

CSSR/SCÉR

CANADIAN SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF RHETORIC/
SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE POUR L'ÉTUDE DE LA RHÉTORIQUE

May 31 – June 2 2012, Wilfrid Laurier/Université Wilfrid Laurier, Kitchener, ON

All Sessions in Room/Salle 1-101B
DR. Alvin Woods Building (DAWB)

PROGRAM/PROGRAMME

Contact: Jeanie Wills, President
jeanie.wills@usask.ca

THURSDAY MAY 31/JEUDI 31 Mai

9:00 am	WELCOME/BIENVENUE INTRODUCION TO THE SPECIAL SESSION RHETORIC AND UNCERTAINTY	(DAWB 1-101B)
----------------	--	----------------------

Chairs/Présidents de séance:

Victor Ferry, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
and
Loïc Nicolas, Université Libre de Bruxelles

9:30 – 10:30 am	Aporia and Metalipsis: Uncertainty in Fiction	(Session/Séance 1)
------------------------	--	---------------------------

Shannon Purves-Smith, Wilfrid Laurier University

TITLE: “Uncertainty as Verisimilitude: The Role of *Aporia* in Recent Fiction”

In the *Rhetoric* (1357a), Aristotle explains that rhetoric does not seek to establish necessity [in the philosophical sense of following inevitably from logical, physical, or moral laws]. It deals rather with the probable; most of the art of persuasion resides in procedures that *might* not construct truth. Living in a state of constant uncertainty, we long for its opposite; hence our passion for statistics, routine, insurance, pensions, medical diagnostics, Google and Wikipedia, social networks, contraception, tenure, and crime fiction, wherein we seek satisfaction through logical resolution.

The rhetorical term *aporia*, an expression of doubt, has also a philosophical definition, “a puzzle or insoluble impasse,” and a post-structuralist sense, “any cognitive situation in which the threat of inconsistency confronts us.” This concept is essential to fiction, but the resolution of uncertainty is no longer recognized as either particularly true to life or necessary for artistic integrity. Authors from Joyce to Calvino have preferred an open-ended conclusion to their stories and now, except in relentlessly plot-driven whodunits, one accepts and even expects ambiguity rather than a concrete dénouement.

Sometimes uncertainty, including the figurative language of *aporia*, is the subject of a work. Such is the case in both “The Harp,” by Carol Shields and *The Sense of an Ending* by Julian Barnes. Both their protagonists and the reader are in search of answers that dispel uncertainty. Yet what matters is their characters’ doubtful

interpretations of what, how, and why “it happened.” These stories explore the conundrum of multiple points of view, especially of cause and effect.

I will discuss *aporia* in its various meanings, but especially as rhetoric. The topics (definition and cause and effect), discursive tropological strategies (maxims, questions – both rhetorical and real, and an overriding metaphor in the Barnes novel), as well as a propensity for the imitation of the conventions of forensic rhetoric all contribute to the quest for an explanation to the initial crisis and consequent disturbance of stasis, and to the verisimilitude of the stories.

Pierre Zoberman, Université de Paris

TITLE: Who is speaking? *Metalepsis* and the making of self-conscious literature

Self-conscious literature (from *Don Quijote* to Sterne, among other examples), brought to the fore in Alter’s *Partial Magic* over three decades ago, typically questions the status of the narrator, whose ethos as omniscient and truthful is challenged to various degrees and through various devices. *Metalepsis* is one such device, peculiarly effective, as it undermines narrative certainty, conversely promoting a strategy of uncertainty whose effect is to highlight the fictional (constructed) nature of fiction and of fictional universes, and the paradoxical nature of narrative *truth*. *Metalepsis* is a figure highly specialized in literature: it refers to the slippages between “real” and “fictional” universes, namely the inclusion in a fictional text of the author (the ostensible source of the fictional events and characters, as phrases such as, “Homer has Athena say,” or “Shakespeare kills Hamlet at the end of the play” illustrate at the simplest level. From Genette to Lavocat, a whole new critical/theoretical tradition has evolved from the study of more or less extreme transgressions of the hierarchical relationships between the narrator and narration (as narrated events)—from Genette to Lavocat. In this paper, I will explore the paradoxical effect of such narrative *uncertainty* on the heightening of writerly and readerly awareness of the facticity of literary discourse.

Thus, when Diderot’s narrator, in *Jacques le fataliste et son maître*, states: “I do not know whom these reflections came from, Jacques, his master or me, it is certain they came from one of us,” he transgresses the rules of narration, by choosing to introduce a kind of uncertainty that blurs the distinctions between the narrator and his characters at the same time as it undermines the claims to authenticity the narrator keeps making in order to dispel any suspicion he is writing a novel.

So, the dialectic claims and disclaimers about “who is speaking”, while appearing as an avatar of a rhetoric of uncertainty (a choice of de-stabilizing discursive strategies) also serve to give its specific character to self-conscious literature—establishing a specific ethos for the narrator, a kind of playful unreliability, at the same time as it calls forth a specific kind of reader, who escapes, rather than falls for, the traps of fiction as persuasive practice.

=====

10:30 – 10:45 am

Coffee break/Pause café

=====

10:45 – 12:15 pm

Rhetoric: Certainty, Uncertainty, and Conspiracy

(Session/Séance 2)

Chair/Présidente de séance: TBA

Victor Ferry, Université Libre de Bruxelles, F.R.S.-FNRS

TITLE: What is a rhetorical certainty?

In a famous passage of his *Rhetoric* (I, 9, 1368a), Aristotle presents the historical example as an appropriate argument for deliberation: “Examples are most suitable to deliberative speeches; for we judge of

future events by divination from past events”. The relevancy of the historical example for civic deliberation is based on the idea, often stated in Aristotle’s *Treaties* that, most the time, the future resembles the past (II, 21, 1394a; III, 16, 1417b). By establishing an analogy between a past situation and a situation under discussion in the present, deliberating citizens can hope to identify the right course of action. But the idea that history can provide examples helping to remove uncertainty from civic deliberations does not fit well with the very definition of the scope of deliberation. Indeed, to quote Aristotle again, “The subjects of our deliberation are such as seem to present us with alternative possibilities: about things that could not have been, and cannot now or in the future be, other than they are, nobody who takes them to be of this nature wastes his time in deliberation”. It therefore invites us to consider the idea that “often, the future resembles the past” not as a law of history but as the description of a commonplace (in the technical sense of the *Topics*, ie, a set of pre-critical representations providing a ground for argumentation).

In my paper, I will show that behind the issue of the status of the argument by historical example lies the more fundamental issue of the identity of rhetoric. Indeed, our civic life, our educational systems, but also, influential argumentative theories (in particular, the pragma-dialectical theory) lead us to conceive deliberation as a means to achieve an enlightened standpoint that may drive us to the best choice. However, the uncertain nature of most of the subjects on which we deliberate in the public sphere causes us continually having to act despite uncertainty. Thus, if rhetoric, defined as an art of persuasion, seems to be necessary for decisions to be reached, it is also potentially a bad advisor.

