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This study analyzes Karl Wallace's philosophy of rhetoric, traces its sources, notes changes in his theory, and assesses his contribution. For more than forty years, Wallace served the field of speech as a teacher, scholar, editor, educational administrator, and leader in professional speech associations. He was a specialist in the rhetorical theory of Francis Bacon, producing numerous works on Bacon, including *Francis Bacon on Rhetoric and Communication* and *Francis Bacon on the Nature of Man*. His broader scholarly interests included an attempt to establish philosophical foundations for the field of speech; this interest is most fully developed in his book, *Understanding Discourse*, and his two journal articles, "An Ethical Basis of Communication" and "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Reasons." Wallace was also an eminent textbook writer, co-authoring *Fundamentals of Public Speaking* with Donald C. Bryant, which is now in its fifth edition. He also edited *A History of Speech Education in America*.

This investigation focuses on Wallace as a rhetorical and educational theorist. It analyzes his concept of practical discourse with its implications for a system of topics,
for a theory of attention and interest, for ethics, for a modern view of rhetorical behavior, and for the place of popular discourse in modern education. On each of these subjects, this study compares Wallace's views with those of other significant theorists.

In many of his publications, Wallace resists modern trends that, he felt, represent a fragmented and incomplete view of communication and of education. In order to unify and to define the uniqueness of speech and its place in modern education, he applies a broad, classical view of popular discourse as "the art and act of oral communication," which he first encountered in the Cornell University speech department's humane tradition in classical rhetoric. Wallace consistently maintained an Aristotelian concept of rhetoric as an art of practical, popular discourse, an art of social adaptation that is interdisciplinary and audience-centered. In addition, Wallace applies Aristotle's view of popular discourse as a unified act entailing four causes. Furthermore, he argues for an Isocratean concept of rhetoric as the core subject of learning, and he believes that the study of the content and ethics of practical discourse is essential to the full development of the public-minded democratic citizen. Hence, Wallace attempts to merge popular discourse with politics in order
to emphasize rhetoric's responsibility to promote the social welfare by upholding the ideals of a free society.

This study shows that Wallace's rhetorical theory was influenced not only by Aristotle and by the Cornell University speech department, but also by Francis Bacon, modern ethicists, especially "good reasons" philosophers, and James A. Winans.

Wallace's chief contribution to contemporary rhetorical theory is his explanation of rhetoric's completeness, unity, and uniqueness through his concept of popular discourse as a product of three elements--the rhetorical situation, the speaker, and "substance." He also clarifies the position of practical discourse in education through the rhetorical situation, rhetorical "substance," and the teacher of communication. Wallace has what appears to be a unified, complete, consistent, and practical philosophy. His unified view is probably unique to modern rhetorical theory.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In a recent festschrift honoring Karl Richards Wallace, Marie Nichols, and Richard Murphy, Roger E. Nebergall and Joseph W. Wenzel state:

[Karl] Wallace taught by example that rigor and human understanding could complement each other to the advantage of both. We remember Karl Wallace in many roles that revealed his versatile and vibrant humankind. In every human way, as in every academic way, Karl Wallace was a rare person.

Especially lauding Wallace for his professional scholarship, they place him "among the group of serious scholars who helped the speech communication profession in its formative years to grow from a collection of teachers of public speaking into a substantial discipline concerned with the full range of scientific and philosophical inquiry into speech communication." Recognizing his influence as an editor and a teacher, they add that his written works "were an even greater influence, for they stand as models of rigorous scholarship."

For over forty years Wallace rendered distinguished service to the field of speech as a leader in many professional speech and related associations, as a teacher and educational administrator, and as an eminent scholar. He was particularly involved in the Speech Communication Association; he was its president, 1954-1955; a member of its Executive Council, 1944-1957; a member of its Board of Finance, 1970-1971; chairman of the Board of Finance, 1971-1973; and editor of The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1945-1947.

Wallace served on The College Conference on Composition Executive Committee, 1965-1968.

Wallace was posthumously awarded the Speech Communication Association's Distinguished Service Award on November 10, 1973. See Donald Bryant, "SCA Distinguished Service Award 1973: Citation of Karl Wallace," Spectra, IX (December, 1973), p. 2.

In addition to his service to professional associations, Wallace was active as a teacher and educational administrator, serving as instructor in speech at Iowa State College, 1927-1931 and 1933-1936; as assistant professor in charge of speech at Washington University, 1936-1937; and as professor of speech at the University of Virginia, 1937-1944, and at the University of Illinois at Urbana, 1947-1968. During the summers of 1933 and 1934 he taught at the University of Missouri. He was chairman of the Committee, 1957-1958; the Legislative Assembly (Member at Large), 1959-1961; the Committee on Certification of the Regional Accrediting Association, 1960-1961; the Nominating Committee (Legislative Assembly), 1961-1962; the Committee on Certification of Teachers of Speech, 1961-1962; the Committee on Curricula and Certification, 1962-1963; chairman of the Committee on Speech Education, 1963-1964; chairman of the Committee on the Nature of the Field of Speech, 1963-1964, which resulted in "The Field of Speech: Its Purposes and Scope in Education," by Karl Wallace, Donald K. Smith, and Andrew T. Weaver, Speech Teacher, XII (November, 1963); the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards, 1964-1965, and as chairman of that committee, 1965-1966; chairman of the Nominating Committee (awards), 1965-1966; chairman of a project jointly sponsored by the Speech Communication Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, 1966-1967, which resulted in a position paper "Rhetoric and Preparation of Elementary School Teachers," by Karl R. Wallace, Box 20, Folder I, "The Karl Wallace Papers," at the University of Massachusetts Archives, Amherst, Massachusetts (the "Karl Wallace Papers" will hereafter be referred to as Wallace Ms.). the Executive Committee, 1969-1970; the National Developmental Project on Rhetoric, Wingspread Conference, January 25-27, 1970, resulting in Wallace's essay "The Fundamentals of Rhetoric," in The Prospect of Rhetoric, ed. by Lloyd Bitzer and Edwin Black (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), pp. 3-20; the Administrative Committee of the Legislative Council, 1972-1973.
School of Speech and Drama at the University of Virginia, 1937-1947, and of the Department of Speech and Theatre at the University of Illinois, 1947-1968.

Wallace also served as guest summer lecturer at numerous colleges and universities, including the University of Michigan, 1953 and 1954, the University of Oklahoma, 1962, and Louisiana State University, 1967.

In 1968, upon his retirement from the University of Illinois, Wallace moved to the University of Massachusetts and worked with Ronald Reid in the initial efforts to start

---

5 Karl R. Wallace, "Aspects of Modern Rhetoric in Francis Bacon," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (December, 1956), pp. 398-406, was a part of his lectures at Ohio State University, University of Missouri, University of Oregon, and University of Washington. Parts of Wallace's Understanding Discourse were delivered at the University of Iowa, Eastern Illinois State University, and the University of Alabama.


7 Karl R. Wallace, "Imagination and Francis Bacon's View of Rhetoric," in Dimensions of Rhetorical Scholarship, ed. by Roger Nebergall (Oklahoma: Dept. of Speech, University of Oklahoma, 1963), was the product of his lectures at the University of Oklahoma.

8 As a consequence of his lectures at Louisiana State University, Wallace published Understanding Discourse.
the Ph.D. program in speech. In addition, he acted as co-director of an undergraduate rhetoric program, independent of both speech and English departments.

Perhaps Wallace's greatest contribution is found in his historical and philosophical writings on rhetoric and public address. He has been called an "award winning specialist in Francis Bacon . . . internationally recognized for his contributions to British and American Public Address." In 1943 he published *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric*. In reviewing this book, Lester Thomassen says: "During the past eight years, not fewer than four substantial contributions to an understanding of Bacon's rhetoric and of Tudor education have appeared under Wallace's name in journals and monographs devoted to the field of speech. *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric* is an important addition to the literature of our subject. It deserves a prominent place in the library.

---

9 Interview with Ronald Reid at Amherst, Massachusetts, January 20, 1977.

10 Letter to James Yarbrough from Jane Blankenship, Amherst, Massachusetts, October 12, 1976. Wallace was co-director with Dr. Walker Gibson, professor of English at the University of Massachusetts.


of every serious student of rhetoric."\(^{13}\) Wallace also authored *Francis Bacon on the Nature of Man*,\(^{14}\) which Dominic LaRusso assesses as "another useful addition to his already imposing list of Baconiana."\(^{15}\)

Wallace served as general editor of *A History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies*.\(^{16}\) James L. Golden declares this book "Ably edited and supervised."

He continues:

Prior to the appearance of this volume serious students of speech have been hard pressed to find needed materials on each of the major aspects of American speech education. Graduate students, in particular, have often completed their course requirements and begun their teaching careers with, at best, a limited knowledge of movements and trends and of the leading figures who pioneered the advancement of speech education in our colleges and schools. That this gap will now be filled is a tribute to the painstaking researches of the authors represented in *A History of Speech Education in America*.\(^{17}\)

---


Concerning this same volume, Wilbur Gilman says that it is "another landmark among the publications of our profession. So important is this history to scholars and teachers in the field of speech and related areas that it deserves close reading in its entirety."\(^\text{18}\)

Wallace also co-edited Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander Drummond, Lectures Concerning Oratory, and A Historical Anthology of Select British Speeches.\(^\text{19}\)

Having what has been described as the "most philosophical mind in the Cornell School,"\(^\text{20}\) Wallace contributed to the intellectual foundations of rhetoric and public address through his philosophical writings pulled together in his book Understanding Discourse.\(^\text{21}\) James Enfield assesses this book as "perhaps the most important...\(^\text{21}\)


statement on meaning made by a rhetorical scholar in the twentieth century." Roderick P. Hart calls it "an instructive book of wide scope, . . . that does much to mark out the unique contributions that rhetorical studies make to an understanding of man."23

Among his philosophical works, Wallace's widely reprinted journal article "An Ethical Basis of Communication" has been called "probably his most influential publication." Goodwin F. Berquist regards it "as an important milestone in the teaching of speech in America." Stanley B. Rives asserts that "Karl Wallace has


25Interview with Jane Blankenship at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, January 20, 1977.

26Berquist, Speeches, p. 190.
written the clearest statement on the relationship of
democratic values to the ethical obligations of the com-
municator." Furthermore, numerous books on rhetoric
and communication refer to this article or have been
influenced by its point of view.

Wallace's philosophical writings also include his
journal article "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Rea-
sons." Malcolm Sillars calls it "the most important

27 Stanley B. Rives, "Ethical Argumentation," Journal
of the American Forensics Association, I (September,
1964), p. 79.

28 For examples of references to Wallace's four "mor-
alities," or ethical standards in "An Ethical Basis of
Communication," see: Alan H. Monroe and Douglas Ehn-
inger, Principles and Types of Speech Communication (7th
ed.; Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1974),
p. 459; Lester Thonessen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Bra-
den, Speech Criticism (2nd ed.; New York: The Ronald Press,
1970), p. 450; Richard J. Murphy, "Preface to an Ethic of
Rhetoric," The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Orato-
ry, Language, and Drama Presented to Herbert A. Wichelm,
ed. by Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,
1958), p. 133; Richard L. Johannessen, "On Teaching the
Social Responsibility of a Speaker," Essays on Teaching
Speech in High School, ed. by J. Jeffrey Auer and Edward
B. Jenkinson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press,
1971), p. 223; A. Craig Baird, A Philosophical Inquiry

29 For examples of the influence of Wallace's ethical
point of view, see: Kenneth G. Hance, David C. Ralph, and
Milton J. Wiksell, Principles of Speaking (3rd ed.; Bel-
mont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1975),
p. 11; Ernest G. Bormann, Discussion and Group Methods:
Theory and Practice (2nd ed.; New York: Harper and Row,
1975), p. 68; Thomas R. Nilsen, "Criticism and Social
Consequences," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (April,
1956), p. 177.

30 Karl Wallace, "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Rea-
work" that attempts "to define . . . [Rhetorical] standards by those of the society."\(^{31}\) Herbert A. Simons refers to this article as a responsible attack on "contemporary works for failing to deal with values."\(^{32}\)

Wallace contributed to speech education as a textbook writer, co-authoring *Fundamentals of Public Speaking* and *Oral Communication* with Donald C. Bryant.\(^{33}\) Russell B. Archer says that *Fundamentals of Public Speaking* (1947) was one of the "most widely used texts" between 1941 and


and 1951, and he concludes that "their discussion of the methods of speaking was the most comprehensive of all the textbooks analyzed for this study from 1915-1951."\(^{34}\)

Robert N. Manning lauds *Fundamentals of Public Speaking* (1953) as "the best example where a clearly presented, philosophical perspective" is in harmony with their explanation of methods and skills.\(^ {35}\)

In summary, Wallace's accomplishments over a period of forty years and the high esteem accorded him by contemporary rhetorical theorists indicate his standing as scholar, editor, textbook writer, professional leader, teacher, and administrator. His distinguished contributions to rhetoric and public address warrant the need for a further discussion of his rhetorical philosophy.

**Purpose of the Study**

In his essay "Research, Methods, Trends, Ideas," Waldo W. Braden suggests a need for the historical study of rhetorical theory wherein "the student of rhetoric may turn to descriptive, comparative and critical investiga-


tion of rhetorical writings of the philosophers, theorists, educators, and practitioners. The goals are to study sources, contributions, and influences, to explain and evaluate points of view, to present new interpretations in view of new information, and to place the figure in the stream of rhetorical thought."^36

Based on Braden's assessment, this study describes, analyzes and synthesizes Karl Wallace's concept of rhetoric. For many years Wallace sought to develop a morally and intellectually sound philosophy of popular discourse consistent with democratic ideals. Hence, this writer examines his definition of rhetoric as an art of social adjustment; his basic concepts of the speech act and rhetorical action, which he believed establishes rhetoric as an ethical and autonomous discipline; and his view of the relationship between popular discourse and the ethical and political values of a free society.

This study investigates the implications of Wallace's concept of practical discourse for a logic of rhetoric. His rhetorical logic encompasses rules for guiding the speaker in the rational application of the ethical and political ideals of a free society essential to social adaptation through communication. It entails a rhetori-

---

cal topos, or a classification of moral values that provides the primary materials of argument, of attention and interest, and of an ethics of communication in a democracy. In addition, it suggests ways of delivering speeches. Therefore, this writer attempts to examine Wallace's recommendations for a contemporary view of rhetorical behavior and its implications for the development of a system of invention, a theory of attention and interest, an ethics of communication, and delivery.

