirty or more . . . well-meaning but naive intermediaries" created an "emotional atmosphere . . . [and] worsened the situation."

Some of those admitted to negotiations by authorities even "fanned the flames." The Democrat

points especially to William Kunstler and Bobby Seale. "Their rhetoric in front of law-abiding audiences in lecture halls is scary enough so one can imagine what kinds of inflammatory things they said to the prisoners in Cell Block D."

In short, negotiations were inappropriate. Wrote the Democrat, "You cannot make deals with desperate men. . . . Every concession, every compromise, every famous visitor served only to raise the convicts' expectations of victory," and with the rising expectations, to increase their hysteria and fanaticism.

Because the convicts were desperate men, and immediate show of force was the proper response. No more lives would have been lost, the Democrat reasoned, and probably fewer. "Quick use of force would have prevented the spread of hysteria."

Fanatical men could not be reasoned with so negotiations did no good. There could be no capitulation by prison authorities for this would have encouraged convicts all over the country to do the same. With no possible course but force, the sooner used the better.

Motives and the Enactive Process

Motives are frameworks for enacting events into experience, for accepting an understanding of events and beginning to act with relationship to them. The Weekly People and the Arkansas Democrat interpret Attica quite differently and urge their readers to support very different reactions to this sort of event. With their rhetorical treatments of Attica as resource material, I now want to look at the similarities rather than the differences, hoping to discover some characteristics of the process through which the events are given meaning.

The Context of the Event

The first important ingredient in the enactment of an event is the development of the context. A motive includes a specific pattern of experience that forms a context from the actions of the event. The People and the Democrat see two different patterns in the events of Attica and develop them using two different methods.

The People develops a scenario of action, detailing to a considerable extent the pattern of the motive. The pattern that explains Attica is the broader conflict between the capitalist upper and lower classes. The

development of the scenario includes not only definitions of the combatants and strategies of the conflict, but ~~x~~ also a history to illustrate the pattern of action. This framework is a thesis that the Socialist Workers Party uses to explain many of the events in society. Attica becomes a scene in the drama with the characteristics and actions at Attica representative of the characteristics and actions of the broader drama.

The enacting of Attica into the scenario becomes a matter of how well the people and events fit into the dramatic plot. If the drama explains the events, if ATTICA "fits," the drama has credibility and the reaction to Attica, our action as we enact ourselves into the drama, should be ~~to~~ to fulfill the dramatic scenario-- in this case to join the socialist revolution.

The great detail and extended elaboration of the scenario is absent in the Democrat. Instead the Democrat briefly refers to a "principle of action" --you cannot reason with ~~an~~ irrational men and their threats must be met with overwhelming force. This principle is just as surely a pattern of experience as is the scenario, but it is in the much briefer form of a simple "if. . . then" statement.

The test of the validity of the pattern of action

is much narrower in the case of the principle. The Democrat must assume, therefore, that the principle is a fairly widely accepted pattern. The scenario offers in its development examples of its validity, the principle offers only the abstract statement of procedure.

The scope of the test of appropriateness is narrowed also from the scenario. The scenario offers a broad range of interpretations of events. The strength of the pattern to interpret events is accumulative. With the principle, however, the test is a short "Yes-No" type: Are the convicts irrational? The Democrat develops the irrationality of the convicts as the major theme of the explanation of Attica. If the principle is indeed accepted as a valid pattern of action, and if the men in question are shown irrational, then the immediate use of force is the appropriate response.

Either method, the scenario or the principle, explains the pattern of experience that gives a context for action. The context then serves as a background for the events that are to be enacted.

Enacting the Events

Whether within the context of a scenario or a principle, the events as they occur must be enacted into

the motive structure. Any event is a collage of people, things, and actions. The process of enactment is a process of sorting and organizing.

In this process there are three basic operations. First is selecting. Some of the events will be selected as important and others will pass virtually without notice. ~~notice~~ Second is valuing. Some of the people and events we select will meet with approval and others will be deplored. Third is relating. Most of the people and events will be combined into causal relationships, relationships of conflict, relationships of coalition, the others will coexist without particular relevance to each other.

Using these three operations we enact our experience to give meaning to it in terms of our worldview. The process of enactment leaves different meanings for the same events and once again Babel divides us as we experience the events.