Through the study of selected historical examples used as arguments in contemporary political discourses (such as the “sputnik moment” used by Barack Obama in his 2011 State of the Union Address), I will present the close relationship between uncertainty, persuasion and decision. The aim is to understand the kind of “certainties” that can be produced by rhetorical skills.

Loïc NICOLAS, Université Libre de Bruxelles

TITLE : L’évidence du complot : douter de tout pour ne plus douter du tout.

Mon intervention se propose d’explorer les ressources rhétoriques mobilisées dans les discours conspirationnistes. Elle mettra tout spécialement l’accent sur l’ambiguïté de leur rapport au doute : sa déconstruction, son déplacement, son dévoiement. En effet, dans un même mouvement conspirationniste, le doute qui envahit l’espace social (le complot est partout, tout n’est qu’apparences...) en vient à quitter celui du discours à l’intérieur duquel, justement, on ne doute pas. Le monde dont ces discours rendent compte est à la fois ouvert (en prise aux forces occultes et terrifiantes de la conspiration) et rigoureusement clos. Ce monde-là se referme et s’épuise dans l’explication totale qui fait tenir son sens – envers et contre tout. Partant, j’analyserai les conditions dans lesquelles s’impose cet irrésistible effet d’évidence face auquel l’argumentation et la critique se retrouvent sans effets. Face auquel la liberté (d’adhésion et de choix) se réduit comme peau de chagrin. Dès lors, il s’agira pour moi de montrer comment les rhétoriques de la conspiration travaillent aussi bien à retourner l’incertitude contre elle-même qu’à inverser la charge de la preuve. Sachant que dans l’esprit des dénonciateurs, la réalité du complot, quant à elle, n’est « plus » à prouver. J’utiliserai pour cela un vaste corpus de textes conspirationnistes, qu’ils traitent du 11 septembre 2001, des Illuminati, de l’administration américaine, de l’affaire DSK, du premier homme sur la lune, etc.

Ahmad M. Kamal & Jacquelyn Burkell, (Graduate students at) University of Western Ontario

TITLE: Rhetoric, Information and Uncertainty

It has become a truism that we live in an information society, ushered in by revolutionary communication technologies. But beyond our technology is an epistemological revolution; one where a quantifiable, empirical and scientific notion of information has become the preeminent rationale of judgment and decision making. In *The Modern Invention of Information* (2001), Day attributes this approach to knowledge to the conduit model of communication, which characterizes information as a mode of transmission (instead of the outcome of translation, for instance). Uncertainty, according to this model, represents a

disturbance in the transmission process. Linguistic, cognitive, affective, and aesthetic aspects of communication become liabilities for certainty. Otherwise, the world is singular, rational and knowable. As John D. Peters observes, the “concept of information does tantalize through its apparent ability to unify questions about mind, language, culture, and technology” (21). By eliminating the particularities of specific discursive communities, information would wash uncertainties away. The popular use of the term “rhetoric” as a dismissal of competing claims on reality demonstrates this positivist epistemology. Yet the study of rhetoric actually reveals a complex, dialogic model of communication obscured by information-based certainty. Through the lens of rhetoric the agency, values, intention, style, and situation undergirding communication become analytical entities which disclose their otherwise invisible role in uncertainty resolution. Without rhetoric, the mechanisms through which we become “informed” are ignored, allowing us the pretence of our fundamental rationality.

But despite their differences, both rhetoric and information acknowledge uncertainty and promise its remedy. The shortcoming of either approaches, therefore, is the challenge of representing inherently uncertain (i.e., unknowable) phenomena. This type of uncertainty requires a specialized approach to communication where uncertainty is not resolved, but articulated. In this conceptual paper, we explore the contrasting constructions of uncertainty implicit to information and rhetoric models, and explore how they must be adapted to represent more problematic form of ontological uncertainty in public communications.

12:15 -1:45 pm

=====

LUNCH/DÉJEUNER

=====

1:45 – 3:15 pm

Rhetoric, Citizenship and the State

(Session/Séance 3)

Chair TBA

Robert Danisch, University of Waterloo

TITLE: Occupy Wall Street as Rhetorical Citizenship: The Ongoing Relevance of Pragmatism for Deliberative Democracy

The two most unique, prominent features of the Occupy Wall Street movement are its organizational structure and the ambiguity of its political demands. Its organizational structure is an experiment in small group democracy governed by specific communicative practices and policies. In addition, “The Declaration of the Occupation of New York City” outlines a series of grievances but does not state clear, obtainable, strategic policy positions. This essay argues that the texture of the occupy movement has its roots in American pragmatism. Furthermore, I argue that the movement updates some of the basic commitments of pragmatism by enacting a specific form of rhetorical citizenship. This form of rhetorical citizenship employs a form of reasoning in response to problems and uncertainties instead of reasoning based on propositions. Because of this, the small group structure of the movement and the ambiguity of its goals allow Occupy Wall Street to practice a unique brand of rhetorical citizenship that advances what the pragmatists called “social democracy.” At the core of a “social democracy” is the belief that technical, policy solutions are less relevant than the deliberative process and the formation of democratic communities that embody specific communicative practices. Occupy Wall Street, narrowly, and pragmatism, broadly, have a tolerance for uncertainty that is generative of rhetorical citizenship as a small group encounter.

John Moffatt, University of Saskatchewan

Title: Policing History: Reading the Opposition to a National Commemoration of the War of 1812

In 2011, Canada's Conservative government announced its support for a range of events commemorating the bicentennial of the outbreak of the War of 1812. Opposition to this position followed swiftly in the Canadian media, with prominent columnists such as Jeffrey Simpson and Catherine Ford speaking out against a national celebration of the war. This paper will examine the rhetoric of that opposition, as expressed both by established journalists and by other citizens in both print and electronic media. The opponents portray the Harper government's effort to use 1812 as an instrument for identity-building as an example of what Kenneth Burke termed the "constabulary function" of rhetoric in *Attitudes toward History* (1937). According to rhetorical scholar Jordynn Jack, Burke identified this constabulary function as "the set of rhetorical strategies that political and economic elites use to bolster a deteriorating social order and maintain the status quo while drawing attention away from broader, systemic problems within the social order itself" (Jack 67). As Jack indicates, constabulary rhetoric may be approached through several of Burke's 'pivotal terms' including alienation, cultural lag, transcendence, symbols of authority, and secular prayer" (Jack 67). The latter term in particular, defined by Burke as "*the coaching of an attitude* by the use of mimetic and verbal language" (Burke 322; his emphasis) is useful to a reading of the opposition to a national, state-sanctioned commemoration. This rejection of an epideictic rhetoric celebrating the 1812-1814 war implicitly attacks the government's use of history as secular prayer in promoting a nostalgic, even anachronistic vision of Canadian identity, at the expense of support for contemporary Canadian cultural industries.