This study also examines Wallace's educational philosophy. Considering himself to be primarily an educator, he endeavored to develop a philosophy of education in accord with democratic principles. In so doing, he places rhetoric at the center of his educational system.

This study investigates the origins of, significant influences upon, and changes in Wallace's theory of popular discourse. Influenced by his classical studies at Cornell University, Wallace maintained an essentially Aristotelian view modified by his research into Francis Bacon's rhetorical theory. In addition, his thinking was guided to some extent by modern ethical and political theorists.

Finally, this study assesses Wallace's contribution to a modern concept of rhetoric, a system of invention, a modern view of attention and interest, an ethics of communication, a modern view of rhetorical behavior, and edu-
cational theory, by comparing him with significant scholars who also wrote on these subjects.

This dissertation does not propose to be a historical or biographical treatise on Wallace as a speech educator similar to studies such as Maxine M. Trauernicht's "The Life and Work of Charles Henry Woolbert" and David George Burns' "The Contributions of William Norwood Brigance to the Field of Speech." Moreover, this study does not propose to trace the implications and influences of Wallace's studies in Renaissance rhetoric and Francis Bacon upon his philosophy of education.

Justification of the Study

Besides the previously mentioned studies by Trauernicht and Burns, dissertations that have investigated the rhetorical philosophies of individual speech educators include Anne Goyne Mitchell, "The Rhetorical Theory of A. Craig Baird as Expressed in Representative American Speeches: 1937-1959," and Eugene Francis Covelli, "James Milton O'Neill--Pioneer in Speech Education."38


Although there are no extensive studies on Wallace, two dissertations have considered aspects of his rhetorical theory. Sister Janice Marie Lauer's "Invention in Contemporary Rhetoric: Heuristic Procedures," gives Wallace only passing notice. In her analysis of major trends in rhetorical invention and their implications for modern education, she covers a relatively large number of writers. She only briefly describes Wallace's concept of rhetorical invention based on his publications prior to 1965. Probably because she excludes some of his major writings since 1965, she makes no assessment of his contribution to a modern system of invention. In addition, she does not explain the relevance of Wallace's view of invention in the total context of his rhetorical theory.39

Parke Gilette Burgess' "A Concept of Social Responsibility in Rhetoric," analyzes Wallace's view of ethics in some detail. Examining major contemporary textbook writers on public speaking and their contribution to a modern view of the social responsibility of rhetoric, Burgess describes Wallace's ethical view and assesses his

contribution to a modern ethics of communication. However, because his analysis was based on a limited number of Wallace's publications up to 1956, Burgess' conclusions represent an incomplete view of Wallace's concept of an ethics of rhetoric. In addition, he does not consider the relevance of Wallace's view of morality in relation to the rest of Wallace's theory. 40

Sources of Materials and Methods of Analysis

The source materials for this investigation consist primarily of Wallace's writings: his dissertation, books, essays, and unpublished papers located at the University of Massachusetts Archives at Amherst.

The plan of this study is as follows:

Chapter II discusses the influences of Cornell University on Wallace.

Chapter III examines his concept of rhetoric, including contemporary trends in rhetorical theory that Wallace resisted; his definition of practical discourse entailing an exploration of the basic concepts of his philosophy, the speech act and rhetorical action; the relationship between rhetoric, ethics, and politics; and Wallace's contribution to a modern concept of communication.

Chapter IV analyzes the implications of Wallace's philosophy of rhetoric for a logic of practical discourse, for a system of topics, for a modern view of rhetorical behavior, for a theory of attention and interest, for an ethics of communication, and for delivery. Then, his theoretical changes in and contributions to each of these subjects are discussed.

Chapter V investigates his educational philosophy by briefly examining classical influences, by considering contemporary trends in education that he opposed, by analyzing his philosophy of education, and by assessing his contribution to modern educational theory.

Chapter VI includes a summary of the study.
CHAPTER II

THE CORNELL CLIMATE

The historian Charles A. Beard says that "everyone writes at some time in space, in some social milieu, from some angle of vision, and according to some scheme of values."¹ Wallace cannot be understood in a cultural vacuum. Being a product of the speech department at Cornell University, his rhetorical views are basically an expression of their interests and ideals regarding the classical tradition in rhetoric. This chapter explores the influence of those with whom he associated at Cornell University on his theory of popular discourse by discussing the origins of the revival of classical rhetoric there and the Cornell climate. The Cornell climate entails the particular kinds of scholars that Cornell produced during Wallace's matriculation there and the impact of their studies on Wallace, as well as on contemporary rhetoric.

The Revival of Classical Rhetoric at Cornell

In his essay "Some Teachers and the Transition to Twentieth-Century Speech Education," Giles W. Gray remarks that "the three decades from 1890 to 1920 were a period of transition in the development of American speech education. The changes that were taking place in these thirty years were perhaps more profound than in any other similar period since the founding of the first colonial schools. It was during these years that all the various aspects of oral communication were drawn together and integrated under the common rubric of speech, into the beginnings of our present profession." Gray says that professional speech educators during this period sought ways to make their field academically respectable. He points out that they were resisting the influences of elocution, which focused on delivery, and English departments, which concentrated on stylistic matters of written composition. He states that neither elocutionists nor teachers of composition before 1900 understood "the educational values" of speech as an academic discipline.²

In his essay "Introduction: Herbert A. Wichelns and the Cornell Tradition of Rhetoric as a Humane Study,"

Everett Lee Hunt refers to members of the Cornell department as among those speech professionals in the twentieth century who desired "a sense of belonging to the academic royal family." He indicates that James A. Winans, head of the Cornell speech department, 1915-1920, and one of the founders of the Speech Communication Association, was probably the first Cornellian to attempt to gain academic recognition through his notable book *Public Speaking.*

Hunt suggests that Winans increased the status of the field of speech through incorporating a balance among the classical canons of invention, organization, style, memory, and delivery in contrast to narrow concerns of the elocutionists and composition teachers of the nineteenth century. Teachers at Cornell, Hunt continues, believed that establishing the significance of their discipline entailed going beyond Winans' contribution to even further study of its history and tradition. He points out that this ambition explains, in part, why Alexander M. Drummond, professor of speech and chairman of the Department of Speech and Drama at Cornell, 1920-1940, initiated a graduate seminar in classical rhetoric in 1920. Everett Lee Hunt, best known nationally as Dean of Swarthmore College through twenty years, 1938-1957, was co-director of

---

*3 James A. Winans, *Public Speaking* (New York: Century Co., 1915).*
the seminar with Drummond. Drummond and Hunt, along with early students including Hoyt Hudson, Harry Caplan, and Herbert A. Wichelns, studied the works of such eminent classical rhetoricians as Aristotle, Cicero, Quintillian, Isocrates, and Plato. In brief, then, these speech teachers at Cornell were beginning to seek a more solid foundation for their discipline through studies in the humane tradition of classical rhetoric. The result was an outpouring of publications that were to have a profound impact on contemporary speech education.

The Cornell Climate During Wallace's Matriculation

During his undergraduate and graduate years, 1923-1927 and 1931-1933, Wallace encountered persons who had an influence on him as a student and later as a scholar and teacher. Many became lifelong friends through inter-


5Wallace earned his B.A. in 1927, with a major in both English and public speaking; his M.A. in 1931, with a major
action on diverse projects. Perhaps the most distinguished of their scholarly enterprises culminated in the four volumes written predominately by Cornellians: *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans*, *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond*, *The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language, and Drama Presented to Herbert August Wichelns*, and *Historical Studies on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*.

An examination of these four volumes discloses their predilection for studies in drama, phonetics and linguistics, and especially, classical studies in rhetoric and public speaking. Loren Reid points out that Cornell scholarship has "more concern with rhetorical theory than with the criticism of speakers . . . . that its standards are classical, applied venturesomely and imaginatively; that it is deeply rooted in literature, including that of the theatre, principally from Renaissance time through the

in rhetoric and a minor in drama; and his Ph.D. in 1933 with a major in rhetoric and public address and minors in drama and in English history.

eighteenth century; that it is perhaps more sensitive to literature than to history and other branches of the social studies."

Having had a tremendous influence upon the views emanating from Cornell, Alexander M. Drummond probably affected Wallace's thinking about rhetoric. In his article "Graduate Work in Public Speaking," Drummond describes the philosophy of rhetorical education that he established at Cornell: "we mean that this term \textit{rhetoric} connotes to one of classical training--properly it includes plan and organization of speeches, study and application of the principles of persuasion, some knowledge of the content and thus of the background and examples drawn from types of public discourse, language, style, and delivery, the oral interpretation of literature, voice training for the normal voice and its improvement, correction of defects, the art of oral dramatic literature as it bears upon the problem of delivery.

Perhaps the final and best test of all these aspects of

\footnote{Loren Reid, review of \textit{The Rhetorical Idiom}, ed. by Donald C. Bryant, \textit{Quarterly Journal of Speech}, XLIV (October, 1958), pp. 316-317.}

\footnote{Alexander M. Drummond: b. 1884; B.A., 1906, M.A., 1909, Hamilton College; instr., 1909-1910, 1912-1915, asst. prof., 1915-1918, professor and chairman of the Department of Speech and Drama, 1920-1940, at Cornell University. He was president of the Speech Communication Association, 1921-1922.}
rhetoric is a certain 'public' ability." In his view of rhetoric, Drummond reflects the broad, classical concept of practical discourse that encompasses all the essential aspects of the classical canons of invention, organization, style, memory, and delivery. Instead of compartmentalizing rhetoric as a subject separate from other related studies in speech--oral interpretation or speech correction, for example--the Cornell speech department believed that practical discourse is the central concept underlying all verbal communication. In addition, Drummond emphasizes rhetoric as the study essential to the preparation of public-spirited citizens.

As Wallace's first undergraduate teacher of public speaking, Everett Lee Hunt apparently contributed to Wallace an awareness of the classical view of rhetorical education. Like Wallace, Hunt was predisposed toward


10Unpublished transcript of a lecture in a seminar on the History of Speech Education at the University of Mass., Fall, 1973, by Karl Wallace, p. 6. This work will hereafter be referred to as "Wallace Lecture."

an Aristotelian philosophy of rhetoric that was best reflected in his well-known article "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians."\(^{12}\)

Hunt's courses in public speaking and argumentation represented to a great extent Wallace's later views on the place of popular discourse in contemporary education.\(^{13}\) In the classical tradition, Hunt hoped to train the student in practical judgment and action of public leadership.\(^{14}\) In order to achieve this ideal, he emphasized the study and communication of issues that citizens actually encountered in public affairs.\(^{15}\) In journal articles such as "General Specialists," he calls upon teachers of public speaking to marry substance and form by focusing on the content of practical discourse.\(^{16}\) Like Wallace, he believes that the subject matter of popular discourse encompasses the "permanent problems of


\(^{13}\)See Chapter V of this dissertation.


individual thought and conduct" and the popular opinions inherent in solving political and social problems in a free society.\textsuperscript{17} Consistent with his view of rhetorical training, Hunt required students to read books on social problems, to discuss these materials in class, and to make a round of speeches on a narrow aspect of a problem.\textsuperscript{18} In addition, he attempted to make his courses practical and relevant, not only by attending to issues actually discussed by public-minded citizens, but also by setting up historically significant communicative situations for better assimilation and transfer of learning. For example, he required students to study "the debates over the American constitution" and to impersonate characters who were crucial to its completion.\textsuperscript{19} By means of this approach, Hunt envisioned rhetoric, as did Wallace, as an interdisciplinary study through which students integrated their coursework. Hunt also argues that practical discourse is the best means for unifying the

\textsuperscript{17}Hunt, "Adding Substance," pp. 258-259.

\textsuperscript{18}"Wallace Lecture," pp. 3-4. Hunt's article, "Adding Substance," gives the rationale to the course he taught. Everett L. Hunt and Alexander Drummond, eds., \textit{Persistent Questions in Public Discussion: Addresses and Essays} (New York: The Century Co., 1924), was one of the texts used in Hunt's courses.

student's social and technical education. 20

As his major professor throughout his graduate studies, 21 Herbert A. Wichelns, former professor and chairman of the Department of Speech and Drama at Cornell, certainly shaped Wallace's views on popular discourse. 22 Wichelns' notable essay "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," which Donald C. Bryant regards as having "had a greater and more continuous influence upon the development of rhetoric and public address than any other single work published in this century," 23 reflects the Aristotelian concept of rhetoric that probably guided Wallace's early thinking about public speaking. Like Wallace, Wichelns viewed popular discourse as an instru-


23 Bryant, ed., The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 5.
ment for wielding public opinion. Hence, he taught rhetoric from the point of view of a speaker whose intent is to persuade an audience on a particular rhetorical occasion.\(^\text{24}\)

Harry Caplan and Hoyt Hudson left the speech department at Cornell in 1923 when Wallace was entering there as a freshman. Nonetheless, Wallace probably read and assimilated into his thinking the eminent publications of both Caplan and Hudson. Harry Caplan left the speech department to join the Cornell University's Department of Classics, where he became Goldwin Smith Professor of Classical Languages and Literature and chairman of that department.\(^\text{25}\) He continued for many years to produce a multitude of books and articles on ancient and medieval rhetorical theory, some of which were published in speech journals.\(^\text{26}\) Caplan's translation of *Rhetorica ad Heren*

\(^\text{24}\)Herbert Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," *The Rhetorical Idiom*, ed. by Donald Bryant, pp. 5-42.


\(^\text{26}\)Howes, ed., *Historical Studies*, p. 436. Among Caplan's prominent contributions to speech journals were the following: Harry Caplan and Henry H. King, "Italian Treatises on Preaching: A Book List," *Speech Monographs*,

nium has been lauded as "a major achievement in the history of rhetorical scholarship."27 James M. O'Neill calls Caplan's essay, "A Late and Medieval Tractate on Preaching," an "outstanding contribution" to the field of rhetoric.28

After leaving Cornell, Hoyt Hudson, former professor of rhetoric and oratory and chairman of the Department of English at Princeton University, published works that reflect his long interest in promulgating knowledge regarding the classical and humane tradition in rhetoric.29


29 Hoyt Hudson: b. 1894; B.A., 1911, Huron College; M.A., 1913, University of Denver; Ph.D., 1923, Cornell University; instr. in public speaking, 1920-1923, Cornell University; asst. prof. of English and public speaking, 1923-1925, Swarthmore College; prof. of English, 1925-1927, Pittsburgh University; assoc. prof. of public speak-
Called one of the "landmark manifestoes for the new study and scholarship in our field," his journal article "The Field of Rhetoric" reflects an Aristotelian view similar to that of Wicelnna. He also wrote Educating Liberally, which attempts, as Wallace was to do later, to bring to modern education the classical emphasis on the wholeness and unity of learning.

