ENGLISH 597A: ETHNIC RHETORICS

Fall 2009
Instructor: Dr. Xiaoye You
Meeting time: Tuesday 9:05A - 12:05P
Location: 047 Burrowes

CONTACT INFORMATION
Office: 118 Burrowes
Office Hours: Tuesday and Thursday 1:30-2:20P or by appointment
Telephone: 863-0595
Email: xuy10@psu.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION
Taking a postcolonial and comparative perspective, this course examines rhetorical traditions that have grown within certain socio-cultural contexts and thus provides a means for understanding the overall experiences of selected communities. We will read both primary and secondary texts on rhetorical theory and practice in the Greek, Chinese, African American, Latino, and Asian American Traditions. Special attention will be paid to voices historically marginalized in those traditions. We conclude the course by discussing the implications of ethnic rhetorics for communication and composition in an age of transnational cultural flows. Course assignments include weekly readings, weekly talking points, a border-crossing activity, a conference proposal, a conference paper, and an end-of-semester presentation.

REQUIRED BOOKS AND READINGS


WEEKLY TALKING POINTS
Each week, you will make notes on our readings for that date. These should be meaningful notes to you, so they do not need to be especially formal. Notes can include questions, extensions, rebuttals, or the beginnings of writing ideas. Bring your notes to class with you, and be prepared to use these notes to talk from during class. Talking points should be about one page in length. They do not need to be in a formal, essayist style. Notes can be sentence or paragraph length statements. Be sure to include any page numbers you are discussing so that you can reference passages during our discussions.
**Border-crossing Activity**

In the middle of the semester, you will be introduced to a selected group of college students in China. You will be invited to assess their fieldwork reports (written as magazine articles) together with their teachers. Then you exchange your evaluations with the teachers and also share them with the students. You are encouraged to comment on every report critically and independently online. It is hoped that you will gain a firsthand understanding of rhetoric, communication, and composition in a transnational context.

**Article and Conference**

At the end of the semester, you should turn in a proposal and a conference-length paper (10 pages minimum) in response to a Call for Proposals (CFP) for the 14th Biennial Rhetoric Society of America Conference to be held in Minneapolis, MN in May 2010. You are encouraged to examine a topic in a less studied rhetorical tradition or to examine a topic through a postcolonial or a comparative lens. Certainly, instead of writing a conference paper, you can take the opportunity to compose an essay for publication or a section of your dissertation. You are encouraged to discuss your topic with me at any stage of your writing. Prepare a ten-minute presentation from this paper for our end-of-semester mini-conference.

**Course Policies**

The usual policies apply. I reserve the right to lower attendance points for absences over a reasonable number (say, two absences). I will also turn down requests to turn in assignments late.

**Grades**

Attendance: 10%
Talking points: 20%
Border-crossing activity: 20%
Conference proposal: 10%
Conference paper: 30%
Presentation: 10%

**Schedule:**

**Introduction to Ethnic Rhetorics**
August 25: “Contrastive Rhetoric” (Matalene)
   “Black Women Writers and the Trouble with Ethos” (Pittman)

**Issues in Postcolonial Studies**
September 1: Postcolonialism (Young)

**Greek Rhetoric**
September 8: *Phaedrus* (Plato)
   *Encomium to Helen* (Gorgias)
   “*Encomium to Helen* as Advertisement” (Pfau)
September 15: *On Rhetoric* (Aristotle)

**Chinese Rhetoric**
September 22: *Tao Te Ching* (Lao Tsu)
   “Conceptualization of Yan and Ming Bian: The School of Daoism” (Lu)
September 29: *Analects* (Confucius, Introduction and Chapter 1-10)
   “Conceptualization of Yan and Ming Bian: The School of Confucianism” (Lu)
Issues in Comparative Rhetoric
October 6: “Reflective Encounters” (Mao)
   “The Way, Multimodality of Ritual Symbols, and Social Change” (You)
   “Recent Advances in Comparative Rhetoric” (Hum & Lyon)
   “Introduction [to Ancient Non-Greek Rhetoric]” (Lipson)
   “Why Do the Rulers Listen to the Wild Theories of Speech-Makers?” (Lyon)
Border-crossing activity starts

African American Rhetoric
October 13: The African American Jeremiad (Howard-Pitney)
   “Preface [to Rhetoric and Ethnicity]” (Gilyard)
October 20: The African American Jeremiad (Howard-Pitney)
   “Discourses of Black Nationalism” (Gilyard)

Latino/a Rhetoric
October 27: Angels’ Town (Cintron)
November 3: Angels’ Town (Cintron)
   “The Chicano Codex” (Baca)
Border-crossing activity concludes

Asian American Rhetoric
November 10: Representations (Mao and Young)
November 17: Representations (Mao and Young)
   Conference proposal for RSA 2010 due

Ethnic Rhetorics, Communication, and Composition
December 1: “Justifying My Position in Your Terms” (Liu)
   “In(ter)ventions of Global Democracy” (Ryder)
   Writing in the Devil’s Tongue (You, Chapter 1, 2)

December 8: Presentations

December 15: Term papers due
Ethnic Rhetorics: A Selected Bibliography

**African American Rhetoric**

**Asian American Rhetoric**

**American Indian Rhetoric**

**Chinese Rhetoric**


**Comparative Rhetoric**


**Latino/a Rhetoric**


Issues in Rhetoric and Written Discourse

1. Contexts and the Initiation of Discourse
What specific rhetorical contexts are addressed? How is rhetorical exigency handled?
What initiates the discursive act? Kairos? How is this defined?
Is there an art for initiating discourse? Status? How is this defined?
Does the text discuss a disagreement over these aspects?