Nick Turnbull, University of Manchester

Title: The Rhetorical State: the ethos, logos, and pathos of the polity

In politics, rhetoric is known primarily as the art of persuasive speech. However, this usage restricts rhetoric to a limited role of communication that is practiced within, and determined by, the institutional settings of the state. This paper proposes an expanded notion of political rhetoric, incorporating recent state theory which proposes the state is a series of communications. Using Michel Meyer's theory of rhetoric as the negotiation of distance between questioners, rhetorical concepts can be extended beyond their application in political speech to become a new methodology for political inquiry which accounts for the communicative, rhetorical dimensions of the state and its institutions. The nation-state is a rhetorical whole which structures identity as unity and difference through the three key questions of self (ethos), world (logos), and other (pathos). The state orders social relationships in the international and domestic spheres as differences between questioners, with rhetorical figures framing questions of identity both within and between nation-states. Externally, nation-states are constructed through a difference in terms of questioning, with each cast as subjective questioners and rhetoric mediating the distances between them. This external difference generates internal unity between individuals by creating a common identity through answers to the questions of self, world, and other as citizenship (ethos), sovereignty (logos), and nationalism (pathos). Hence, the international and domestic comprise rhetorical systems which structure identity and difference. Within nation-states, politics is primarily constructed through the state/society difference—also conceived as questioners—expressed in practice as a rhetorical relationship between government (ethos) and people (pathos), mediated through institutions (logos). The variable distance between state and society is the rhetorical relationship which underlies substantive argumentation around political questions. This approach to analysing the state offers a method for integrating rhetorical analysis with political sociology and for linking explicit argumentative discourse to the rhetorical foundations of state power.

3:15 – 3:30 pm

Coffee Break/Pause café

3:30 – 5:00 pm

The Rhetoric of Display: Visual Rhetoric

(Session/Séance 4)

Chair TBA

Monica M. Brown, (Graduate Student at) University of British Columbia

“It’s Your Health”: Identification, Division, and the (Visual) Rhetoric of Handwashing

This presentation examines links between language and understanding in contemporary, western public health campaigns. I focus on one particular kind of campaign, the promotion of handwashing by public and global health agencies during and since the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. Hygiene practices may promise to make us healthier, but they also work to keep us *together*. As a contemporary hygiene ritual, handwashing can be understood, in Burkean terms, as a cogent source of identification and symbolic action—particularly in the workplace, where success is often premised on the ability to manage conflicting personal and public demands (and where communal spaces such as washrooms most often play host to public health campaigns that dictate *good*, as opposed to *bad*, handwashing techniques). In other words, when we enact handwashing practices endorsed by public health campaigns and perhaps from there engage with the broader public discourse of health and health risk (which circulates through conversation, in news media, and on the web), we find new ways of fitting in within increasingly complex networks of social life.

So, by adopting handwashing rituals, we “can act together, but for [our] own, separate motives” (Burke 22). This presentation, however, explores the other side of identification, the extent to which it is also a confrontation with division. Handwashing rhetoric, for example, perpetuates “good” and “bad” standards of health practice, which can then become the basis for division through judgment regarding individual membership in a social group. But division is also an epistemological issue in contemporary public health campaigns, entailed by the enthymeme, “knowledge is power,” and played out in the methods used to convey information about handwashing and its benefits for personal and public health, such as the infographic. By looking not only to campaign materials themselves, but also to the public discourse and popular culture of handwashing, I challenge the narrow view of knowledge that underlies the promotion of health practices, and consider whether, in countering this view with corrective, rhetorical critics have corroborated the simplification of language and understanding in public health.

Cynthia Messenger, University of Toronto

TITLE: False Fronts, Simulacra, and the Great Exhibition of 1851: Rhetorics of Display

I will examine how the false fronts, the papier maché construction, the ersatz monumentalism, all framed by the fragile metaphor of the Crystal Palace, were fundamental to the construction of a simulacrum or hyper reality, to use Jean Baudrillard’s term. In the glass house world of the Great Exhibition, even extinct animals could be recreated. A world in harmony through commerce, reimagined and housed by British architectural innovation, is offered as a trope that undergirds this hyper reality. The visual rhetoric of the patterns of display in the Crystal Palace reinforced certainty in progress and confidence in the shaping hand of Great Britain. The trope of a benevolent empire made it possible to imagine international cooperation, to celebrate the achievement of foreigners, to buy their goods. When Queen Victoria purchased china from the

Hungarian manufacturer Herend, after viewing its wares at the Great Exhibition, she situated the decorative arts of other countries as harmonious with English aesthetic values. She also positioned foreign goods as acquirable. (Even today Herend china is heavily featured in films such as *Gosford Park* because the rhetoric of its decorative features suggests wealth, refinement, and class difference.) The essays in Lawrence J. Prelli's *The Rhetorics of Display* are indispensable in any discussion of situated rhetoric, and I will engage with his text in my presentation.

Derek Foster, Brock University

TITLE: Remembering Robocop: The tragic-comic rhetoric of dystopian commemoration.

In February 2011, Detroit's mayor put out a request for public works projects. One resident of the city suggested a statue of Robocop, the subject of the 1987 sci-fi film set in an imaginary Detroit of the future overrun by crime. The mayor's subsequent response that there were no plans for a Robocop statue motivated a grassroots, fan-based effort to raise funds for such a statue, generating enough funds in under a month. Currently, the design is approved, lands have been designated, and the statue is on schedule for display in the not-fictional near-future.

What is the significance of this? Why is a gratuitously violent film from the late twentieth century depicting a dystopian future (not even filmed in Detroit) now being celebrated as an appropriate form for commemorating Detroit's present? As an alternative form of public art, this is not consistent with other examples of what might be termed "postmodern popular-culture-based heritage." For instance, the Rocky statue in Philadelphia and the Mary Richards statue in Minneapolis at least celebrate working-class, Horatio Alger-type work ethics and plucky individualism that their respective sites can trumpet. How does the drug-infested, crime-ridden, crumbling urban wasteland of the RoboCop future get rhetorically refashioned into a tourist attraction or inspiring civic project in a contemporary Detroit that seems to present too many parallels to its fictive representation?

To examine this phenomenon, I will provide a background of the tragic-comic rhetoric of the film franchise and use it to contextualize the rhetoric of Robocop boosterism. Building upon communication scholar Carole Blair's recent theorization of the tripartite relationship between rhetoric, memory and place, my analysis will demonstrate how memory is activated by present concerns, narrates shared identities, is animated by affect and is partial and thus often contested. Commemorative practices such as the Robocop statues allow us to suggest how certain public memories "matter" and how representations help constitute an affiliative mode of public memory that is both felt and legitimated rhetorically.