Through his interaction with Wallace during their undergraduate years at Cornell, 1923-1927, and certainly through their association on many scholarly projects, Donald C. Bryant, Professor Emeritus of Speech at the University of Iowa, influenced Wallace. They worked together

---


31Hoyt Hudson, Educating Liberally (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1945).

as co-authors of *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*, now in its fifth edition, and *Oral Communication*, a shortened version of the first, now in its fourth edition. They also labored together as co-editors and as Speech Communication Association committee members.33 Considered definitive in the field of speech, Bryant's best known publications include "Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition I: The Intellectual Foundation;" "Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition II: Emotion, Style and Literary Association;" and "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope."34 In these articles, Bryant agrees with Herbert Wichelns that rhetoric is an art of practical, popular discourse integrally associated with politics and literature.35


33Included among books that Wallace and Bryant co-edited were *Studies in Speech and Drama* and *An Historical Anthology of Select British Speeches*. Wallace and Bryant worked together on Speech Communication Association committees, including the Committee on Publications, 1947-1948; the History of American Public Address Committee, 1948-1949; the Administrative Committee, 1970-1971; and the Executive Committee, 1969-1970.


Bryant wrote his dissertation on Edmund Burke, and he later became a recognized authority on the British statesman for his many publications, including his book *Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends*.\(^{36}\)

Wilbur S. Howell, Emeritus Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Princeton University, knew Wallace as an undergraduate, 1923-1925, and as an instructor, 1927-1928 and 1931-1932.\(^{37}\) They were associated in committee work in the Speech Communication Association.\(^{38}\) Howell is known nationally as an authority on Renaissance rhetoric, contributing three distinguished books: *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric*, and *Poetics, Rhetoric and Logic: Studies*

\(^{36}\)Donald C. Bryant, *Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends* (St. Louis, 1939).


in the Basic Disciplines of Criticism.\(^3^9\)

During his graduate years at Cornell, 1931-1933, Wallace most likely had many conversations with well-known textbook writer\(^4^0\) and scholar Russell H. Wagner, who was an instructor there.\(^4^1\) Wagner, who taught at Cornell from 1926-1947 and was later chairman of the School of Speech and Drama at the University of Virginia, worked with Wallace on many committees of the Speech Communication Association.\(^4^2\) Wagner wrote his dissertation


\(^4^0\)Among Wagner's texts is Handbook of Group Discussion (2nd ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), which he co-authored with Carroll C. Arnold.


\(^4^2\)Wallace and Wagner worked together on numerous Speech Communication Association committees, including the Committee on Committees, 1945-1948; the History of American Public Address Committee, 1945-1949; the Com-
on the sixteenth-century classical rhetorician Thomas Wilson, and he later contributed two essays: "Thomas Wilson's Contributions to Rhetoric" and "Thomas Wilson's Speech Against Usury." He became known as the "foremost authority on the life, works, and times of Thomas Wilson."

While Wallace was an undergraduate, 1925-1926, another well-known textbook writer and teacher, Wilbur E. Gilman, Professor Emeritus of Speech and former chairman of the Department of Speech at Queens College, was an instructor at Cornell. Later, they also had contact through the


44Howes, ed., Historical Studies, p. 444.


As an instructor at Cornell University, 1930-1931, and as a co-member of the Speech Communication Association's Executive Council, 1948-1953, Harold F. Harding, Benedict Professor of Speech at the University of Texas at El Paso, interacted with Wallace. Believing, like Wallace, in the rhetorical study of social and political


problems, Harding edited *The Age of Danger: Major Speeches on American Problems* and *The Speeches of Thucydides*.  

Wallace worked closely with colleague Wayland M. Parrish at the University of Illinois, 1947-1955. Parrish, former professor of speech and chairman of the Division of Public Speaking at Illinois, was a distinguished teacher and scholar in oral interpretation and rhetoric. He was best known for his book *Reading Aloud*. Parrish also co-edited *American Speeches* with Marie Hochmuth. In his introduction to this book, Parrish reveals his Aristotelian concept of rhetoric. In particular, like Wallace, he emphasizes the ethical quality of a speech rather than its effect.

---


Other modern scholars in public speaking from Cornell whom Wallace probably knew included H. Clay Harshbarger, Emeritus Professor of Speech and former chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatic Arts at the University of Iowa; Marvin Bauer, Emeritus Professor of Speech at Brooklyn College; and Raymond F. Howes, scholar and former administrator at Cornell University.

In addition, Wallace apparently interacted with many


scholars from Cornell in the field of linguistics, including Charles K. Thomas, former professor of speech and director of the Speech Clinic at Cornell,\textsuperscript{57} and Lee S. Hultzen, former Emeritus Professor of Speech and one of Wallace's colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1947-1964.\textsuperscript{58}

Furthermore, Wallace maintained contact with numerous Cornellians in the field of drama, including Barnard Hewitt, professor of speech and theatre and chairman of the Department of Theatre, and another of Wallace's associates at the University of Illinois, 1948-1967.\textsuperscript{59}


\textsuperscript{59}Bernard Hewitt: b. 1906; B.A., 1928, M.A., 1929,
and Arthur Woehl, professor of speech and dramatics and former chairman of the Department of Speech and Theatre at Hunter College. 60

In summary, the Cornell speech department had a tremendous influence not only on Wallace, but also on contemporary rhetorical theory and education. Bower Aly asserts that "no company of scholars in our time has contributed more to the understanding of the spoken word and to the renaissance of rhetoric than the Cornellians." 61 According to Edward P. J. Corbett, "It was the Speech Department at Cornell University that fostered the resuscitation of classical rhetoric in our time." 62 Wallace's

Ph.D., 1934, Cornell University; instr. of English, 1931-1932, University of Colorado; instr. to asst. prof. of speech, 1932-1936, Montana State University; instr. to asst. prof. of speech, 1936-1948, Brooklyn College; prof. of speech and theatre, 1948-, chairman of the Department of Theatre, 1967-, University of Illinois at Urbana.


view of popular discourse was shaped through his studies at Cornell and by his many associations with Cornellians throughout his life.
CHAPTER III

WALLACE'S CONCEPT OF RHETORIC

At the 1970 Speech Communication Association's National Developmental Project on Rhetoric, Karl Wallace, the speech field's representative of the traditional view, presented and defended a classical definition of rhetoric.1 His view contrasted with that of many persons at the conference who repudiated the classical approach and who wished to expand the concept of rhetoric to include the achievement of persuasion through the manipulation of symbols of all kinds.2


2Perhaps Samuel L. Becker reflects the general opposition to setting the boundaries of practical discourse when he says: "I hope that we will not be too concerned with the trivial question of what is or is not 'rhetoric.'" The members of the conference conceive rhetoric "in the classical sense." However, Wayne Brockriede, Barnett Baskerville, and Edward P. J. Corbett note the conference's general rejection of the classical view. See The Prospect of Rhetoric, ed. by Bitzer and Black, pp. 22, 124-125, 157-162, 168-169, 214, 237. Early in this century, the classical view came into prominence through publications such as Hoyt Hudson's "The Field of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, IX (April, 1923), pp. 167-189 and Herbert
Like Wallace, other traditionalists express apprehension over the inclination of some to disregard the limits of the field of rhetoric. James J. Murphy warns that "the term 'rhetoric' is becoming stretched almost beyond endurance; its future usefulness is doubtful if it continues to be broadened."\(^3\) Douglas Ehninger cautions that an excessively broad definition of practical discourse puts "rhetoric... in danger of losing its identity as a discrete discipline."\(^4\) Donald C. Bryant argues that there is "little intellectual profit" in an undefined concept of practical communication. He adds that "unless we are to claim practically all interhuman activity as the field of rhetoric... some limits must be admitted."\(^5\) Barnet Baskerville likewise opposes an


all-inclusive view because in so doing "the rhetorical critic becomes at a single bound the Universal man, taking all knowledge to be his province." In brief, these contemporary rhetoricians see a need for setting boundaries on the field of practical discourse.

Like these traditional theorists, Wallace believes that the field of popular discourse should have limits, and he develops a concept that represents one viable means of establishing it as a distinctive discipline. Wallace endeavored not only to define the uniqueness of rhetoric but also to unify the field of speech through the application of the classical view that he first encountered at Cornell University. Wallace declares: "rhetoric . . . is . . . the 'core' of our field . . . \(\text{and}\) includes everything meant by the phrase, 'the act and the art of oral communication.' In focusing primarily upon the act and art of oral communication, the field of speech is distinguished from other academic fields." Thus, conceiving practical discourse broadly


as the "art and act of oral communication," he developed
a theory of rhetoric that fuses the specialized areas of
communication into a meaningful whole.

What Wallace consistently advocates is an Aristotelian
view of rhetoric as an art of practical, popular dis-
course; an art of social adaptation that is audience-
centered and interdisciplinary. He says:

The rhetorician looks at things and ex-
periences that men share in common, at the
interests and problems of society in gener-
al . . . he focuses upon that speech and
language behavior that reflects the commun-
al experience to which men become subject
and to which men appeal in deliberating
upon their mutual problems, in coming to
decisions mutually acceptable to them, and
in appraising their decisions and actions. Wallace adds that "Of the four chief elements in a com-
municative situation--speaker, message, audience, and
circumstances--audience-in-circumstances is central.
All that goes on is conditioned by audience responses." He
believes that rhetoric "is improvable--it is
learnable--through study and understanding." Thus,

9 This analysis of Aristotle's philosophy of rhetoric
is based on Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W.
Braden, Speech Criticism (2nd ed.; New York: The Ronald


11 Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Oral Commu-
nication: A Short Course in Speaking (4th ed.; Englewood

12 Ibid., p. 1.
he speaks of a systematic body of principles capable of being taught.

He believes that "a recognition of the appropriate means to accomplish an end" is essential to rhetorical discourse. Therefore, seeing the variability of the factors of a rhetorical situation, he suggests that "appropriateness" is possibly the key term and that the "right" application depends on the nature of a speaker, audience, subject and circumstances.

Wallace asserts that "Among the values of public communication . . . substance and social usefulness will always be primary." Thus, he stresses the importance of fulfilling the social obligations of rhetoric through an emphasis on reason and moral values.

In order to achieve a single theory of rhetoric, Wal-

---

13 "Wallace Lecture," p. 16.


15 Parke Gilette Burgess, "A Concept of Social Responsibility in Rhetoric," (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956), p. 481ftn. says that Wallace's Aristotelian position is inconsistent because he accepts Aristotle's amoral view of rhetoric while attempting to unify it with ethics and politics. This study argues that perhaps through Cornell's influence he did view Aristotle's Rhetoric as amoral. However, it was probably through the intensive studies required to teach his famous course in Aristotle at the University of Illinois that Wallace later saw Aristotle's philosophy as inseparable from Athenian cultural values. Cf. Karl R. Wallace, Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1943), p. 171 and "An Ethical Basis of Communication," Speech Teacher, IV (January, 1955), pp. 1-9.
lace borrows Aristotle's notion that speech is a unified act entailing four causes—(1) materials, (2) forms, (3) purposes, and (4) agent. He says:

> it seems appropriate to employ the fundamental terms that have always been used to describe movement and change. The terms are a set of four and have been traditionally called the 'four causes.' As designated by Aristotle, they were the material cause, formal cause, efficient cause, and final cause or end. As modified somewhat over the ages, they allow me to undertake a more complete account of the making of an utterance than would any other terms I know of.\(^\text{16}\)

Wallace believes that the unity and completeness of a particular act results from the peculiar interaction of these four elements. He states:

> The speech act . . . is the proper unit of the teacher and student of communication. Its virtue lies in its completeness and its implications. For in applying its categories, one will omit nothing that is essential to the understanding of both formal and in-

---

formal discourse in action. The act we are dealing with is truly a unit; the features or conditions of the act may be considered as parts of a whole. Each is necessary to the others; that is, if any one of the parts is missing, no act of speech, no communication, can possibly come into being.

He also thinks that the interaction of the four causes determines the uniqueness of a rhetorical act, as well as the field of practical discourse. Wallace declares:

The peculiar character of rhetoric emerges most clearly when one grasps this fact: Fields related to rhetoric may reveal the same ends, the same materials, some of the same activities; but no discipline combines end, material, and form in quite the same way as rhetoric. No other discipline among the arts and sciences claims the study of rhetorical actions as its dominant end nor the subject matter of speeches as its dominant material.

In addition, he views popular discourse as a substantive and moral art, and he persistently recommends that rhetoricians utilize the basic materials of two other fields: ethics and politics. Furthermore, he agrees with his


20For examples of Wallace's plea for the unity of rhetoric, ethics, and politics, see Karl Wallace, "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Reasons," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIX (October, 1963), pp. 239-249; "Rhetoric, Politics, and Education of the Ready Man," The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language, and Drama In Honor of Herbert A. Wichtelns, ed. by Donald C. Bryant
former student Wayne C. Brockriede who prefers "a single theory of rhetoric" on the grounds that the larger number of phenomena comprehended under the fewest number of explanatory concepts, the better the theory." In brief, then, Wallace suggests that modern rhetoric develop a unified concept consistent with the morality of a free society.

In order to establish the context of Wallace's concept of rhetoric, this chapter first analyzes some specific trends in modern rhetorical theory that he opposes; second, it examines his basic concepts of practical discourse; third, it studies his view of the relationship between rhetoric, ethics, and politics; and fourth, it investigates his contribution to a contemporary concept of practical communication.

Contemporary Views of Rhetoric
Contrary to Those of Wallace

In many of his publications, Wallace opposes modern definitions of rhetoric that are antithetical to a unified concept. He is especially critical of philosophies that


neglect subject matter and ethics. He disagrees with teachers of English composition who prefer to view the subject as a formal art, dealing basically with style, grammar, punctuation, skill, or organization rather than with substance. Likewise, Wallace takes issue with those teachers who think that rhetoric is a formal art that primarily concerns skills, forms, and techniques. He is critical of modern textbooks on public speaking that do not provide the speaker with fundamental content.