Selecting. The individual faced with the chaos of events will select some as important and dismiss others. This selection process requires that some criteria be passed over the events to shape selection, and the motive provides a form of criteria.

Our two studies illustrate the variance in

selection. The People, for example, concentrates on the fact that the convicts are black and Puerto Rican while the Democrat makes no observation about their ethnic background at all. The explanation, of course, is that the ethnic background has importance for the People but not for the Democrat. On the other hand, both accounts note the emotionalism of the convicts and both of the motives explain the emotionalism.

The People describes the charge, the gunfire, the killing of hostages and prisoners that occurs as the corrections officials retake the prison. The Democrat speaks much more passively and only of the fact that the deaths have occurred. The Democrat, however, notes the prisoners' killing of a guard early in the occupation and the threats to kill more.

The People ignores the negotiations between the convicts and authorities, which the Democrat describes in great detail. Negotiations and a search for a peaceful settlement is to an extent inconsistent with the People's description of the situation while the presence of outside negotiators, the concessions of the authorities are both integral parts of the Democrat's explanation.

Valuing. The second operation in the enacting of

an event is the choice of elements to avoid and the elements to condone and the designation of their value. The valuing of two elements from the description of Attica illustrates the operation. To the People, the convicts are innocent victims undeserving^{of} ~~out~~ scorn. They are blacks and Puerto Ricans driven to their actions by society and should be pitied for the emotion and hate that has been forced upon them. The Democrat, on the other hand, condemns the convicts. Instead of pitying them for the emotion and hate, they are to be condemned for it. Their fanaticism and hysteria render them irrational. They are to be condemned for killing guards and threatening to kill more. The convict occupies a different place in the two motives.

The valuing of the action of penal authorities is an even more interesting case. Both condemn the authorities' actions but for different reasons. The People condemns the violence of the retaking of the facility. They describe the guards killing in cold-blood as they enter with their guns blazing. The ~~Democrat~~ Democrat, however, condemns the delay in retaking the prison. The Democrat reasons that this delay intensified the fanaticism of the inmates and perhaps cost lives. Thus the actions are valued identically by

both but for different reasons.

There are several methods of valuing a concept. First, the selection of descriptive vocabulary values a term. The valuing of different vocabulary choices is essentially communicated in the motive. In most cases many motives share the valuing of a term, and indeed some terms, "murder" for example, are nearly universally valued in the motives of which they are part.

When the People describes the convicts as "victims of society" the power of the word "victim" derives directly from the motive. Labelling the prison guards "capitalists" condemns them with a metaphorical use of the primary devil term of the motive. As the "executioners" of Attica guards become the vicarious representatives of the capitalists.

The attributes of an element, expressed as adjectives and adverbs, also value. Describing the intermediaries trying to negotiate the crisis as "naive" values them. "Brutal" billings by the guards value the action for us. These choices, like the vocabulary choices, are heavily influenced by the attributes expected of the elements according to the motive.

Valuing also occurs by relating the elements to

other elements already valued. One frequent variation of this is to condemn the person or action because of the things it causes. Thus the Democrat condemns the ~~negotiation~~ negotiations because they lead to greater hysteria and fanaticism.

There is an important variation of this pattern that deserves special recognition. When people are involved they are condemned only if their actions result from the exercise of free will. If their action is determined, the causes and not the victims of the determinants are condemned. Thus it is that the convicts are excused by the People because they were forced into their actions by the real culprit--capitalism. If responsibility and choice are absent the "victim" of the powers that rob him of choice is forgiven.

In many cases the relating that condemns or condones is simple association. For example, the Democrat does a hatchet-job on Tom Wicker of the New York Times. The Democrat condemns Wicker because the convicts "must have been especially glad to see him." The condemnation of the convicts condemns Wicker by simple association.

Finally, valuing may occur through various stylistic devices. The most important is contrasting.

This form ~~is~~ recognizes the goodness (or badness) in the valued element, but uses it as evidence of the evil (good) so that the exception proves the rule. Writes the Democrat, "Even after four days of rising fanaticism there were still some of the convicts with enough sanity left ^{not} ~~not~~ to carry out the execution orders shouted by their leaders. . . . If the authorities had rushed the cell block three, or even two days before, there might have been more of that."