7:00 pm

BANQUET:

Sole Restaurant & Wine Bar

83 Erb Stree West, Building No 2, Waterloo, On:

519-747-5622

FRIDAY JUNE 1st/ VENDREDI 1 JUIN

9:00 – 10:30 am **Rhetorical History: Battle, Torture, and Ancient Poetry** (Session/Séance 5)

CHAIR TBA

Benoit Sans, Université Libre de Bruxelles

TITLE : **Vaincre ou mourir : rhétorique et incertitude dans le récit de bataille**

Dans cette intervention, je voudrais proposer une lecture rhétorique comparée des récits de la bataille Zama (202 avant J.-C.) de l'historien grec Polybe ($\pm 208 - \pm 126$ avant J.-C.) et de l'historien latin Tite-Live (64 ou 59 avant J.-C. - 17 après J.-C.), ainsi que des événements qui précèdent immédiatement cet affrontement, qui clôt la deuxième guerre punique (218-202 avant J.-C.). J'analyserai comment les ressources de la rhétorique et du récit permettent de créer ou de lever l'incertitude à deux niveaux.

Je me pencherai tout d'abord sur le niveau de l'histoire et des acteurs, des interactions entre les personnages ; je m'intéresserai particulièrement à la discussion entre Hannibal et Scipion (Pol. XV, 5 - 8 ; T.-L. XXX, 29 - 31) et aux harangues attribuées aux deux généraux.

J'étudierai ensuite, au travers des différentes phases du récit de la bataille (Pol. XV, 9 - 16, 6 ; T.-L. XXX, 31, 10 - 35), la communication entre l'historien et son lecteur et tenterai de montrer comment le premier d'imposer au second une certaine interprétation des événements et une vision précise des acteurs en présence. Au travers de leurs récits respectifs, les deux historiens ont recours aux différentes modalités de l'argumentation, aux indices, aux effets de voix et à des changements dans l'organisation même du récit pour créer des jeux de tension dramatique, rendre le propos vraisemblable, mais aussi orienter le lecteur vers des conclusions déterminées. Les extraits sur lesquels repose mon exposé et les éventuelles lectures seront abordés dans une traduction française, même si je n'exclus pas de revenir sur quelques points de l'expression linguistique dans les langues originales.

Christine Horton, (Graduate student at) University of Waterloo

TITLE: **Persuasive *Basanos*: Rhetorics of Torture in Athens**

The Athenian practice of torture (*basanos*) has been widely criticized because it inflicted pain on an innocent slave in order to confirm information about the offences of another person. However, legal scholars argue that there is no evidence that *basanos* ever involved physical coercion; instead, the orators refer to a refused challenge (*prokelesis*) to *basanos* which contained the questions that would be asked during torture. Since this challenge to *basanos* was always refused by his opponent and the torture was never applied, the litigant could assume his questions would be answered in the affirmative and he used both the refusal as well as the content of the challenge to his rhetorical advantage in court.

This paper explores how *basanos* operates as persuasive evidence rather than legal proof in the Attic orators in forensic argumentation. Drawing on legal scholarship, I suggest that *basanos*, especially in its rhetorical form, further objectifies slaves by limiting their agency by denying them participation in court. Since physical coercion was a common method of control over slaves in Athens, I argue that *basanos* was used as a means of rhetorical coercion to further objectify slaves by denying them any legal agency through testimony, even by means of torture. As this practice denied any slave autonomy, it also maintains and constructs the legal status of the citizen, and through him, the court, democracy, and the city-state (*polis*). Through a re-framing of Aristotle's inartistic proofs (*atechnoi pisteis*) from the perspective of its forensic application as persuasive evidence in the Attic orators, I aim to show how persuasive *basanos* is ideologically effective as a coercive means of demarcating status in Athens.

Guillaume Tedeshi, Université libre de Bruxelles

TITLE : Lever l'ambiguïté du poète : l'argumentation des scholiastes anciens d'Hésiode

Si les poèmes d'Homère et d'Hésiode ont constitué durant l'Antiquité une référence culturelle majeure du monde grec, assez rapidement ces textes ont posé de graves difficultés à leurs lecteurs, en raison de l'évolution des mentalités, mais aussi de l'obscurité de certaines expressions ou de l'incertitude planant sur la transmission du texte lui-même. Les sophistes sont apparemment les premiers à avoir tenté de résoudre ces questions, ce qui a posé les bases de la discipline plus tard nommée "philologie" ; ils ont ensuite été suivis par les Péripatéticiens et les grammairiens d'Alexandrie à l'époque hellénistique.

Malheureusement, aucun de ces travaux ne nous est directement parvenu : les seules traces des doutes et des discussions antiques sur les poèmes traditionnels se trouvent dans les notes marginales (ou scholies) des manuscrits médiévaux, sous une forme particulièrement concise. En analysant deux de ces scholies portant sur un passage du poème d'Hésiode intitulé Les Travaux et les Jours (vers 202-216), je mettrai en évidence les méthodes appliquées par les philologues anciens pour résoudre les ambiguïtés du texte.

La première de ces scholies fournit un aperçu des débats contradictoires entourant l'exégèse de termes ambivalents. Je tenterai de montrer comment il est possible, malgré la concision de l'expression de la scholie, de reconstituer les arguments de chacune des parties, les prémisses implicites sous-tendant leur raisonnement et les types de preuves qu'ils estiment pertinentes.

La seconde note marginale concerne la présence incertaine de trois vers (210-212) dans le texte original. Je montrerai à travers cet exemple comment, à propos de certains passages d'Hésiode, les grammairiens alexandrins ont réutilisé la conception de l'éthos développée par Aristote dans sa Rhétorique pour en faire un critère normatif permettant, de manière certaine, d'identifier dans l'œuvre du poète les adjonctions d'interpolateurs postérieurs.

=====

10:30 – 10:45 am

Coffee break/Pause café

=====

10:45 – 12:15 am

The Rhetorical Exhibit: Challenging the Dominant Discourses

(Session/Séance 6)

CHAIR TBA

Jacqueline Schiappa, (Graduate student at) University of Minnesota

TITLE: (Re)Dominating the Story of Peoples Temple through Feminist Critique

In this paper I reinterpret the narrative of the 1960s-70s Peoples Temple movement/cult through feminist critical discourse analysis, or, 'FCDA'. More specifically, I contextualize Peoples Temple through its relationships to Black revolutionary discursive action and marginalized female experience. In so doing I offer a counter-history and discover an unexpected site for feminist and rhetorical learning, offering different insights into Peoples Temple as a distinct subject of rhetorical inquiry *and* a heuristic demonstration of how FCDA may function.

Researchers have primarily characterized Peoples Temple as a failure or aberration in the realms of social action, collaboration, and organizing. Indeed the way most scholarship constitutes 'rational (re)action' narrowly construes and represses the revolutionary thought in the discourse of the Peoples Temple. I problematize the proclivity of this existing work to magnify the most unnerving and catastrophic piece of the narrative (that is, the mass murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 persons) in ways that oversimplify an otherwise rich collection of social action and discourse. I argue that existing analyses signal a problematic dominant interpretation that suppresses the revolutionary qualities of the movement. An explicitly feminist critique offers a much needed confrontation of that dominant line of thinking.