22 Unpublished papers of Karl Wallace in the files of Dr. Kenneth Brown, chairman of the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Massachusetts. Wallace states that the "remote causes" of his essay "Fundamentals of Rhetoric," presented at the National Developmental Project on Rhetoric, was "a dissatisfaction with narrow views of rhetoric," especially those that emphasize form and that neglect ethics.


through a classification of ethical and political values.25

Wallace opposes those modern views that omit ethics and emphasize immediate success. He resists the prevalent notion, supposedly derived from Aristotle, that rhetoric is primarily an amoral instrument for achieving persuasive success. He also finds unacceptable the view that morality is just a matter of the good character of the speaker apart from specific standards.26 In addition, Wallace disagrees with those who claim that persuasive effect is an essential part of rhetorical research.27

25Wallace, "Substance of Rhetoric," p. 239. For an explanation of the classical emphasis on a classification of values, see Chapter IV, under "Wallace's Rhetorical Invention" in this study.


Wallace takes issue with those scholars who desire to isolate the major elements traditionally considered essential to rhetorical study—speaker, message, and environment (audience, culture, and occasion). Hence, he objects to the focus on one or two variables, the environment or the message, to the neglect of other factors.\footnote{Sillars, "Persisting Problems," p. 73. For the rationale behind the separation of variables in the rhetorical situation, see Lawrence W. Rosenfield, "The Anatomy of Critical Discourse," \textit{Speech Monographs}, XXXV (March, 1968), pp. 50-69. For examples of the message-environment approach, see Ernest Wragge, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," \textit{Quarterly Journal of Speech}, XXXIII (December, 1947), pp. 451-457; W. Charles Redding, "Extrinsic and Intrinsic Criticism," \textit{Essays in Rhetorical Criticism}, ed. by Thomas R. Nilson (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 98-125. For an example of emphasis on social effects and consequences to the neglect of}
beginning or end and which is the primary assumption underlying the neglect of some variables in the situation, does not adequately characterize public discourse.30 The fundamental nature of rhetoric is not transitory, he says, but rather enduring and substantive. He also states that practical discourse is not primarily interested in dynamic, ongoing processes, but rather in concrete communicative products entailing discernible beginning and ending points.31

Finally, Wallace differs with contemporary writers who propose various systems of rhetoric that are useful according to time and circumstances.32 Thus, he disagrees with systems that are useful according to time and circumstances.32 Thus, he disagrees


32Ibid., pp. 13-14. For examples of pluralistic con-
with those who seek many definitions of popular discourse rather than a single theory in harmony with the persisting cultural and social ideals of a free society.

Basic Concepts of Wallace's Definition

In order to give continuity to disjointed current views, Wallace proposes that "our [The field of speech] ultimate concepts are those of the speech act and the rhetorical action." Calling "the speech act" "a unit of meaningful utterance," he adds that it "is the element of communication, beyond which we cannot go in reducing communication to its lowest terms." Hence, Wallace views the "speech act," as does J. L. Austin, as "the basic unit of linguistic communication" and as the "concrete production or issuance of an utterance." Unlike Austin, concepts of rhetoric, see Otis Walter, "On Views of Rhetoric, Whether Conservative or Progressive," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIX (December, 1963), pp. 367-382; Robert T. Oliver, "Culture and Communication: A Major Challenge in International Relations," Vital Speeches, XXIX (September 1, 1963), pp. 721-724; Douglas Ehninger, "On Rhetoric and Rhetorics," Western Speech Journal, XXXI (Fall, 1967), pp. 242-249; and Robert L. Scott, "On Not Defining 'Rhetoric,'" Philosophy and Rhetoric, VI (Spring, 1973), pp. 81-96.  

Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 3, 21, 97.

however, he applies Aristotle's four causes in order to explain the "speech act" and "the rhetorical action" as units of "mutually interdependent parts," including first, the rhetorical situation, second, "substance," and third, speaker.35

The Rhetorical Situation

The first feature of the speech act that Wallace considers is the rhetorical situation. He is not always clear about what he means by rhetorical situation. He views the occasion as encompassing those elements that "set up a potential" for utterance. Within his concept of situation, he includes those factors usually considered a part of a speech occasion: the immediate setting

Searle, Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language (Cambridge at the University Press, 1970), p. 16. Although Wallace refers to J. L. Austin several times in his writings, he does not explicitly mention any particular source from which he derives the term "speech act." See Wallace, Understanding Discourse, 17-18, 40ftn, 67, 67-68ftn, 71. For a comment on the differences between Wallace's and Austin's view of the speech act, see Stewart, "Speech Act Analysis," p. 197

35Wallace uses numerous terms to describe the four basic elements of the speech act—materials, forms, purposes, and agent—including, "causes," "conditions," "forces of change," "energies," "sources of energies," "parts," and "features." He prefers terms like "causes," which suggests the driving forces generating movement, and "conditions," which implies the necessary requirements before an act is possible. He probably does not care as much for terms such as "features" and "parts" because they suggest a static quality. See Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 12, 26, and "Speech Act," pp. 175-179.
of "time, place, audience, and subject" as well as "a broader, more remote rhetorical context that furnishes the historical background relevant to the subject matter of the speech." In addition, Wallace considers an unresolved problem entailing those facts and values that account for important differences and similarities between speaker and audience and that constitute the primary materials of the speaker's purpose to be an essential part of the rhetorical situation. Furthermore, when discussing occasion as the generator of utterance, he includes the speaker's goal as a part of the "stimulous situation." Wallace says that, "The occasion initiates a speech and gives it direction. The goal, together with its contextual circumstances, constitutes the stimulous situation to which the speaker responds."36

Wallace believes that the rhetorical situation determines utterance. Characterizing the "speech act" as "a response to a communicative situation," he asserts that "The locus of persuasion is ultimately in the occasion and in the state of the audience."37 Wallace argues that the occasion controls rhetorical behavior in two ways: first, reflecting his studies of Aristotle and Francis

37Ibid., pp. 37, 140.
Bacon, as well as modern ethicists such as Gideon Gottleib, Stephen Toulmin, Kurt Baier, and Charles L. Stevenson, he says the rhetorical situation necessarily sets up a fixed sequence of events. According to Wallace:

The material condition or experience of a speaker determines his capability for each utterance, and his capacity to say something must precede his saying of it. And obviously, neither statement is made without an appropriate context, or stimulus-situation, or occasion, from which the speaker's purpose derives . . . From this it can be seen that the parts, or better yet the conditions, of an act of speech must occur in a fixed sequence.

Consistent with his view of rhetoric as resolving social and political conflicts through communication, he says that the facts regarding the problem and also ethical

---


values are essential to the completion of an utterance. Wallace is not always clear as to what he means by the terms "ethical," "social," and "political." By "ethical," he suggests all practical decision-making in social and political life. By "social" and "political" he means "mutual cooperative living" under a form of government embodying common goals, ideals, and values. He says that ethical and political decisions are made, for example, in judgments regarding citizens, local and federal governments, businesses, educational institutions, and families, and their relationships together.

Wallace suggests that political values dominate utterance because "the social end of rhetoric is that of adjusting people to ideas and ideas to people." Hence, he believes that social values govern because popular discourse upholds the goals of a culture. In addition, like Lloyd Bitzer, he thinks that the customs and conventions of a society are the best means of successful adap-

\[\text{40} \text{Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 16-17.}\]


\[\text{42Wallace, Understanding Discourse, p. 105. The definition of rhetoric as "adjusting ideas to people and people to ideas" is taken from Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," p. 413.}\]

\[\text{43Bryant and Wallace, Fundamentals (1976), pp. 72-73.}\]
Using George William Curtis' speech "Puritan Principle: Liberty Under the Law," Wallace explains how a communicator utilizes facts and values in developing a final purpose that represents his adjustment. Curtis responded to a problematic situation regarding the Hayes-Tilden election that caused his immediate audience, the New England Society, to be divided over the respective presidential candidates. He sought a rhetorical means of allaying their hostility and of bringing them together on common ground. Curtis' purpose was "to persuade the hearers that they should support a Congressional commission that would arbitrate the disputed election." Curtis apparently examined the situation for information about the problem, including causes of the conflict and audience values. After this careful analysis, he probably utilized the "puritan principle," (i.e., liberty under the law is an ethical ideal that preserves our national fibre) because it was familiar and acceptable to most of his New England listeners. He focused on it and its relation to the audience's values through his remarks that it guided and strengthened the civil government of their forefathers, that it was and is a part of the federal consti-

tution, and that its application to the present conflict was morally sound as opposed to the selfish motive of not attempting to find a solution. Hence, Wallace concludes that Curtis found in the occasion materials through which he creatively shaped a purpose appropriate to the audience. Because Curtis' final goal included the listener's cultural ideals, suggests Wallace, it controlled the remaining sequence of steps in a communicative response; that is, it determined relevance and fitness in selecting materials, forms, strategies, language, and mode of delivery.

In seeing the social values of an audience as the fundamental determinant of the propriety of utterance, Wallace seems to imply what Lloyd Bitzer suggests in his journal article "The Rhetorical Situation." Bitzer says that an occasion like the assassination of President Kennedy, for example, requires certain types of responses. He points out that the American people expected a clarification of the incident, a eulogy of the president, and public reassurance concerning a new president. In addition, Bitzer, like Wallace, says that the circumstances dictate the "purpose, theme, matter, and style" of the speaker. He asserts that "the inauguration of a President of the United States," for example, "demands an address

---

which speaks to the nation's purposes, the central national and international problems, the unity of contesting parties; it demands speech style marked with dignity.  

The second way that Wallace believes situation determines communicative behavior is through supplying its "source of energy." Reflecting Aristotle, he argues that "contrariety," consisting of similarities and differences among values, purposes, and knowledge between speaker and audience, is the prime generator of utterance. He points out that significant disagreements between communicator and listeners create some motivation. He remarks: "There is tension between the speaker's desires and interests and the audience's desires and interests. From such a context is the chief source of energy giving rise to the materials, form, and substance of a speech." He explains that a need for communication is caused when speaker and audience perceive something they desire, but do not have, and are aware of the possibility of achieving it; for example, the resolution of the conflict and the accomplishment of their individual goals. In addition, he suggests that the intent of the speaker and audience to resolve their problem based on important likenesses also stimulates utterance. He concludes that political values, being im-

important to most people, and the speaker's sense of obligation to fulfill them, generates the strongest driving force for social cooperation through discourse.47

In summary, Wallace believes that the rhetorical situation is the essential element because it "set up a potential" for communication through its "material conditions" and "energies." Viewing the final purpose as a product of the facts and values embedded in the occasion plus the speaker's intent to use them in shaping a fitting solution, he argues that it is the ultimate cause and condition of utterance.

Substance

The second aspect of the speech act that Wallace considers is "substance." Like Aristotle and Francis Bacon, he believes rhetoric has a unique content.48 Arguing


against many who thought Aristotle conceived rhetoric as having no special subject matter, he says that this view is inconsistent with the emphasis on emotions and values in the first two books of the Rhetoric. Referring to the Rhetoric 1.2, which is usually interpreted as "rhetoric has no subject matter of its own," Wallace asserts that John Henry Freese's "translation of the key passage has removed some of the ambiguity: 'rhetoric is not limited to any special science' or matter."49

Wallace persistently declares that the "substance" of popular discourse is distinctive through the peculiar union of its materials, forms, and purposes.50 Viewing "substance" as fully intelligible only through communication, he thinks that it encompasses all experiences personally encountered by members of a culture in their "social and political roles."51 Reflecting Jean Piaget, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Whorf, Wallace believes that the speech of a culture structures permanent forms, such as ways of reasoning, grammatical structures, and vocal and gestural meanings; it also organizes the values, pur-


50 Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 86, 99.

poses, knowledge, feelings and emotions, abstract conceptions, and images that tend to be recurring aspects of social life.\(^{52}\) Wallace envisions utterance as dominated by its political aims, and he says that its ultimate matter consists of ethical ideals.\(^{53}\)

Wallace suggests that there is a hierarchy of materials, forms and purposes, which is determined by their (1) prevalence, permanence, and recurrence and (2) the extent to which they make utterance concrete, "real," and intelligible. He places the union of purpose and matter, that is, social ideals and values, at the deepest and most substantive level. Wallace implies that some of these values are more prevalent, enduring and recurring than others. At the second level of "substance" is the union of matter and the forms that contribute to the intelligibility of utterance. Included among these forms are types of reasoning,


\(^{53}\)Wallace, "Primacy of Substance," p. 3.
such as deductive and analogical, which are "so demanding as to influence belief and compel assent;" the "less strict and compelling" forms, including sentence structures, such as active or passive voice; kinds of public address, such as deliberative or forensic; and ways of ordering a speech, such as by time sequence or by comparison and contrast; and finally, says Wallace, the use of voice and body, especially those socially significant and recurring vocal and gestural movements that make utterance fully comprehensible to speaker and listener in a particular society. 54

Wallace agrees with Aristotle and Bacon that "Rhetoric is between logic on the one side and moral and civil knowledge on the other, as participating of both." 55 Hence, he says that its "substance" constitutes the application of reason to moral values in determining relevance and appropriateness to situation. Wallace asserts that "values and value judgments ... are in reality the ultimate substance of discourse." 56 Using the term "substance," as does Aristotle, to refer to the capacity for and the products of rhetorical behavior, Wallace recommends that


modern communication borrow the concept of "good reasons" from modern ethicists such as Kurt Baier, Stephen Toulmin, Paul Edwards, P. H. Nowell-Smith, and R. M. Hare to suggest the content and "processes of practical reason." In using the term "substance" to designate the ability to respond to a situation, he seems to concur with Bacon that communicative operations require the peculiar use of "reason and creative imagination," called by Bacon "imaginative reason." Apparently influenced by Bacon, Wallace believes that rhetorical behavior usually follows a fixed sequence of events. He says that a speaker reacts to an occasion by first searching for meanings common to all men through their "social and political roles," and second, by judging the relevance and appropriateness and the truth and validity of these shared experiences. In so doing, Wallace thinks the communicator makes them plausible.