2. Topics
Is there an art of topoi or topics? What kinds of topics are presented (general, specific?)
Are topics theorized? Exemplified? List topics and their categories.
What are the purposes of the topics? To arrive at judgment, to find material to support judgments already in hand, to adapt discourse to audience?
Does the text discuss a disagreement over this aspect?

3. Rhetorical Reasoning
What is the nature of rhetorical reasoning (e.g., dialogic, dissoi logoi, enthymeimic)
Is this reasoning theorized? Exemplified?
What kind of epistemology (e.g., probability, certainty) does rhetoric employ?
What kinds of claims are made for rhetoric’s relation to “truth”?
What relationship is suggested between language and “thought”?
Does the text discuss a disagreement over this aspect?

4. Province of Rhetoric: Subject Matters, Borders
How is “matter” of rhetoric characterized? Is rhetoric restricted to particular domains?
What is rhetoric’s relationship to other types of study and inquiry or other disciplines: (poetics, philosophy, law, science, theology, homiletics, politics etc.)?
What is rhetoric’s relationship to the political, social, and economic conditions?
Does the text discuss disagreement over these aspects?

5. The Rhetor and Ethos
What are the subject positions of the rhetor? Who can speak, who is marginalized?
What is the nature and relative importance of ethos (in relation to logs and pathos)?
Is there an art of ethos: Strategies for achieving it?
What is the relationship between ethos and ethics, if any?
Does the text discuss a disagreement over this aspect?

6. The Audience and Pathos
How does the text characterize the audiences for discourse?
What is the nature and relative importance of emotion (in relation to logs and ethos)?
Is there an art of pathos: strategies for achieving it?
Does the text discuss a disagreement over these aspects?

7. Genres and Style
What are rhetoric’s genres or discourse classifications?
Are they theorized? Exemplified?
What are the features of these genres?
What types of styles are theorized or exemplified?
Does the text discuss disagreements over these aspects?

8. The education of the Rhetor and Rhetoric as an Art
Is rhetoric characterized as 1) a set of rules (craft), 2) a set of theoretical principles of transferable strategies capable of reflecting or guiding practice and being adapted to specific contexts (art), or 3) the product of genius and/or a mysterious function of language?
What is the role and definition of an art (technē) per se?
What relationships are suggested among art, talent (nature), practice, and imitation in the development of the rhetor? Are they equal in importance?
What is the character of the relationship between the “teacher” and the “student”?
Call for Proposals
14th Biennial Rhetoric Society of America Conference
May 28-31, 2010, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Conference Theme
RHETORIC: CONCORD AND CONTROVERSY

I have often and seriously debated with myself whether men and communities have received more good or evil from oratory and a consuming devotion to eloquence.

Cicero

But put identification and division ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and the other begins, and you have the characteristic invitation to rhetoric.

Kenneth Burke

In the de Inventione, Cicero recognizes two opposing dimensions of rhetoric, the one divisive and conflictive, the other irenic and unifying. Kenneth Burke, in characteristic fashion, converts this either/or into a both/and. For him, rhetoric simultaneously divides and unifies, separates as it identifies and dwells most naturally in the in-between space where sameness and difference ambiguously embrace one another. The theme of our conference calls these distinctions and confusions to mind. It asks, among many other things: Does rhetoric civilize? Or does it repress and control? Or both? Does it express the self? Or dissolve it into a cultural miasma? What is the price of community gained through the language of social control? What is the limit of dissent expressed through the language of difference and personal liberation? Where do diversity and sameness meet on the human tongue and in the human condition?

We welcome any and all papers that touch on this theme or that redefine it or reconstruct it or deconstruct it. We also welcome all other papers that deal with any aspect of rhetorical scholarship—historical, theoretical, critical, pedagogical, sophistical or Platonic, Aristotelian or Foucaultian. All are welcome to meet in Minneapolis, a space between the coasts, and a place where nice is the norm, but where nastiness has left it as the only spot in the U.S. where the number of senators has equaled the number of governors for half a year. Celebrate the confusion and the order of Minnesota and of the rhetorical world to which it belongs. Join us at RSA in May.

Proposals for sessions, special events, and individual presentations - due by September 18, 2009 - must be submitted electronically as a Word document. Instruction for submitting abstracts are indicated below. You may also go to http://rhetoricsociety.org for directions. There you will also find information (and regular updates) on housing, special features, and other aspects of RSA 2010.

Individual proposals - should be no longer than 350 words.

Panel proposals - should be no longer than 1250 words.