Accordingly, it is through FCDA that I explore how the dominant academic response(s) to Peoples Temple discursively limit the sociopolitical meaningfulness of the movement. More specifically, by "dominant response" I mean the scholarship (books, articles, and media commentary) that frames the narrative of Peoples Temple in our academic and social history. I contend that we may learn something valuable for feminist rhetorical scholarship from 1) considering the ways in which the movement was discursively effective and 2) how that success is obscured by the majority of existing Peoples Temple scholarship and popular discourse. I finally suggest that such obscuration serves to (re)stabilize a patriarchal ideology that devalues dissent.

Michael Purves-Smith, Wilfrid Laurier

TITLE: "Um, I think So": The Teleology of the Rhetorical Landscape at the Singularity Summit

The most recent of six conferences on the Singularity took place for two days last October. As the word "summit" implies it gathered together the best minds, in this case to discuss the subject of artificial intelligence.

"The Singularity Summit is the premier conference on the Singularity. As we get closer to the Singularity, each year's conference is better than the last." So says the quote from Ray Kurzweil, the high priest of the Singularity, at the top of the home page of the summit's slick website. A simple explanation of the concept appears on the same page. It is drawn from the 1993 article by Vernor Vinge, "The Coming Technological Singularity," in which he discussed the possibility that future technology could feed on itself, causing an "exponential runaway" in technological progress: "Developments that before were thought might only happen in 'a million years' (if ever) will likely happen in the next century." This passage neatly sidesteps the issue of artificial intelligence, although Mr. Vinge and most of the presenters at the conference undoubtedly couple technology and intelligence.

What justifies the certainty implied by the use of the capital letter? How are we being manipulated to adopt the world view of the adherents of the doctrine of the Singularity? How should we respond? Using examples from the hours of videos memorializing the complete summits to date, this paper will briefly examine the metareligious rhetoric of the summits, highlighting the semiotics of their Internet presentations, the rhetorical performance conventions of the speakers, and important rhetorical strategies from the texts of the presentations themselves. Next, the paper will attempt short answers to the foregoing questions. Finally, it will touch on the profound moral and ethical issues raised by a belief system that is potentially game-changing for us all.

Gregory J. Schneider, Kettering University

TITLE: **Uncertainty in the Science Museum: Contributions to a Rhetorical Education**

Situated within and responding to specific political and cultural contexts, the science museum is often faced with a paradoxical task, one that requires it to negotiate uncertainty in rather sophisticated ways. On the one hand, in their more traditional forms, science exhibits dispel doubt, ignorance, and uncertainty by inform visitors about what science knows. In so doing, the science museum asserts the certain authority of science as a body of knowledge and provides the basis of informed public debate. On the other hand, in their multidimensional, hands-on, interactive galleries, science museums promote a form of inquiry based on a fundamental appeal to what we don't know and don't understand. In so doing, the science museum cultivates a sense of science as a practice that emerges from uncertainty. Museums accomplish both of these tasks (often in the same installation) through appeals to wonder and the use of questions. More recently, trends in science exhibition have led to exhibits that go beyond the communication of facts or the promotion of inquiry and instead provide a more thorough kind of rhetorical education. Through the application of stasis theory, the strategic use of metaphor, and the display of commonplace arguments (not just facts), these exhibits directly link the science on display to the realm of political action, thus preparing visitors to participate in deliberation

under conditions of scientific and political uncertainty. By employing discourse analyses on a set of international science museums, this paper describes how exhibits both cultivate and negotiate scientific uncertainty, and it outlines the character of the rhetorical education offered by modern exhibits.

=====

12:15 – 1:30 pm	LUNCH/DÉJEUNER	
------------------------	-----------------------	--

=====

1:30 – 3:00 pm	Rhetorical Theory: Authority and Control	(Session/Séance 7)
-----------------------	--	--------------------

CHAIR TBA

David Beard

TITLE: Psychology, General Semantics, and Canadian “Epistemics” as Contribution to 20th Century Rhetorical Theory

The reconstruction of mid-20th century rhetorical theory is complicated by our willful forgetfulness. We are more eager to “claim” Aristotle and Derrida than we are to claim the writers of influential books at midcentury. Such histories are even more difficult to trace in Canada, where US sites for rhetorical work (the speaking and writing classrooms) do not exist on a national scale.

This paper recovers the work of J.S.A. Bois, French-Canadian Jesuit who left the clergy and became a psychologist (Ph.D., McGill) and an eventual President of the Canadian Psychological Association. Bois wrote monographs for the Institute Psychologique in Montreal, including *Le bonheur s'apprend*, *Psychologie et médecine*, and *Psychologie pour tous*, all while ascending in influence in the CPA.

This trajectory changed when he read *Science and Sanity*, Korzybski’s work on General Semantics – a midcentury theory of language, communication and mental hygiene. Bois became taken with his theory and also with his distinctly *DIY (Do It Yourself)* attitude. Bois would “do it himself,” as well, lecturing at the Institute for General Semantics in the 1950s. In the 1970s, he offered his extension of General Semantics, “New Epistemics.”

In outlining “New Epistemics,” I argue that J.S.A. Bois works through the second of Bloom’s “revisionary ratios” in *The Anxiety of Influence*: “*tessera*.” Bois uses a creative misprision of Foucault to break from his psychological training and from his Korzybskian inheritance in the way that “completes” his precursor, “by so reading the parent... as to retain its terms but to mean to them in another sense, as though the precursor had failed to go far enough.” Bois argues, using a Foucauldian understanding of “*episteme*,” that Korzybski is not the final statement on mental health, language, and communication. Instead, he is the high watermark of the penultimate episteme. The final episteme, in Bois’ mind, is best characterized by Bois’ own theorizing on “Applied Epistemics.”

In retrospect, in recasting his mentors and colleagues as outmoded, he alienated a natural audience for his work. At the same time, he failed to attract a new readership in the 1970s. Nonetheless, his works in “General Semantics” and “Applied Epistemics” retain a wide readership today (*Art of Awareness* remains in print) – popular with a readership happier to understand Bois’ work as an extension, rather than a transcending, of Korzybski’s work, and so worth a look as a Canadian attempt a midcentury rhetorical theory.