57 Wallace, "Substance of Rhetoric," pp. 247-248. Cf. Wallace, Understanding Discourse, p. 36. See also Kurt Baier, The Moral Point of View; Stephen Toulmin, An Examination of the Place of Reason in Ethics (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1958); Paul Edwards, The Logic of Moral Discourse (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955); P. H. Nowell-Smith, Ethics (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1954); R. M. Hare, The Language of Morals (London: Oxford University Press, 1969). Wallace does not mention Baier, Toulmin, Edwards, Nowell-Smith, or Hare specifically as those from whom he derived his notion of "good reasons." These ethicists are, however, the most prominent of those mentioned in Wallace's writings, and they all advocate the use of "good reasons" in practical judgment.
Finally, he suggests that the speaker imaginatively selects and words these shared experiences so that they generate credibility, vividness, intelligibility, acceptability, and interest.58

Viewing it as unique through its application of popular opinions and "contrariety." Wallace presents an example of Bacon's "imaginative reason." Wallace says that the utterance "Your enemies will be glad of this" is a joint production of the speaker and audience concerning a course of action, i.e., "this," and its results, i.e., undesirable, in this case. Noting "contrariety" as inherent in it, he suggests that conflict is involved because the listener likely does not want to see his enemies happy about his "evil" condition and is motivated not to accept whatever may cause it. In addition, Wallace remarks on the use of social values, that is, the application of "commonplace ideas known to every educated Elizabethan," such as, "What is evil for one's friend is good for one's enemies." Furthermore, he comments that this utterance is concrete and indirect. Wallace says that it probably brings to the listener's memory a realistic image

of specific enemies who were "nodding and smiling" because of his unhappy future state.59

Wallace also discusses "substance" in terms of the peculiar products of rhetorical behavior. Defining "substance" or "good reasons" as "a number of statements consistent with each other, in support of an ought proposition or value-judgment,"60 he argues that the social ideals of the audience ultimately determine the worth of the speaker's "reasons." Wallace asserts that "The [Statements] are good reasons precisely because their materials and ideas reflect what all parties to a communication regard as valuable. We apply the word good to what we approve of. We derive our standards of approval from our system of values and from such facts and evidence as may be at hand." He presents the following example of "good reasons:"

"The Federal government ought to provide a minimum annual income for poor families.
   I. A minimum income would contribute to the security of the poor.
      A. The advisors of the President of the U.S. say that $6400 covers the basic expenses a family worries about.
   II. The proposal would do justice to the poor.
   III. The proposal would be good for the welfare of everybody."


In this illustration, Wallace points out that the fundamental form of these statements of "good reasons" is deductive reasoning and that the basic materials of "substance" are of several kinds, including facts and probabilities of the case; for example, "$6400 covers the basic expenses." It also contains implied social values, for example, doing justice to the poor is desirable, which he believes is an enduring ideal of a free society. Consistent with Bacon's view of "imaginative reasoning," Wallace's "good reasons" entail not only popular opinions but also "contrariety." Contrariety is revealed in the contrast between what is, for example, the poor not being sufficiently cared for, and the ideal of a democratic society, that is, social justice for all is desirable. Hence, the ideal of social justice for the poor provides a common ground for achieving the purpose of getting a minimum annual income for needy families. He also advises that the speaker make such basic statements even more fitting through concreteness and indirectness.\(^1\) However, according to Wallace, the ultimate "substance" encompasses the processes and products of rationally applying the ideals of a free society in order to judge the relevance and appropriateness of utterances.

In summary, Wallace explains the unique "substance" of popular discourse in terms of (1) the products of rhetorical behavior, which are composed of the facts and values of a situation and the forms that make them concrete, comprehensible, acceptable, and persuasive and (2) the speaker's capacity for audience adaptation, which is ultimately determined by a listener's personal and social values and which is developed through repeated practice.

The Speaker

The third aspect of the speech act that Wallace considers is the speaker, whom he regards as "the most important factor." He believes that ameliorating the "human condition in all its essential aspects" entails bettering communication and that the starting point is the individual communicator. He focuses on two main features of the speaker: his capacity and his morality. First, Wallace emphasizes the speaker's capacity to adapt to a rhetorical situation. He asserts that the speaker's personal confidence in his ability to communicate and his desire or obligation to attempt to communicate are dependent on two conditions: "(1) the materials for communication must be ready at hand in the experience of the individual; if not at hand, the individual must know where to find them, and (2) the individual must have formed a set of interlocking habits: habits of estimating the appro-
priateness of his information to meet the needs of the occasion; habits of organizing and managing his resources in language understood by others. "62 Hence, Wallace says that the speaker's successful response to an audience depends on his possessing or being able to discover relevant and appropriate facts and values.63 He suggests the need for the speaker to understand the fundamental causes and conditions, especially cultural ideals, of multivarious kinds of listeners if he is to fully develop his potential for audience adjustment.64

Wallace also stresses the speaker's moral obligations for the speaker's rhetorical choices. Although he views the situation as the driving force determining utterance, Wallace points out that the communicator makes the final decisions for his product: the speaker has a conscious understanding of the occasion and its requirements, especially the ethical standards of communication, and he deliberately designs his speech. Therefore, Wallace holds the communicator fully responsible for his speech act, though not necessarily for its effects and consequences.65

64Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. vi-vii, 41.
65Ibid., pp. 67, 76, 92-95.
Being primarily concerned with oral discourse, Wallace believes that "confrontation," as Charles Henry Woolbert calls it, differentiates the activities of the speaker and the writer. Wallace says that speech has this quality because of the definiteness of the occasion and audience and that the communicator creates his final product only before a "live" audience. In so doing, he makes final adjustments to them as he delivers his speech.

Aristotle's Four Causes and the Speech Act: A Summary

Wallace is not always clear about the relationship between Aristotle's four causes and Wallace's three basic features of the speech act--rhetorical situation, "substance," and speaker. In the first place, Wallace believes that communication has prerequisites that involve Aristotelian's Four Causes:


totle's four conditions—materials, forms, purpose, and agent—and that occur in a fixed chronological order: a choice-situation with inherent purposes and materials, which determine a speaker's response; a speaker who has the capacity to find or to recall and apply the materials and forms demanded by the occasion and audience in order to judge relevance and appropriateness while first, creating a purpose, and second, selecting and managing the remaining materials and forms, including delivery.

In the second place, Wallace thinks that there are "sources of energy" causing or generating the motion necessary to complete utterance. He refers to the rhetorical situation as the initiating force and as the source of the final purpose, and he says that it determines the psychological, temporal, and physical beginning and ending points of a speech act.68 He views the occasion as a "set of circumstances that ... account for both the beginning and the end of a rhetorical ac-

68 Wallace, "Speech Act," p. 174. Cf. Wallace, Understanding Discourse, p. 37. Wallace says that a speech act is a movement progressing over a period of time, and ending in bodily actions "into the final stages of the act;" hence it has temporal and physical terminal points. He also sees an utterance as having psychological terminal points in that at some point in time a speaker begins and ends a communicative response that he "considers complete enough to allow his action to stand by itself as his utterance." Wallace believes that situation determines the psychological, temporal, and physical terminal points for informative as well as persuasive speeches.
tion." Wallace sees situation and the speaker's purpose as inseparably related in generating utterance, and he discusses situation as a stimulus only through the addition of a communicator's goal, which is derived from and determined by the materials of the situation. Otherwise, the occasion, which is the "chief source of energy," remains only a potential cause. Wallace refers to situation and purpose together as the "final cause," the ultimate reason for and the end product of a speech. He also discusses situation and purpose as the beginning, or initiating force, or "efficient cause," which drives the speaker to organize and deliver an utterance. Hence, he discusses a "material cause," encompassing the speaker's personal and social values, motives, and purposes, which are the sources, he says, of "our greatest potential for utterance." In addition, Wallace considers the speaker as the "efficient cause," who unites "in himself the conditions and forces represented by the material, formal and final causes."

Finally, he sees that a communicator is compelled to use conventional ways of structuring ideas and that these structures represent the "formal causes." In brief, Wallace discusses Aristotle's notion of material, formal, final, and efficient causes in terms of situation, "substance," and speaker.69

Meaning: The Product of the Speech Act

Wallace argues that a speech act's meaning is "the direct result of, or function of, four factors—intention, materials, relevance, and appropriateness of materials to purpose or intent on the one hand and to order on the other."70 He believes that the language symbols of popular discourse refer to various kinds of meaning, or experiences shared by members of a society, including knowledge, emotions and attitudes, ethical values and purposes.71 Wallace concludes that a speech act's meaning is the product of three elements—the rhetorical situation, the speaker, and "substance"—and that it is the ultimate justification of utterance. He disagrees with those contemporary scholars who focus on the listener's response to the neglect of other variables: the speaker and the experiences he shares with his audience. In addition, he agrees with Wayland M. Parrish and J. L. Austin that persuasive effect is separate from meaning, and he opposes those who include it.72 Wallace admits communication is an instru-

70Ibid., p. 135.


ment used to generate effects, but he suggests that rhetoricians should not include historical and sociological studies, for example, into the effects of public discourse as a part of their research. Through limiting communicative investigations in the meaningful units of public utterances, he restricts them to the speech object itself within a rhetorical context.73

The Relationship Between the Speech Act and Rhetorical Action

Wallace is not always clear about the relationship between the speech act and rhetorical action. Referring to the speech act and rhetorical action as essentially the same, he explains their connections in two ways. First, he clarifies their kinship through the notions of "act" and "action." Using the term "action" to designate larger units and "act" to denote smaller units, he says that rhetorical action refers to longer utterances, such as a completed speech, and that speech acts refer to shorter utterances, such as a sentence, or any meaningful statement completed through delivery. Hence, he refers to the rhetorical action as a sequence of speech acts.74

Wallace also explains the "speech act" and "the rhe-


74Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 69, 72, 74, 112ftn.
torical action" through their intent. He associates the
term "intent" with a speech act and the term "purpose"
with a rhetorical action. Wallace declares that "the
notion of intent seems to be a good fit for that which
generates a single utterance and the notion of purpose
would seem to be appropriate for that which governs a
sequence of utterances or an action."75 He says that
"purpose" entails the speaker's estimation of success
and his deliberate use of his methods to achieve a goal
appropriate to an audience. He suggests that "intent"
pertains mainly to impromptu situations wherein the com-
municator has little time to adapt to his listener, but
rather has to focus immediately on "making sense." There-
fore, Wallace refers to rhetorical action as extemporan-
eous utterances carefully adapted to an audience, and to
the speech act as informal, everyday conversations that
do not involve complex adjustments.76 In brief, Wallace

75 Karl R. Wallace, "Speech Act and Unit of Communica-
Wallace makes concerning the difference between "intent"
and "purpose" is located in Wallace's original, uncut ver-
sion of "Speech Act and Unit of Communication" in "Wallace Mss."

76 Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 72, 75-76,
132, 140. See also Karl R. Wallace, "A Modern View of
Delivery," Essays in Honor of Claude M. Wise, ed. by
Arthur Bronstein, et al. (Hannibal, Missouri: The Stan-
defines the speech act as "a response to a communicative situation" and the rhetorical action as "a response to a rhetorical occasion." In so doing, he envisions speech acts as smaller units of rhetorical actions, or single, isolated utterances, or informal dialogues. He explains rhetorical actions as a single, sustained speech, or a chain of separate statements in more extended conversations that emphasize planned adaptation.

The Relationship Between Rhetoric, Ethics, and Politics

In order to understand Wallace's view of the relationship between rhetoric, ethics, and politics, it is necessary to see his theory in the light of his classical background. Wallace, of course, drew heavily upon his life long study of the writings of Aristotle. Therefore, as a preface to discussing Wallace's ideas, a brief review of Aristotle's concept of rhetoric and its public responsibilities is in order.

Aristotle's View of Rhetoric, Ethics, and Politics

In his book *Aristotle: The Growth and Structure of His Thought*, G. E. R. Lloyd says that Aristotle sees the aim of the "state" as ensuring "the good of the community as a whole." Aristotle believes that the defining trait of any political association of men is its moral purpose.
He envisions the ideal "state" "under a single constitution and law" that provides for its unity. Conceiving ethical character as determining the happiness of the individual and of his political organization, Aristotle asserts that the "state's" most important "safeguard of its constitution" is "the virtue of its citizens." Thus, he declares that one of the "state's" chief obligations is aiding its citizens to be ethically responsible. However, he thinks that the individual is ultimately accountable for his own actions.77

Aristotle says that politics is the discipline that studies and determines the nature of the "good community." Because virtue is so essential to this fundamental aim, he thinks, ethics is central to political studies. In addition, he believes that rhetoric is crucial to politics because its prime function is to promote social cohesion. Hence, Aristotle views politics as the master art that determines the ends of other arts and sciences. In particular, he discerns that rhetoric, ethics, and politics are inseparably related.78 Wallace drew heavily upon this view.


Wallace knew that in the *Rhetoric* Aristotle establishes the connections between the controlling art of politics and its handmaiden, rhetoric, and that he attempts to provide a means for the ordinary citizen-speaker of Athens to apply ethical values in practical discourse. In his article, "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," Everett Lee Hunt points out that Aristotle is concerned about popular participation in the political society of his day and that Aristotle believes that "in political matters the judgment of the people may be superior to those who have special knowledge." According to Hunt, Aristotle says that "final power would rest with the multitude . . . making rhetoric a universal political instrument." Hunt says that Aristotle provides the communicator with "goods" or popular opinions and that "both the trained thinker and the multitude would benefit by making a common stock of their wisdom for the guidance of the state."79 Hence, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* presents the ordinary citizen with the rhetorical means for political partic-
ipation based on their values as well as those of political experts. In his translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, W. Rhys Roberts confirms Hunt's view that Aristotle's social values took a "middle position between a philosophical ethics and popular valuations."\(^{80}\) Influenced by those views advanced by his great mentor, Aristotle, Wallace modifies them to meet the requirements of a modern democratic society.

**Wallace and The Relationship Between Rhetoric, Ethics, and Politics**

Wallace concurs with Aristotle that "rhetoric is instrumental to political and social life." Wallace asserts: "It serves the national community and must therefore respect the values of the nation."\(^{81}\) Hence, he emphasizes that rhetoric, ethics, and politics are inextricably related through their common concern with social values.\(^{82}\)

Like Aristotle, Wallace applies moral values that are generally agreed to by political specialists but that reflect popular opinions. Unlike Aristotle, however, he ex-


explains the social function of practical discourse in a free society today. Based on the assessment of modern political theorists such as Harold Lasswell, M. D. McDougal, and A. T. Mason, Wallace concludes that the ultimate ideal of a democratic society is summed up as "the dignity and worth of the individual." Borrowing from Lasswell and McDougal, he believes that the realization of individual human worth requires mutually shared power, respect, and knowledge that establishes a "commonwealth of mutual deference." 83

Wallace says that shared respect necessitates that all persons be given equal opportunity for self-fulfillment and that only social laws and rules restrict freedom to achieve this ideal. 84 He points out that mutual possession of power demands responsible participation in policy-making at all levels of government. He explains that joint ownership of knowledge requires not only educating the public about democratic processes, but also making available to citizens-at-large the information relevant to political


decision-making. Only if "communication is widespread and free," insists Wallace, "will knowledge . . . prevail over ignorance, and truth over falsehood."