To intensify the valuing, a series is often used. This method includes terms not usually strongly valued with a series of strongly valued terms thus ~~giving~~ giving them the strength of the rest of the series. The People lists the abuses against the blacks--denial of family life, prohibition of education, treated like barnyard animals, and made necessary migration to the North. The impact of the last of these is increased because of its place in the series of more important elements.

These techniques value the people and events in such a way to isolate some for praise and some for condemnation. These evaluations then combine with the relationships to form the motive.

Relating. Relating tells what goes with what.

It ties the objects and attributes selected by the motive together to give the events a sense of action and completeness.

Relationships function in two ways. First, concurrent relationships help complete characterizations of situations. They give breadth to description of the situations and remove the randomness of concurring objects and events. The Democrat, for example, discusses visits by William Kunstler, Bobby Seale, New York representative Herman Badillo, and Tom Wicker, a federal court order against reprisals by prison officials should the occupation end, and the delay in action by prison authorities. Together these form a definite pattern of capitulation to prisoner demands and weakness of prison authorities in the Democrat's view.

Consider also an example of the People's description of capitalism. Their description of capitalists and the capitalist state seeking individual wealth through oppression of minorities with legislation and violence combines a number of elements of the situation into one unit of action. These elements (agent, purpose, act, and agency) are congruent with each other giving an impression of consistency to the description of the situation.

Relationships also serve as temporal bridges between situations, however, describing the development of the situation over time. Causality and interaction relationships result. This not only permits testing of congruence of past actions and thus the motive's explanatory power, but also predictability of future action to provide a framework for choice.

The People links the oppression of the capitalists with the slum conditions including the hate⁹ and ~~resent~~ resentment of the blacks and Puerto Ricans, and the ~~can~~ committing of slum crimes. The Democrat ties the presence of the outside negotiators and the delay in action to the increasing fanaticism of the prisoners.

Two forms of interaction relationship deserve special attention. Relationships of conflict and coalition are important parts of the motives. Because motives help us to join with others for action, one of their functions is to point out those to support and those to oppose. Thus coalitions are formed and conflict is acted out within the motive.

The primary relationships of the People's account of Attica is the conflict between the capitalists and the slum victims. The conflict, ~~representative~~ represented at Attica by the conflict

between the guards and the prisoners, develops as the crisis evolves. Against the capitalists ^{is the coalition of} ~~are the~~ slum victims, ~~the~~ prisoners, and ~~the~~ working people who are at the heart of the revolution.

These relationships are absolutely essential to give the motives the sense of complete organizing power necessary to make them reliable operating models.

Selection, valuation, and relation work simultaneously and in relation to each other to enact the events into the motive. Thus the relationships and the values suggest the elements from the situation to be selected as important. The relationships between elements help value each element. The relationships provide a structure among the elements selected and valued.

Reaction to the Event

Enactment of the events is completed only when the motive is accepted and reaction chosen. Motives not only help understanding of the events that have occurred, they also suggest alternative responses and provide a framework for evaluation of the alternatives. Thus the motive includes a role through which the individual integrates himself into the situation. The

selection of a motive to describe and evaluate the events includes the selection of an appropriate action.

The Democrat describes the riot by highlighting the fanaticism and irrationality of the convicts. Given this irrationality the alternative responses are to move immediately or delay response. The Democrat then through relation and evaluation rejects the latter course of action and explains that the former was more appropriate.

The People describes the riot as an inevitable reaction to capitalism. The proper reaction must be commitment to the revolution against capitalism.

The enactment of the events places the individual in a position to enter the event. Actions in relation to it are consistent with motives. Participation may be direct participation in united action or it may be vicarious as agents act on the individual's behalf and with his support. The choice of action, and the choice of accepting or rejecting the actions in which the individual is invited to participate will be motivated by his view of the situation. Thus the situation serves as a nexus of the context and the action. The rhetorical motive then welds the three together.

FOOTNOTES

¹Among studies of this type are: Herbert W. Simons, "Patterns of Persuasion in the Civil Rights Struggle," Today's Speech, 15(1967)25-27; Walter R. Fisher, "A Motive View of Communication," QJS, 56(April 1970)131-142; Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," QJS, 56(1970)

²Among studies of this type are: Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetorical Structure of the 'New Left' Movement: Part I," QJS, 50(1964)113-136; Parke G. Burgess, "The Rhetoric of Black Power: A Moral Demand?" QJS, 54(1968) 122-133; James R. Andrews, "Confrontation at Columbia: A Case Study in Coercive Rhetoric," QJS, 55(February 1969) 9-16.