Luc Vaillancourt, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi

TITLE: Postures et impostures de l'éthos missionnaire chez Paul Lejeune

Suivant Aristote, l'éthos peut être envisagé comme une stratégie argumentative qui consiste à mettre en évidence le caractère moral de l'orateur afin d'augmenter son autorité. Mais à partir du moment où le discours

renonce (en apparence) à sa finalité persuasive, quel rôle peut y jouer encore l'éthos? En fait, quel que soit le contexte de l'énonciation ou sa visée, le sujet écrivant ne laisse pas d'être en représentation et chaque fois qu'il intervient, l'occasion lui est donnée de se faire valoir, sinon par ses moeurs, à tout le moins par le caractère qu'il rend manifeste. Les Relations de Paul Lejeune se distinguent des écrits ethnographiques contemporains notamment par le fait qu'ils brouillent la frontière entre le compte rendu objectif et le récit de voyage à la première personne. Lejeune alterne constamment d'un point de vue à l'autre, n'hésitant pas à se mettre en scène avec force détails même lorsque ce n'est pas requis pour la bonne intelligence du propos. Cette complaisance apparente trouve à s'expliquer si l'on prend en compte la situation rhétorique bien particulière dans laquelle se trouve le locuteur. Soucieux de satisfaire aux attentes de ses supérieurs, il se doit d'adopter les postures éthiques les mieux appropriées. Mais l'éthos discursif se trouve un peu en porte-à-faux du fait de tensions induites par la triple destination du propos, lorsqu'il s'agit par exemple de réconcilier l'image de soi projetée dans ses rapports avec les autochtones, avec celle qui est attendue de ses superviseurs, et par delà, du public susceptible de lire ces relations. Notre communication s'intéressa aux modulations de l'éthos missionnaire de manière à mettre en évidence les motifs conflictuels et la visée propagandiste qui les déterminent.

Andy Stubbs, University of Regina

TITLE: Rhetoric as Criminal Action

This paper departs from Thomas Farrell's statement that "the very meaning of rhetoric's materials—the probable or contingent, what may be one way or the other—derives from rhetoric's characteristic approach to appearances" (Norms of Rhetorical Culture 27-28). Rhetoric's apparent immersion in "doubleness" (as T.S. Kuhn says, "There is no such thing as research without counterinstances" [The Structure of Scientific Revolutions 79]) is not unrelated to its reputation for duplicity—the ability of the skilled speaker to persuade to wrong and right action equally. This seems at first glance to absolve rhetoric of ethical responsibility, to make rhetoric morally uncertain, notwithstanding such well known demands as Quintilian's for "the good man speaking well." My interest is in the ways texts of popular culture romance antithetical—or "criminal"—action, and influence audiences to crime, through an investment in mourning and melancholy as a rhetorical event—one constructed to appeal to an outside reader/public. I'll explore this in relation to several pop culture allegories, including McLean's "American Pie," Dylan's "Lily, Rosemary, and the jack of Hearts," and especially the ways that The Catcher in the Rye can be taken—according to Mark Chapman—as the rationale for John Lennon's killing. I'll also take into account a number of texts that present an author as the "composer" of a criminal act, which is then "valued" as a work of art: for example Salieri's murder of Mozart in Amadeus. Further instances are found within the Canadian long poem tradition, works such as Ondaatje's Collected Works of Billy the Kid, Dennis Cooley's Bloody Jack, Paulette Jiles' The Jesse James Poems, etc, where rhetoric merges with violence, violence with authorship, and where the author seeks not exoneration but rhetorical/recursive pleasure in gaining power over the reader.

=====

3:00 – 3:15 pm

Coffee break/Pause café

=====

3 :15 – 5 :00 pm ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING/ASSEMBLÉE GÉNÉRALE ANNUELLE (room/salle DAWB 1-101B)

All CSSR members are welcome. /Tous les membres de la SCÉR sont bienvenus.)

9:00 – 10:30 am

Rhetoric of Change: Agency, Invention, Culture

(Session/Séance 8)

Mark Rowell Wallin,

TITLE: “What are you Playing at?:” Pathos and the Persuasive Power of Interactivity

Gerard Hauser (2002) presents the rhetorical power of Pathos as shorthand for judgments individuals make about the world with which they are presented. These judgments tend to represent a kind of evaluative self-interest insofar as the level of emotional response relates to the perceived stake or involvement individuals have in a given situation.

Interestingly, this process is precisely the way designers of interactive interfaces discuss the power of interactivity to involve and implicate users in virtual worlds of wildly varying types: from video games to DVD interfaces. As Dominic Stansberry posits in his book *Labyrinths* (1997), interactive new media is psychologically impactful “because it calls for users to take action. If users’ actions are meaningful and produce meaningful responses, interactivity can be a very powerful tool. It offers the opportunity to engage the audience by bringing them into the program and making them responsible for its outcome” (54).

For designers of interactive interfaces, on the other hand, interaction represents an opportunity to manage and influence audience judgments.

As Brookey and Westerfelhaus (2002) suggest, interactive interfaces appear to reconfigure otherwise passive consumers of information into “active agents” who “uncover” the digital reality. This process of interactive archeology engages audiences at the level of Pathos because as the gamer interacts with the digital world through the game console, they become personally invested in that world’s rules, systems and moral judgments by means of the choices and decisions they make. From a design perspective, then, we create meaningful interactions when we invite users to, on the one hand, reference existing judgments they have about the world in which they live, while at the same time, allow them to form new judgments about the world we create for them to explore. In short, interactivity represents a powerful opportunity for persuasion.

Philip Sloane, (Graduate student) Kent State University

TITLE: Rhetorical Invention: The Persistence of Neo-romantic Idealism and Implications for Pedagogy

In this presentation, I unpack and critically examine the epistemological assumptions underlying rhetorical invention, especially as it has been conceptualized since the Enlightenment and the onset of modernity. I focus on romantic notions of invention – those that ascribe great importance to spontaneity and Truth. LeFevre attributes these conceptions to Plato’s legacy, arguing that he is “to a large degree responsible for a longstanding view of invention as radically individualistic [...]” (12). I extend Lefevre’s argument to show that “individualistic” notions of invention are frequently associated with two other pervasive and problematic assumptions: 1) *invention is born of spontaneous inspiration*, and 2) *invention must be authentic*.

I trace manifestations of these assumptions across both classical and contemporary rhetoric, exploring their pedagogical implications. In stark contrast to our social and postmodern theories of knowing and doing, popular conceptions of invention remain well-anchored in the notion of a “real” autonomous self and in rhetoric as an “authentic” expression of that self. Romantic assumptions persist, pointing to a potential epistemological disconnect between would-be rhetors and those who teach rhetoric. While pedagogy has long been a concern for rhetorical scholars, most discussions focus on how *we*, the scholarly community, ought to conceptualize invention. Few have examined the compatibility of these conceptualizations with our student’s epistemologies. How do we teach students whose assumptions are rooted in theories that we, as teachers and scholars of rhetoric, have discarded? Such is our dilemma – rhetoricians tend to embrace non-foundationalist assumptions about the “invention” of knowledge, fluid notions of truth and self, and the inseparability of discourse from thinking, but such ideas remain counter-intuitive to many people outside (and even some inside) the academy.