Wallace argues that the latter two assumptions regarding the availability of information and the prevalence of general communication are crucial to the social responsibilities of rhetoric in a democratic society. First, guided by nineteenth-century political historian George Sabine, he says that the processes of a free society require "a constant and effective interchange of both information and opinion." Thus, he concludes that the citizens of a democracy need rhetoric in their continual adjustment of interests. He also comments that mutual agreement between members of a culture necessitates "good faith and good will--attitudes which are inseparable from notions of political liberty and equality." Hence, he concludes that cooperative action in a free society requires an art of popular discourse that emphasizes the


the moral and social welfare of others. 89

In the second place, reflecting the views of nineteenth-century political theorists Walter Bagehot and E. L. Godkin, Wallace believes that freedom of discussion, restrained "only by rules which they citizens themselves recognize and abide by," is the best test of truth in a democratic society. 90 He believes that political judgments in a free society should be based on "quality of information and opinion available and desired," and he persistently argues against relying on the specialized information or on the authority of a few persons. 91 He says that "truth" is a product of the continuous discussion of public-minded citizens who contribute from their collective experiences concerning a particular problem. 92 Hence, he declares that rhetoric promotes free speech and improvement


in popular judgment and opinion.

Wallace also argues that the ideals and processes of a free society are essential to practical discourse and that the "health and virility of public address depend upon a way of life which supports and encourages free and vigorous discussion." He states: "When that mode of life is missing, rhetoric in theory and practice becomes feeble, delicate, and ornate; infatuated with its own image, it loves stylistics and the fine art of delivery." 93

In summary, Wallace agrees with Aristotle that rhetoric, ethics, and politics are inextricably related in any instance of communication through their mutual concern for the social welfare. Unlike Aristotle, he describes those political ideals that are essential to the well-being of a modern democratic society as well as to the art of popular discourse. In essence, then, Wallace believes that rhetoric, ethics, and politics are the only disciplines that study moral and political decision making and judgment based on the values of a free society.

Wallace’s Contribution to a Contemporary Concept of Rhetoric

Wallace made a distinctive contribution to a modern concept of rhetoric. He probably more fully explains the

causes and conditions of the unity and uniqueness of the field of practical discourse than any other modern writer. He seems to be one of the few contemporary rhetoricians who establishes the distinguishing character of rhetoric through the peculiar interaction of situation, speaker, and "substance." In addition, he appears to be one of the few modern theorists to define the autonomous subject matter of rhetoric through the particular fusion of its materials, purposes, and forms. Consequently, he goes further in clarifying the philosophical foundations of a single theory unified with ethics and politics. In order to illuminate his contribution in defining the unity and uniqueness of the field of popular discourse and its content, it is necessary to compare Wallace's view with those of other significant scholars (1) who establish the distinctiveness of rhetoric through situation or who discuss it as a unified act and (2) who endeavor to unify it with ethics and politics.

Determining the Uniqueness of Rhetoric

Like Wallace, some modern writers view communication as a unified act. Charles Henry Woolbert discusses speech as an act produced by the interaction of meaning, language, voice, and body. However, this concept only involves

materials or meanings, form or language, and the relationships between materials, forms, and the voice and body of the speaker. Thus, he neglects the occasion. In contrast, Wallace believes situation is the essential element of practical discourse.

Some contemporary theorists conceive speech as a unified act and also believe, as does Wallace, that situation is important. Like Wallace, Kenneth Burke sees rhetoric in a context involving exigences that generate and control utterance. In addition, Burke applies Aristotle's four causes in order to explain it. Furthermore, he defines a linguistic act as a linguistic response to a situation. Yet, in contrast to Wallace, Burke's concept includes all potentially persuasive symbols, such as poetry,

---


96Fogarty, Roots, pp. 62-63. For a concise summary of Burke's application of Aristotle's four causes in terms of his "dramatic pentad," see Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism, pp. 89-91.

97Holland, Counterpoint, p. 101.
magic, guns. He seems more concerned with constructing a general theory of symbolic action and with finding a linguistic means of solving social problems than in locating the uniqueness of rhetoric. Hence, he does not define popular discourse in terms of a particular kind of occasion. On the other hand, Wallace explains rhetoric's autonomy by its situation.

Like Wallace, J. L. Austin attempts to examine "the total situation in which the utterance is issued--the total speech act." He says that utterance is controlled by an occasion encompassing audience, purpose, and circumstances. Austin does not clarify the uniqueness of a speech act as a particular kind of situation that entails the values of a free society. Unlike Austin, Wallace explains autonomy through situation, speaker, and "substance,"

George Herbert Mead's view that communication is an

98Nichols, *Rhetoric and Criticism*, pp. 39, 84. Holland attempts to clarify Burke's scope of rhetoric. She suggests that Burke does not consider communication as synonymous with "every object of nature." She suggests that he includes objects such as guns because they are potentially persuasive to human beings. She concludes that Burke does not consider everything within the field of popular discourse. Yet, she states that he sees persuasive potential within these things. This dissertation concludes that Burke's association of rhetoric with such objects is inconsistent with the view that situation determines utterance.

99Holland, *Counterpoint*, p. 119ftn.

act with terminal points and unity corresponds with Wall-
lace's.\textsuperscript{101} He talks about a speech purpose that reflects
the factors of a problematic situation and that determines
utterance. However, unlike Wallace, Mead is probably more
interested in the communicative process required for the
development of the "social self" of the individual than he
is in the causes of uniqueness.\textsuperscript{102} Hence, he never ex-
plains the relationship between situation, speaker, and
"substance" peculiar to rhetoric. In contrast, Wallace em-
phasizes the peculiarity of popular discourse through these
elements.

Like Wallace, some modern rhetoricians believe that
practical communication is defined by a particular kind of
situation. Many of the early Cornellians, Hoyt Hudson and
Herbert A. Wichelns, for example, declare that rhetoric is
differentiated from other fields because it entails an oc-
casion.\textsuperscript{103} However, Wallace explains more completely than

\begin{footnotes}
\item J. Edward Hulett, Jr., "A Symbolic Interactionist
Model of Human Communication, Part One: The General Model
Communication Review}, XIV (Spring, 1966), pp. 6-12.
\item Paul Pfetze, \textit{The Social Self} (New York: Bookman
\item Hoyt Hudson, "Rhetoric and Poetry," \textit{Studies in
Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans},
ed. by A. M. Drummond (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,
1925), p. 370; Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Or-
\end{footnotes}
they why situation determines uniqueness.

In their book *Speech Criticism* (1970), Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, like many others, including Wallace, suggest that popular discourse necessarily involves an interaction among speaker, audience, subject, and occasion. Yet, unlike this source, Wallace attempts to explain how the peculiar fusion of all these elements determines the uniqueness of rhetoric.

In his article "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," Donald C. Bryant concurs with Wallace that rhetoric entails a situation. Nonetheless, he differs from Wallace by including poetry within his concept. Unlike Bryant, Wallace defines popular discourse by a specific kind of occasion.

Wallace is probably most similar to Lloyd Bitzer in his view of situation. In his article "The Rhetorical Situation," Bitzer, perhaps influenced by Wallace, conceives of a communicative situation as necessarily entailing a problem requiring discourse to solve it, an audience capable of serving as mediators to resolve the conflict, and "constraints," such as the values of the speaker and the audience and the facts of the situation, which determine the

---

104Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, *Speech Criticism*, pp. 6-10.

decisions and actions of communicators and listeners. Both Wallace and Bitzer emphasize real situations rather than fictive, as are found in some literature. In brief, they are close in their view of rhetoric as a "response to a rhetorical situation."^106

Unlike Bitzer, Wallace focuses on the specific inter-relationships among all the factors of the occasion. In other words, he presents a more detailed explanation of the unity of speaker, "substance," and situation. For example, Wallace places more emphasis on the communicator as essential to the occasion. He presents a more complete interpretation of the necessary connections between the materials and purposes of the situation and the speaker who embodies them. In summary, Wallace presents a more thorough and unified concept of situation as the essential condition of utterance.

Defining the Autonomy of Subject Matter

Like Wallace, some contemporary writers desire to unify rhetoric and politics and to emphasize subject matter. Among the early Cornellians, Everett Lee Hunt is similar to Wallace in his belief that popular discourse is inseparably related to politics and that its peculiar content consists of ethical and political values.107 Yet, Hunt never ac-

107"A Symposium on Rhetoric and General Education,"
cepts democratic ideals as its unique subject matter. Unlike Hunt, Wallace defines the autonomy of rhetoric's "substance" by merging practical discourse with the purposes and values of a free society.

Like Wallace, Thonssen, Baird, and Braden proclaim "intellectual substance . . . the core of communication" and advocate a marriage of rhetoric, ethics, and politics to "give effectiveness to truth." Yet, in contrast to Wallace, they assert that "it is not necessary to regard politics as a branch of rhetoric." Hence, unlike them, Wallace unites rhetoric and politics, producing the distinctive content of popular discourse—democratic ideals.

Richard M. Weaver, like Wallace, attempts to merge rhetoric, ethics and politics. In addition, he affirms that moral and political ideals are the subject matter of popular discourse. However, unlike Wallace, Weaver is a devoted Platonist and does not accept the values of a democratic society. Apparently having as his main interest the amelioration of culture and man, he focuses on content and disregards the unity of the whole act. He also does not clarify the relationships between rhetoric, ethics, and


108Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, pp. 388, 555, 558.
politics, nor does he specify the autonomous content of popular discourse. Unlike Weaver, Wallace explains the distinctiveness of "substance" by merging rhetoric with the values of a free society, and he maintains a unified approach by considering techniques and strategies while focusing on content.

Among modern writers concerned with the union of rhetoric and politics, Ralph T. Eubanks and Virgil Baker are probably most similar to Wallace. In their article "Toward an Axiology of Rhetoric," Eubanks and Baker contend that "rhetoric must become boldly axiological, seeking and committing itself to a sound system of civilizing values." Hence, like Wallace, they accept democratic ideals as the peculiar subject matter of popular discourse. Unlike Wallace, however, they do not explain the relationships between speaker and his materials, forms, and purposes in a situation. Influenced by Richard M. Weaver, they stress content more than the dynamic interactions among all these elements and neglect the unity of rhetorical action.


111Virgil L. Baker and Ralph T. Eubanks, Speech in
In contrast, Wallace explains the uniqueness of rhetoric's subject matter through the interrelationships of its forms, materials, and purposes while retaining harmony among all these essential parts.

Summary

Wallace contributed to a modern concept of rhetoric by explaining its unity and uniqueness through the speech act and the rhetorical action. He discusses rhetoric's autonomy through the interaction of three basic elements, the rhetorical situation, the speaker, and "substance," and he explicates why it is neither coherent nor complete without them. In addition, Wallace clarifies its peculiar subject matter by showing the connections between its fundamental forms, materials, and purposes. Furthermore, he merges popular discourse and the ideals of a free society while retaining a proper balance among all its parts.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLICATIONS OF WALLACE'S CONCEPT OF RHETORIC FOR A MODERN VIEW OF INVENTION AND DELIVERY

Wallace asserts that "It seems self-evident that an autonomous art . . . ought to study not only its own materials but the ways they are used." Based on his concept of the speech act, he believes that, in contrast with science and mathematics, which only treat form, rhetoric focuses on rationally determining the relevance and appropriateness of the peculiar materials, intentions, and structures of utterances. Thus, Wallace recommends that modern communication theorists consider the ideas of modern philosophers such as Stephen Toulmin, Gideon Gottlieb and Chaim Perleman in developing rules for an "autonomous logic for rhetorical discourse" that direct the speaker in producing and delivering content.  

Reflecting Francis Bacon, Wallace believes that the operations for producing content occur in a relatively fixed order and involve four of the five classical canons, including (1) inventing or finding appropriate materials, (2) disposing them, (3) recalling them, and (4) selecting fitting language. He argues that by means of these four
procedures the speaker creates a subject matter that is inherently interesting, moral, and persuasive. Therefore, he agrees with Charles L. Stevenson that communicating value judgments appropriate to a listener is essentially persuasive act. Wallace also appears to follow Bacon's suggestion that the speaker's main goal is "to make pictures of virtue and goodness, so that they may be seen." In addition, he believes, as did Bacon, that style is an integral part of making content and not just a dress for it.

Wallace asserts that "A modern view of delivery would regard vocal and gestural events and words uttered in combination, he believes the second canon, disposition, is concerned with selecting, ordering, and testing materials as well as with organizing the parts of speech. Hence, in Wallace's view, these four operations involve all of the classical canons except delivery.


4Stevenson, Ethics and Language, pp. 14, 27, 31, 139, 263. Although Wallace was familiar with Ethics and Language, he does not explicitly mention Stevenson as the source of his view that communicating value judgments is one means of persuasion.

5Wallace, "Francis Bacon on Understanding," p. 91.

municative settings as integral parts of a single act."
Thus, unlike Bacon, Wallace says that the fifth classical
canon, delivery, is a necessary aspect of a speech act
that is a "single event." Suggesting an inseparable re-
lationship between delivery and the meaning originating in
the situation and internalized by the speaker prior to
utterance, he says that delivery terminates rhetorical
action, making it concrete for an audience.7 Wallace also
declares that "'style' must always signify, among its many
meanings, the objective, the sensory aspect of an act ...
whose origin is inside the speaker. It is so integral a
feature of the act that it has the function of form, in
that it enables an act once begun to be actualized." Hence,
he believes that style involves more than wording. Based
on his unified view of utterance, he explains that style
represents the final form of a speech act entailing the
peculiar interaction of situation, "substance," and the
speaker and his delivery. Wallace concludes that all utter-
ances are unique.8

Wallace declares that "inventing is at the heart of

7Wallace, "A Modern View of Delivery," Essays in
(Hannibal, Missouri: The Standard Printing Co., 1970),

8Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 65, 119-120.
Cf. Bryant and Wallace, Fundamentals (1976), pp. 312-313,
349.
all communicative behavior."9 Because he emphasizes the
importance of rhetorical invention to rhetorical behavior,
this chapter first examines his system of topics with its
implications for attention and interest and for ethics.
Second, it discusses Wallace's perception of the relation­
ship between producing content and delivering it. Third,
it studies his theoretical changes, and fourth, it assesses
his contribution.