³See, for example, Fisher, p. 131.

⁴Burgess, "Rhetoric of Black Power,"

⁵Griffin, "Rhetorical Structure of 'New Left'."

⁶"These writers sense a corporate wholeness in the messages and methods of various men. An attempt to explain the combination of message and method which forms the wholeness gives rise in each case to a rhetoric." Robert L. Scott and Donald K. Smith, "The Rhetoric of Confrontation," QJS, 55(February 1969)1n-2n.

⁷Parke G. Burgess, "The Rhetoric of Moral Conflict: Two Critical Dimensions," QJS, 51(April 1970)120.

⁸Cf. Scott and Smith, p. 2n; Lloyd F. Ditzer and Edwin Black, eds. The Prospect of Rhetoric (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 229.

⁹Scott and Smith, p. 2n.

¹⁰This view is central to the view of Kenneth Burke. See especially A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1969; original copyright 1951), p. 21.

¹¹Fisher, p. 132.

¹²See Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1 (January 1968):1-14.

¹³See, for example, R.M. MacIver, Social Causation (New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1964; original copyright 1942), pp. 195-233; Patrick O. Marsh, Persuasive Speaking (New York, Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 95-99; Thomas M. Scheidel, Persuasive Speaking, (Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman, 1967), pp. 43-45.

¹⁴John Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology (New York, Modern Library, 1950, original copyright 1922), pp. 119-120.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁶Physiological motives may be able to answer the question: Why did he act? It is the question Dewey dismisses, however. The question--Why did he act in that way instead of this?--cannot be answered by physiological motives. A man may eat because he is hungry, but why does he demand to eat fish on Friday? or why does he eat with a fork instead of with his fingers? Thus the question of choice is not answered by the traditional conception of motive.

¹⁷Cf. Kenneth Burke, Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1966), pp. 3-9.

¹⁸C. Wright Mills, "Situated Actions and Vocabulary of Motives," in Social Psychology through Symbolic Interaction, eds. Gregory Stone and Harvey Faberman (Waltham, Massachusetts, Ginn-Blaisdell, 1970), p. 472.

¹⁹Kenneth Burke, Permanence and Change (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1965, revised edition copyright 1954), p. 25.

²⁰A.D. Hall and R.E. Fagan, "Definition of System," in Modern System Theory for the Behavioral Scientist, ed. Walter Buckley (Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1968) p. 81.

²¹Ibid., p. 82.

²²Burke, Permanence and Change, p. 35.

23A number of writings have reflected various applications of Heisenberg's principle. The Whorf-Sapir hypothesis makes essentially the same argument in the more restricted sense of syntactical structure. The view is also reflected in Kenneth Boulding, The Image (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1956),

24Mills, p. 473.

25For a definitional discussion of open systems see Gordon W. Allport, "The Open System in Personality Theory" in Buckley, pp. 344-345. Also Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1966), pp. 189-28.

26Mills, p. 475.

27Cf. Discussion of identity and identification in Burke, Rhetoric of Motives.

28Mills, p. 472

29Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form (New York, Vintage Books, 1957; original copyright, 1941), p. 18.

30see the writing of Mircea Eliade. Also A.J.M. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," Journal of Communication, 20(1970)17-31.

32See, for example, Bakelids paper read earlier in this seminar.

33Bernard L. Brook, "Unifying Issues and Image in Political Argument," Paper read at CSSA convention April 8, 1972. Arthur Hastings, "Metaphor in Rhetoric," Western Speech, 34(Summer 1970)181-193.

³⁴Karl E. Weick, The Social Psychology of ~~Organic~~ Organizing (Reading, Mass, Addison Wesley, 1969), p. 64.

³⁵The Weekly People's coverage of the Attica disorders include: "Capitalism's Harshness is Reflected in Prison Brutality and Killings," 81, no. 27 (October 2, 1971)1-3. "Background to the Attica Massacre," 81, no. 27 (October 2, 1971)4. "Capitalism Threatens Our Common Humanity," 81, no. 28 (October 9, 1971)4.

³⁶Reprinted in Editorials on File, September 15, 1971, p. 1151.