Qiumin Dong, New Mexico State University

TITLE: Copyright Globalization and Piracy in China: a Rhetorical Perspective

This paper addresses the conflict between copyright globalization and the piracy issue in China by applying Marxist approach to compare and contrast Western and Chinese approaches to copyright practice. It argues that the conflict exemplifies differences, domination, and reconciliations between the two cultures. First, it will introduce briefly the movement of world copyright protection. Next, the paper focuses on China's piracy issue that has caused much concern from developed countries, the United States in particular, by investigating two Sino-U.S. bilateral agreements, the 1992 Memorandum of Understanding and the 1995 IP Agreement to illustrate the disparity between how the Chinese and the West perceive copyright practice. Specifically, it will be examining the legal structures that emerge in texts that show the United States exerts its power over China and China has to make reconciliations. Using Marxism as its theoretical framework, the study brings classical Marxism and the Gramsci hegemony into the discussion. Such an approach first aims to complement existing research in the field to help dispel uncertainty in our understanding of China's copyright issue. Although researchers have identified and analyzed China's piracy issue, they mainly stressed the political and legal perspectives, maintaining that China's political/ideological emphasis and unprofessional legal enforcement have caused rampant infringing of copyrights. Little study has been conducted using rhetorical criticism to explore and compare copyright approaches of different cultures. In doing so, the study also sheds light for both Chinese and Western policy makers regarding how they should view cultural differences in the aspect of intellectual property right practice.

10:30 – 10:45 am

=====
Coffee break/Pause café
=====

10:45 – 12:15 am

Rhetorical Theory: Knowing, Socialization & Non-Being (Session/Séance 9)

Robert Prus, University of Waterloo

TITLE: Kenneth Burke and Pragmatist Rhetoric in 20th and 21st Century Scholarship: Contemporary and Classical Analytic Resources for the Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Although the term “rhetoric” has often been maligned by those lacking familiarity with classical Greek and Latin scholarship, the sustained examination of persuasive interchange is of fundamental importance for the study of human knowing and acting across the humanities and social sciences as well as all realms of community life.

While acknowledging several scholars who have reengaged aspects of classical Greek and Latin rhetoric in the 20th and 21st centuries, this statement gives particular attention to the works of Kenneth Burke and the linkages of Burke's writings with both Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and American pragmatist thought. Because scholarship does not exist as isolated instances of genius, even the works of highly accomplished individuals such as Kenneth Burke are best understood within the context of a horizontal-temporal as well as a vertical-historical intellectual community. Accordingly, the relevance of Kenneth Burke's contributions to the human sciences more generally and pragmatist social theory (along with its sociological extension, symbolic interaction) more specifically are best comprehended within this broader scholarly context.

Rob Walsh, Valley City, State University North Dakota

TITLE: Personal Power and the Rhetoric of Insecurity

This paper examines the delicate relationship between personal power and social insecurity. Competing forces, they illuminate a psycho-civic rhetoric that informs an individual's action against the myth of liberty. An intrapersonal discourse is omnipresent to adjudicate conviction versus subjugation. Participants must negotiate choice as a condition of power or powerlessness—the former being the ability to act and the latter the condition of being acted upon. Given this dichotomy, premeditated actions rarely represent one's untethered intentions. That is, personal power is rarely personal, but rather an internalized civic discourse. The situated self and the social persona are forever engaged in a Habermasian coffeehouse discussion, balancing thought and action to affect individual and social accord.

Therefore, personal power and the rhetoric of insecurity are coordinating constructs that Norman Fairclough called *synthetic socialization*. As social beings, people naturally acquiesce autonomy to be members of a collective vulnerability. The authors argue that through the din of uncertainty emerges an interpersonal and societal identity that discovers the capacity to influence others' thoughts and actions inside a collective dynamic. In other words, insecurity is the pathway to demonstrable power through disciplined social negotiation. Ikäheimo and Laitinen (2011) place it more precisely:

[G]enuine...power is a capacity which has two characteristics. First, as an instance of social power, it is the capacity of a person to bring about certain states of affairs by influencing the actions of other people in terms of giving them reasons to act. Second, this capacity is created through a system of status functions which entitles the person to issue demands upon the actions of others. (p. 351)

Carol Poster, York University

TITLE: Gorgias' "On Non-Being": Genre, Purpose, and Testimonia

Rather than use "On Non-Being" as a lens through which to examine the ancient relationships among philosophy and rhetoric, this paper will instead examine how reception of the text in philosophically and rhetorically oriented testimonia can be used to provide generic context for its interpretation. It will argue that the testimonia suggest several things. First, that asking whether we should understand Gorgias as "a sophist", "a philosopher", or "a rhetorician" is simply a badly phrased question. He was a person who at various times in his life engaged in certain activities some of which would later be termed philosophic (studying with Empedocles, writing a treatise on metaphysics), some sophistic (display oratory, teaching), and others rhetorical (teaching, possibly -- but not probably -- compiling some sort of handbook), although, for Gorgias these seemingly disparate activities may have been part of a coherent and unified application of a type of verbal and conceptual agility practised in Eleatic circles. Next, a parodic reading of "On Non-Being", as a strong critique of Eleatic ontology has no obvious support in the testimonia. Instead, taken en masse, the testimonia suggest that we should read "On Non-Being" seriously in its Eleatic context, functioning like the works of Melissus and Zeno to defend core Eleatic understandings of the world against pluralists, in the sense that it too rejects the changing world of phenomena as inherently illusory, positioning the sophist who discussed the phenomenal world, not as one who talks about things which are, but instead about things which are not, and in "On Non-Being" investigating pure non-being as other philosophers investigated pure being.

12:15 – 1:30 pm

LUNCH/DÉJEUNER

Tania Smith, University of Calgary

TITLE: Mary, Lady Chudleigh's Essays (1710): A Theory and Practice of Self-Persuasion

How can one contribute persuasive rhetoric in a culture that is hypersensitive about maintaining concord and preventing civil discord, when an openly persuasive public speech act would be considered inappropriate to one's character and therefore could be a futile and stressful experience, if not even a dangerous endeavour? One strategic answer might be to turn one's attention to persuading oneself and educating one's own mind, and to do so publicly, through publishing essays addressed at oneself and seemingly apolitical readers. Through such apparently arhetorical works, one could disseminate ideas, dispositions and practices that could end up transforming the public and social sphere if they were adopted.

A self-educated British poet and essayist of the early eighteenth century, Mary, Lady Chudleigh (1656-1710) taught and modeled a rhetorical theory and practice in the stoic tradition. As Agnew has explained, in the British eighteenth century, the stoic philosophy and its rhetoric were attractive to many after an era of political chaos such as the English civil war, when society was undergoing unprecedented economic and social change. Chudleigh's *Essays on Several Subjects* (1710) employ a rhetoric of essay-writing also seen in Montaigne's *Essays* (1580-1588), whose rhetorical power was paradoxically founded upon critiquing and disowning the practices of agonistic and sophistic rhetorics, as Claudia Carlos has argued. Her crowning work, her essays addressed women on common moral and philosophical topics but provided an antidote to the traditional arguments provided to women in conduct books of the era such as *The Ladies Calling*, which explained how women could best fulfill their calling to please God and serve mankind (father, husband, children, society). In contrast, her rhetoric was aimed inwardly at her own (and women's) self-education and self-persuasion, and yet it was not keeping the status quo in its content, awakening moral and ethical aspirations beyond the norm.