Wallace's Rhetorical Invention

Influenced by Aristotle, Wallace developed a system
of invention consisting of two parts: (1) an index of the
major elements of the rhetorical situation, and (2) a
classification of values. Concurring with Bacon, Wallace
constructed these topical schemes as aids to the speaker
for stirring his memory and imagination while he searched
for and selected meanings appropriate to his listeners.10
Consistent with his view of the occasion as controlling all
aspects of utterance, Wallace presents the following index
of its three essential aspects—the subject, the audience,
and the speaker:

9Karl R. Wallace, "Topoi and the Problem of Inven­
tion," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVIII (December,

10Ibid., p. 391, 395. Cf. Wallace, "Francis Bacon
on Understanding," p. 90.
Topoi of the Subject: Sources of information
Facts, as found in things and persons
Classification: naming and identifying facts and experience
What is, and what is not, as revealed by modes of definition
Like and unlike
The Unique
Causation: the facts involved in process and change
The end or product as cause
Means to end
Materials
Method of combining materials
Disagreement encountered, as revealed by Cicero's survey for issues
Dewey's survey of the problem presented
Special state of the audience situation as cause of a speaker's position

Topoi of the Audience:
General condition
Values
In general
The desirable
The obligatory
The commendable
In the chief rhetorical genre
Deliberative
Judicial
Epidictic
Value hierarchies
Group and institutional
Age
Individual
Economic
Educational
Affective states: emotions, motives, feelings
Political preferences
Ideals as determined by kinds of states
Ideals professed by political parties
The probable and possible, as revealed in Probabilities: assumptions and presumptions
Habitual patterns of thought
Deduction
Generalization and example
Analogy
Correlation and causation
Topoi of the Speaker:
Character traits held desirable by audiences:
s__ethos__

Signs of personality esteemed by audiences:
the sensory

Wallace believes that, of those elements in his rhetorical topoi, the audience's personal and social values dominate utterance. Thus, he developed a more detailed classification of values as follows:

I. The Desirable:

A. Satisfaction of physical well-being
   1. Maintenance of food supply and drink
   2. Maintenance of health
B. Satisfaction of pleasurable tensions and feelings
   1. Sexual activity
   2. Venturesome activity, involving risk and suspense
   3. Novel activity, involving interplay of the old and new
   4. Playful activity: humor and laughter
C. Action in one's own interests
   1. Wages and salary
   2. Property
D. Action in the interests of others: good will
E. Achievement
   1. Personal
      a. Realization of one's capabilities
      b. Production and creation of something
      c. Possession and discovery of knowledge
      d. Power: being in a position to exercise control
      e. Physical attractiveness in dress, speech, and action
   2. Social
      a. Status: occupying a position respected by others
      b. Esteem: personal achievement respected by others
      c. Belongingness: being liked, loved, and accepted by others

---

F. Freedom: a condition permitting satisfaction of desires under minimal constraints
G. The useful: the means of achieving one's desires and ends.

II. The Obligatory:

A. Duties: behaviors specified or expected because of one's membership or position in a recognized group
   1. Family
      a. Obligations of parents
      b. Obligations of children
   2. State: national and local
      a. The lawmaker's concerns
         (1) Conditions and rights securable through law for the realization of individual needs: opportunities
         (2) The general welfare of citizens
         (3) Justice in the application of law
      b. The citizen's concerns
         (1) Respect for his own rights
         (2) Respect for law and the rights of others
   3. Economic: duties required by a business, company, and corporation
   4. Religious: conduct specified and sanctioned by church or creed
   5. Educational: the ideals and practices of schools, colleges, and universities
   6. Professional: the principles, methods, rules, and conventions specified by persons who are committed to an art or science
   7. Special clubs, fraternities, and so on

B. Truth telling
C. Promise keeping
D. Mores: the rules, practices, conventions observed by a culture, typically recognized in customs of speech and dress, in folk sayings and maxims, and in manners generally.

III. The Commandable:

A. Conscientiousness: behavior in keeping with one's self-image and obligations
B. Kindliness
C. Fairness
D. Courage
E. Magnanimity
F. Honesty
G. Prudence
H. Tolerance
I. Persistence
J. Sincerity

Wallace explains the nature of each of these classes of values. First, he characterizes the "desirable" as representing the personal "goals, ends, and motives of thought and conduct." He says that the "morally obligatory" encompasses the "rules and norms . . . practices and conventions . . . and . . . ideals" authorized and enforced by a free society. He notes that the "desirable" focuses on the purposes and motivations of the "private self" while the "obligatory" stresses the intentions of the "public self." Finally, he explains that the "commendable" reflects "very general character traits of desirable conduct that have become stable and predictable." Hence, he refers to the "commendable" as socially acceptable and consistent behavior applicable to a specific person.

Wallace believes that political and ethical ideals, represented by the "obligatory" and the "commendable" classes, dominate the personal motives contained in the "desirable" category. Consistent with this belief, he

---


agrees with Chaim Perelman that "social justice" is perhaps the "master value" of public life.\textsuperscript{15} Wallace thinks that "social justice" is the key to achieving democratic purposes that respect "freedom of choice and action" and that emphasize "the dignity and worth of the individual." Therefore, he suggests that it is essential for the speaker to consider questions concerning legal conventions and rules and their fair and equitable applications when constructing his classification of values.\textsuperscript{16}

Wallace gives some guidelines for teaching and applying his rhetorical topoi. In his classroom instruction, he expanded upon each of the three kinds of topics—topoi of the subject, of the audience, and of the speaker. He would, for example, name and illustrate methods of defining terms under topoi of the subject, or he would list and explain the various "commendable" values under topoi of the audience. In guiding the student's use of Wallace's topics, Wallace would probably have recommended that the speaker, while preparing a speech, focus first on ana-


\textsuperscript{16}Bryant and Wallace, \textit{Fundamentals} (1976), pp. 52, 55-56.
lyzing the situation through the topoi of the subject before applying the other two topoi. 17

Wallace also explains how to apply his classification of values. He recommends that the student make an index of the three categories—the "desirable," the "commendable," and the "obligatory"—and choose those values most relevant and appropriate to the communicative situation. Next, the communicator develops statements in which the values are implicitly or explicitly used. Wallace presents an example from former President John F. Kennedy's "Inaugural Address" in which Kennedy states: "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed." Wallace believes that Kennedy's statement implies the following value: "it is the government's duty to protect the country," which fits under Wallace's class of "the obligatory." Wallace suggests that his classification scheme would help a speaker to systematically, yet creatively, locate a value such as "it is the government's duty to protect the country," and to generate a fully developed statement appropriate to the situation, as did Kennedy. 18

Wallace derives his topical scheme from both

17 Wallace, "Topoi," p. 394ftn. Wallace does not fully explain his three topoi.

classical and modern sources. Reflecting Aristotle, he hopes to provide a creative approach for helping the speaker adapt to an occasion by indexing values such as praise and honor and then leaving the specific application to the communicator’s imagination.\textsuperscript{19} In this way, he differs from Bacon, who lists maxims in fully developed statements; for example, “What men praise and honor is good; what they dispraise and condemn is evil.”\textsuperscript{20} Hence, unlike Bacon, Wallace permits the speaker to find and determine the relevance of materials and to word the final statement himself.

Wallace’s classification of values originates from two modern sources. First, Wallace borrows his idea for the three major categories—the “desirable,” the “obligatory,” and the “commendable”—from modern ethicist Richard Brandt.\textsuperscript{21} Second, he applies Abraham Maslow’s concept of a hierarchy of individual needs to the list of “desirable” values.\textsuperscript{22}


\textsuperscript{22}Bryant and Wallace, \textit{Fundamentals} (1976), p. 52. See
In summary, Wallace believes that the speaker's first step in adjusting to an audience is to examine the facts of the problem and to locate materials familiar to and accepted by both himself and his listeners. In order to help the speaker achieve this task, Wallace provides two indexes, one containing the major elements of the situation and the other consisting of the fundamental meanings needed to resolve social conflict through communication. Through his topics he hopes, like Bacon, to help the speaker classify materials "likely to be useful in recurring communications," the permanent and enduring ideals of a free society.23

Attention and Interest

Wallace believes his classification of values provides the fundamental sources of attention and interest. He asserts: "values . . . constitute the chief sources of interest,"24 and "the persuasive speech is likely to achieve its goal when speaker and audience can be shown to share beliefs and attitudes, motives and interests, emotions and feelings that are relevant to the business at


hand." Thus, Wallace concurs with A. E. Phillips, James A. Winans, and Kenneth Burke that locating significant meanings common to speaker and audience is the "single controlling principle" of persuasion.25

Like A. E. Phillips, Wallace presents a practical, two-step approach: (1) develop an index of shared experiences representing a "survey of the possible materials relevant to the rhetorical situation" and, based on the preceding index, (2) create a second list comprising those values most important to both speaker and listener.26 Agreeing with Kenneth Burke, who believes social cooperation takes precedence over the communicator's goal, he suggests that from this second list the speaker derives


26 Phillips, Effective Speaking, pp. 33, 35. Wallace was familiar with Phillips' Effective Speaking, but he does not directly state whether his practical, two-step approach is derived from Phillips.
his primary means of attention and interest and of resolving social conflict.²⁷

Perhaps an illustration will clarify Wallace's concept of achieving interest through shared experiences. George William Curtis' "The Puritan Principle: Liberty Under the Law" represents an interesting and persuasive speech that contains shared experiences relevant to the occasion. The situation, which involved a political conflict over the Hayes-Tilden controversy, demanded that Curtis fulfill his public responsibility through seeking social cooperation. Envisioning unity as the prime goal, Curtis utilized those values that were important and common to most of those concerned, such as the survival of America so she could fulfill her mission to bring freedom and equality to the world or the traditional custom of Americans to obey the laws of the American constitution.

Wallace points out that these common experiences are persuasive because they represent the important desires and motivations that generate the problem and the need for a resolution through communication in the first place. Probably borrowing from James A. Winans, he recommends that the communicator focus on making plain the relationship be-

tween the audiences' significant purposes and the solution he advocates. Wallace says that the listener's acceptability and action depend on his perception of the solution's meaningfulness to himself.

Ethics

Wallace states that his system of invention furnishes not only sources of interest, but also the moral standards for justifying and evaluating materials, methods, and purposes of utterances. Influenced primarily by Aristotle, he believes that an ethics of communication emphasizes the integrity of the speaker and the worth of his product as judged by the highest moral standards of speech. He sees that there may be conditions legitimately preventing achievement, and he concludes that the communicator's purpose is a "guide for finding and selecting materials, and for organizing his efforts, rather than . . . a goal to be reached at all costs." Wallace asserts unequivocally that

28 Bryant and Wallace, Fundamentals (1976), p. 227. See Winans, Public Speaking (1923), pp. 277-278. Winans' influence on Wallace's advice for the speaker to attend to the relationship between the audience's values and the speaker's solution is highly probable. Wallace does not explicitly state the exact source of this idea.

29 Wallace, Understanding Discourse, p. 114.


31 Roberts, Rhetoric, 1355b, 9-14.
"Evil means, even for a good end, produce evil results." Believing that the field of speech should have its own moral standards, he discusses ethics in terms of first, the rhetorical situation and second, the speaker and his "substance."

The Rhetorical Situation

The first aspect of ethics Wallace discusses is the rhetorical situation. Influenced by Aristotle, as well as by modern ethicists such as B. J. Diggs, Richard Brandt, P. H. Nowell-Smith, and Kurt Baier, he recognizes that utterances often occur in choice-situations in which a speaker counsels listeners concerning their alternatives. Wallace declares: "I am not now advising that speechmaking and practical writing on the one hand and advising on the other be regarded as equivalent territories." He says, however, that "rhetoric ought to regard public and popular discourse as an activity in which advice and advising

---

32Bryant and Wallace, Fundamental (1976), pp. 74-75, 82.


strike the dominant tone" and "we should regard the speaker's primary role as that of advisor." Hence, Wallace recommends that rhetoric be viewed generally as an art of advising. He believes the preceding concept of popular communication covers all practical discourse except those occasions when choice is restricted, such as in "commands and directives" like "Close the door." Advising also excludes informative discourse, such as some scientific reports that have no concern for guiding decisions of listeners.35

Reflecting the ethicists mentioned in the previous paragraph, Wallace states that the act of advising stresses ethics. It stresses ethics, he says, because advising entails choosing, which is essentially a rational act, requiring good "reasons perceived as relevant and applicable to the situation," and because "true morality" depends upon the use of reason. Borrowing again from these ethicists, he explains that the advisor has two important responsibilities. First, either during or after a speech, the speaker is obligated to justify rationally all his choices. Second, seeing situation as ultimately determining relevance and appropriateness, Wallace recom-

mends that the communicator consider the "standards and expectations" of audiences. Some occasions require exhortation, he says, while others necessitate deliberation.36

The Speaker and His "Substance"

The second aspect of ethics Wallace considers is the speaker and his "substance." He declares that "What a good reason is is to some extent fixed by human nature and to a very large extent by generally accepted principles which make social life, as we understand it, possible." Hence, like contemporary ethicists such as Paul Edwards, Kurt Baier, and Richard Brandt, Wallace believes that there are objective standards for making rational value-judgments.37 In addition, he agrees with "Most of the great ethical writers," for example, Aristotle, who recommends "a social goal as determinant of morality."38 However, unlike most classical or modern philosophers, Wallace applies these principles to the cultural ideals of a mod-


ern, free society. Hence, he asserts that the "substance" of rhetoric, democratic ideals, controls appropriateness and relevance of communicative choices. Like William Norwood Brigance, among others, Wallace says that the speaker is obligated to know the ethical standards of utterance. Therefore, like Brigance and others, he develops moral criteria for the communicator based on the values of a free society. Wallace presents four "moralities" based on the concepts of "the dignity and worth of the individual" and mutually shared power, respect, and knowledge: (1) "toleration of dissent and disagreement," (2) "knowledge," (3) "fairness," and (4) "the willingness to submit private motivations to public scrutiny."