This essay will explore how Chudleigh's theory of persuasion addresses the aspirations and ills of her time by employing rhetorical approaches evident in contemporary English translations of the Classical Stoic philosophers (Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius). Perhaps we will also come to recognize and appreciate the situations that make stoic rhetoric an attractive approach to persuasion.

Burton Urquhart, University of Saskatchewan

TITLE: Packaging Principles: Rhetorical Footing in Arlene Dickinson's Business Advice

Arlene Dickinson, marketer, venture capitalist, and one of the "dragons" on the successful CBC show *Dragons' Den*, has attempted to popularize rhetorical theory and practice with the publication of her business advice book *Persuasion: A New Approach to Changing Minds*. While she argues for "principled persuasion" and seems to describe a neo-Aristotelian rhetoric, Dickinson never mentions the rich rhetorical tradition, even though she addresses the uncertainty in many of rhetoric's common themes and debates throughout the centuries. George L. Dillon, in *Rhetoric as Social Imagination*, notes that advice books are "consumed ... as an experience with nominal historical affiliations," which "rarely refer to other previous works" (4). Therefore, Dickinson, like other advice book authors, must, as Dillon argues, "show great inventiveness" because the "new information is usually slight" and success is dependent on the "inventiveness in packaging, in the way the 'scene of advising' is conceived and executed" (5). In my paper, I will explore her "packaging" of rhetoric in terms of Dillon's system of "plotting" an author's footing using five continua and his understanding of an author's codes of engagement and authority. During this process, I will also chart the terminology she uses in place of traditional rhetorical vocabulary. Once Dickinson's footing, or "voice," is determined, I will comment

on her own success in “inventing the packaging” of her theory of “principled persuasion.” Does she in fact achieve the “win-win persuasion” she advocates in her own discourse? What is her gain in her persuasive discourse and is she principled in her own approach? I will argue that, while her discourse is useful in introducing students to a contemporary example of a rhetoric, her footing is ultimately unbalanced and over-emphasizes, and potentially manipulates, pathos appeals causing uncertainty around her central – and neo-Aristotelian – themes of authenticity, reciprocity, and honesty.

Tracy Whalen, Winnipeg University

TITLE: Gendering Charisma: Delivery, Empathetic Rhetoric, and the Charismatic Woman

In both scholarly and public discourse, charisma—the elusive, magical leadership quality that attracts devotion from rapt followers—has been understood primarily as a masculine attribute and has been confined to such figures as male revolutionaries, explorers, and political leaders. Historically, charismatic women have been aligned with martyrdom or the sacred (e.g. the 12th-century visionary Hildegard of Bingen), an understanding that harkens back to charisma’s ancient religious roots (“grace” or “gift from the Holy Spirit”). Women’s charisma—which emerges relationally with an audience in a given context—has often been associated with those attributes that are generally determined to be positive and appropriately feminine: for instance, the maternal qualities of empathy, sacrifice, and compassion—and its frequent precursor, a believable vulnerability.

This paper will study the gendered rhetorical strategies of women who have been considered charismatic within conventional feminine frameworks (e.g. First lady of Argentina Eva Peron, Princess Diana of Wales, and to a lesser extent former Canadian Governor General Michaëlle Jean). It will draw upon the fifth canon of rhetoric and rhetorical theory, recent scholarship in rhetoric and sincerity (including the media production of sincerity effects), and the role of vulnerability in this charismatic dynamic. This presentation will explore how female charisma complicates previous understandings of the term (particularly Max Weber’s influential definition) and how these instantiations of “feminine charisma” are both productive and limiting.

=====

3 :00 – 3 :15

Coffee break/Pause café

=====

3 :30- 4 :30

Rhetorical Uncertainty: Mysticism & Doubt

(Session/ Séance 11)

Josef Schmidt, McGill University

TITLE: APOPHATIC RHETORIC – The role of Katachresis and Paradox in the discourse of Western mysticism

From Pyrrhon to Wittgenstein, the problem of articulating the unfathomable question about the meaning of our existence, and the comprehension of God, has led to framing the query in distinctive forms of rhetorical figures of apophatic speech.

Katachresis and paradox have proven to be two distinctive forms of expression of the issue from Hellenism right into our age of postmodernity to approach this problem. While katachresis is a traditional intellectual device to comprehend our difficulty with experiencing reality per se, and with it the question of authenticity, the paradox has been used to express the unintelligibility of structures of cognition.

The main focus of this paper will be concerned with medieval German mystical forms of expression; but other relevant authors like Paul of Tarsos and Graham Greene will also be discussed.

Aline Wiame, Université Libre de Bruxelles

TITLE: Dieu, le doute et le sujet philosophique : l'incertitude comme nécessité rhétorique et conceptuelle

Dès l'idéalisme de Platon, la réflexion philosophique s'est construite par une ambiguïté constitutive quant au statut du doute, tant aux niveaux conceptuel que rhétorique. Sur le plan théorique, les Idées sont ce qui assure le caractère certain et intangible de la pensée. Cependant, la construction des dialogues dits « aporétiques » atteste de l'extrême difficulté, voire parfois de l'impossibilité, d'atteindre quelque certitude. A l'aube de la Modernité, Descartes redessine les lignes du partage entre doute et certitude, sans pour autant s'affranchir de cette ambiguïté fondamentale. Certes, pour l'auteur des *Méditations métaphysiques*, le doute est d'abord méthodique. Mais cette méthode amène à une incertitude existentielle qui donnera naissance, à travers le *cogito*, à rien moins qu'une forme nouvelle de subjectivité. Et l'on sait que le sujet pensant cartésien baignerait dans l'incertitude la plus totale quant à tout ce qui lui est extérieur sans l'assurance du bien-fondé de ses connaissances garanti par l'idée de Dieu.

Au vingtième siècle, alors que le statut philosophique de Dieu ne va pour le moins plus de soi, l'agencement conceptuel qui relie le doute, le sujet et Dieu demeure un moteur crucial dans l'élaboration de l'argumentation philosophique. Les questions de la croyance religieuse et de l'existence de Dieu inquiètent la rhétorique philosophique, comme nous le verrons à travers les textes de William James (dans *Le pragmatisme*) et d'Etienne Souriau (dans *L'ombre de Dieu*). A travers ces œuvres, le doute et l'inquiétude se livrent non seulement comme principes d'élaboration du discours philosophique, mais aussi et simultanément comme principes d'une construction conceptuelle efficiente. L'incertitude se révèle dès lors centrale dans l'élaboration de la pensée, tant par rapport au « Je » qu'à son Autre et à ses autres.

=====