The first criterion Wallace explains is "toleration of dissent and disagreement." It requires the speaker, he says, to respect "the views and opinions of his hearers" as well as "his own opinion." Wallace recommends that the communicator disclose, "whether explicitly or implicitly," positions opposed to his own. However, he stresses that the speaker should never accept "compromise at the expense

39 Bryant and Wallace, Fundamentals (1976), pp. 71, 75-76.  
of principle and strong belief."42 Wallace points out that the application of this standard preserves "a commonwealth of mutual deference [where] integrity and self-respect are shared."43

The second criterion Wallace advocates is that of "knowledge." Recommending "full search and inquiry" through perusing "a wide variety of opinions and facts," he states that the speaker is responsible for answering any question pertinent to his subject.44 Because the audience relies on him to present a clear, unbiased view, Wallace comments that the communicator demonstrates his regard for them by being well-informed.45

The third criterion Wallace discusses is "fairness." He says that the speaker has to "preserve a kind of equality of opportunity among competing ideas;" that is, within the limitations of time and speech situation, the communicator is obligated to give the audience the same chance for judging facts and ideas that he had.46 By being accurate,

46Ibid.
honest, and just in his interpretations and use of techniques, Wallace says, the speaker respects the audience’s capacity for making informed decisions and provides citizens of a free society with the "widest access to information and knowledge." 47

The fourth criterion Wallace recommends is that of disclosing "private motivations to public scrutiny." He believes the speaker should reveal his own biases as well as those of his sources. Wallace remarks that this standard not only upholds the right of the audience to make their own rational judgments, but also preserves the communicator’s "public integrity." 48

In summary, Wallace believes that rhetoric, viewed broadly as an art of advising, requires the speaker in a free society to justify his choices through appeals to democratic ideals. He explains that his ethic applies to the speaker’s goal in two ways. First, the values of a free society ultimately control rhetorical ends. Second, the audience’s interests, always modified by democratic ideals, govern the communicator’s purpose. In addition, Wallace points out that his four “moralties” are primarily concerned with the methods and means of utterances. 49

48 Ibid., p. 79.
He appears to agree with Aristotle, among many others, that the "moral individual is one upon whom the social factor exerts a pull rather than a push." Hence, Wallace suggests that the final authority determining accountability is the influence of ethical values conditioned by society and the ability of the individual to make his own rational decisions.\textsuperscript{50}

Delivery and Style

Consistent with his concept of rhetorical behavior as a unified response to a situation, Wallace discusses rules concerning the relationship between the speaker's internalized "substance" and his delivery. Reflecting James A. Winans, he asserts that "conceptions and meanings dominate utterance and bodily behavior." Based on his view of "contrariety" and popular values as the primary "source of energy" motivating and sustaining interest, Wallace recommends that the speaker attend to these material "conditions" and "causes" if he desires to be lively, animated, and audience-centered. Borrowing again from Winans, he says that the communicator achieves "vivid-realization-of-the-idea-at-the-moment-of-utterance" and a "sense of communication" through his application of "memory and recall." Apparently influenced by Winans' concepts of "attention to

\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Rice, On the Knowledge}, pp. 238-240, 245.
meaning" and "productive and reproductive imagination" and by Bacon's "imaginative reason," Wallace uses the term "recall" to refer to a creative operation requiring the speaker to explore his past experience in order to generate a new, stylized utterance. In brief, what Wallace suggests is that the communicator focus on producing "good reasons" through the imaginative use of popular opinions and "contrariety" during preparation and, while focusing on the audience's interests, create a fresh, intense response to them during his speech. He contrasts this "attention to ideas" with memorizing language, which tends to make delivery less vital and spontaneous.

Summary

Wallace constructed a system of rules reflecting a fixed set of conditions for producing and evaluating rhetorical actions. He says that in many cases these principles are no more than guides to the best choices in a given circumstance. However, whenever they are common to a speaker and audience, he recommends that "the set then becomes binding, and operates as an objective frame of reference, giving the speaker confidence in his decisions


and constituting his ultimate basis of appeal he needs to justify his arguments.⁵³ Wallace concludes that democratic ideals, being the most common experiences of a free society, are the final standard of public utterances.

Wallace's Theoretical Changes

Over a period of years, Wallace made major changes in his theory of rhetoric. A discussion of the theoretical changes that represent his later view of the rhetorical situation and its relationship to the speaker and his "substance" follows.

In Fundamentals of Public Speaking (1947), Wallace does not stress social values and their relationship to a system of topics, to attention and interest, or to ethics. Based primarily on modern psychology, his analysis of topics involves a classification of motives with little consideration of ethical and political values. His discussion of attention and interest concerns the use of motive appeals and also psychological laws such as intensity, size, activity, pattern and organization, and familiarity. His examination of ethics focuses on reason and the integrity of the speaker. He does not, however, include specific moral standards. In brief, Wallace does not stress the importance of social values regarding his system of in-

vention, his theory of attention and interest, and his ethic. In contrast, in Fundamentals (1976), he emphasizes moral ideals, basing his discussion on modern ethics. Wallace also presents ethical standards for determining the appropriateness of utterance.

In Fundamentals (1947), Wallace recognizes the relationship between delivery and meaning without fully clarifying it. On the other hand, in Fundamentals (1976), Wallace explicitly points out the connections between producing content, attending to values, and having an animated delivery through the use of "imaginative reason."

Wallace also changes his emphasis on situation through the organization of his text. In Fundamentals (1976), he combines a discussion of the two most important subjects concerning social ideals, "Values, Interest, and Attention" and "Ethics" in an early part of the book. In each succeeding part, he examines materials first and forms and strategies second. He places an analysis of the final stages of utterance, style and delivery, toward the end of the text. In addition, Wallace includes the facts of the occasion, the inartistic proofs, in a chapter apart from reasoning, the artistic proofs, and relates them to both

55 Ibid., chapters 7, 17.
informative and persuasive speaking.\textsuperscript{56} In contrast, in \textit{Fundamentals} (1947), he discusses evidence with reasoning in a chapter on persuasive discourse but not on informative.\textsuperscript{57} Thus, Wallace emphasizes the values and facts of the occasion through order of development in his later edition of \textit{Fundamentals of Public Speaking} in a way that he does not do in the earlier editions.

\textbf{Wallace's Contribution to a "Rhetorical Logic"}

In order to determine Wallace's contribution to a "substantive logic" of rhetoric, it is necessary to compare his theory with that of other significant contemporary rhetoricians who discuss (1) a system of topics, (2) attention and interest, (3) ethics and (4) rhetorical behavior.

\textbf{Wallace's Contribution to a Modern System of Topics}

Wallace's system of topics consists of two indexes: one representing the major elements of the rhetorical situation—subject, audience, and speaker—and another comprising the personal, ethical, and political values of a free society. His topical scheme is distinctive in that it reflects the occasion as controlling rhetorical behav-

\textsuperscript{56}Bryant and Wallace, \textit{Fundamentals} (1976), pp. v-vii.

\textsuperscript{57}Bryant and Wallace, \textit{Fundamentals} (1947), chapter 15.
ior. In addition, his classification system is generative of the full range of individual, moral, and social interests necessary for ready, effective, and moral adaptation to popular audiences in a free society. Furthermore, he appears to be one of the few writers who develops both kinds of the aforementioned indexes. A comparison of Wallace's system of topics with that of other eminent theorists who consider values either (1) in an index of the situation, or (2) in a classification of ideals follows.

Index of the Situation

Some modern scholars developed an index of the situation. Like Wallace, John F. Wilson and Carroll C. Arnold present an index of elements useful for stimulating the speaker's exploration of the materials of the occasion. Implied in their scheme are values, such as "Desirability in terms of rewards and punishments" and "Feasibility: Workability." Yet, consistent with their amoral view of rhetoric, they do not emphasize political values. Unlike Wilson and Arnold's, Wallace's index of the occasion focuses on moral ideals that the speaker shares with his audience. In addition, he differs from them in providing a classification of popular opinions essential to the resolu-

tion of conflict through communication.

Like Wallace, Chaim Perelman believes that the speaker needs a scheme that emphasizes the facts and values of the rhetorical situation. Yet, consistent with his lack of interest in adaptation to popular audiences, Perelman de-emphasizes their ethical opinions. In contrast, Wallace stresses the political ideals of a free society and provides an index of personal and social values.

Like Wallace, Richard M. Weaver provides a modern system of topics. Modifying Aristotle’s scheme, he places arguments into five classes, including definition, example, analogy, cause and effect, and expediency. Being a conservative, Weaver focuses on traditional principles through these categories. Hence, his system is too restrictive to be useful over multi-various situations in a democracy. In contrast, Wallace provides a topical system and a corresponding classification of values that permits a wide variety of popular opinions of a free society.


61 Johannesen, Strickland, and Eubanks, Language is Sermonic, pp. 11-12, 27.
Classification of Ideals

Some modern rhetoricians furnish a classification of values. Like Wallace, Ralph T. Eubanks and Virgil Baker developed an index of democratic ideals that are derived from Harold Lasswell. Their scheme includes two major categories: "welfare" and "deference," which correspond to some extent to Wallace's "desirable," "obligatory," and "commendable" classes. However, their system is too specific to be generative of the full scope of human motives and values necessary to a complete art of social adaptation in a free society. Unlike Eubanks and Baker, Wallace provides a classification that is general enough to allow a broad range of choices. In addition, he furnishes the communicator with a scheme reflecting the major elements of the situation.

Like Wallace, Wayne C. Minnick believes that the speaker needs a classification of motives and values. Besides providing physiological and social motives, he indexes six categories of specific, traditional American ideals based

---

Wallace's Contribution to a Modern Theory of Attention and Interest

Wallace made three basic additions to a modern rhetorical view of attention and interest. First, he presents what is probably one of the most complete explanations of the relationship between meaning and interest. Second, he is one of the few contemporary rhetoricians who emphasizes moral values as the chief sources of subject matter, of attention and interest, and of the ultimate justification of both. Third, his two-step approach to classifying values relevant to the occasion and rank ordering those most important to speaker and audience seems to be a practical and unified way of producing an inherently interesting, 

persuasive, and moral content. A comparison of Wallace's view with that of other eminent scholars who discuss the importance of shared and significant experiences and their relationship to interest and persuasion follows.

Like Wallace, A. E. Phillips explains a practical approach to attention and interest through his concept of "reference to experience." He also advocates that the speaker classify and rank order experiences familiar to the audience. Unlike Phillips, Wallace explains attention in the context of the total speech act; that is, he clarifies the relationship between the audience, the speaker, and their interests in connection with a situation. He also emphasizes moral ideals. Consequently, Wallace specifies the need for developing an index of ethical and political values and rank ordering them. Finally, in contrast to Phillips, he emphasizes social cooperation rather than persuasive effect in seeking to gain audience attention.64

Like Wallace, James A. Winans discusses attention and its importance to public communication. Wallace explains more fully than Winans, however, the relationships between situation, meaning, and interest. In addition, he presents a more practical and unified approach.65


65Winans, Public Speaking (1923), pp. xiii, xviii, chapters 3, 4, 6.
Like Wallace, Kenneth Burke refers to the importance of the shared interests of speaker and audience through his concept of "identification," which he uses to suggest both the means of securing common ground as well as the end of rhetoric, socialization. Unlike Burke, Wallace explains attention primarily in terms of the values of a free society. He also presents a more coherent and orderly approach to creating a subject matter that is simultaneously moving, interesting, and moral.

Wallace's Contribution to an Ethics of Communication

Wallace's ethic of communication is distinctive because of the peculiar amalgam of six characteristics. First, it comprises what is probably one of the most concise, specific, and practical moral standards in modern rhetoric. Second, because it encompasses the essential conditions of utterance—situation, speaker, and "substance"—it is within the field of practical discourse. Third, his ethic is consistent with the processes and values of a democracy. It is based on modern political experts' assessment of the ultimate ideals of a free society for the purpose of providing specific criteria for the communicator. Yet, its prescribed values are on a general level, permitting a wide range of popular opinions. Fourth, his moral view focuses

on the ethical responsibility of the speaker. Fifth, Wallace's ethic applies to all aspects of utterance, including the speech goal, selection of materials, values, and premises of argument, and techniques and methods. Sixth, though it emphasizes the integrity of the speaker, his ethic allows for an effective art of persuasion. A comparison of Wallace's philosophy with that of some significant modern writers (1) who discuss rhetoric as advising or (2) who represent various views of democratic ethics follows.

Rhetoric as Advising

The first group of writers to be considered are those who view popular discourse as an art of advising. Like Wallace, B. J. Diggs sees rhetoric in this way. He requires the speaker to be responsible and rational in his decisions. He also emphasizes institutional and cultural norms in determining appropriateness. However, Diggs never fully clarifies the practical application of his view beyond obligating the communicator to justify his choices. In contrast, Wallace provides a moral system within popular discourse and presents specific, workable standards.

Like Wallace, Richard M. Weaver considers rhetoric pri-

arily as advisory. Believing the speaker's first obligation is to uphold moral values, Weaver says that the communicator's ethical position is revealed by his means of argument. As a conservative and Platonist, he thinks that argument by definition is the most ethically desirable type of argument because it refers to the fixed nature of things. He positions argument from basic principles and from example as second because they both imply general classes. Weaver ranks the remaining types, such as analogical, causal, and circumstantial, according to their proximity to essences. Weaver also believes that the speaker is responsible for adapting to the audience. However, since Weaver does not explain his view of cultural ideals or means of arguments as a part of rhetorical art, his ethic is outside it. Furthermore, his narrow view of moral ideals restricts the speaker's effective adaptation because it omits many individual and social interests of democratic audiences. Moreover, in focusing on content, Weaver does not apply his ethic to anything other than arguments. Finally, he never clearly explains how to apply his system. Unlike Weaver, Wallace develops a clear,

practical ethics that is within the field of practical discourse, that permits an effective art of persuasion, and that is applicable to all aspects of utterance.

Democratic Ethics

In his consideration of ethics, Wallace is one of many who developed moral principles consistent with democratic ideals. Like Wallace, some writers focus on the speaker's moral integrity in the context of a free society. Emphasizing the communicator's adherence to democratic values, William Norwood Brigance advocates standards corresponding to Wallace's, including obligations to be prepared, to be well informed, to be clear, to be sincere, and to consider the welfare of the audience. He does not believe, however, that the ideals of a free society are the peculiar content of popular discourse. Hence, his ethic is outside it. Unlike Brigance, Wallace constructed moral criteria that are based on the distinctive subject matter of rhetoric and that are a part of the field of practical discourse. In addition, his explanation of his moral standards in relation to the ideals of a free society is more detailed and concise than Brigance's.

Like Wallace, Giles W. Gray and Waldo W. Braden insist that the speaker's moral integrity is based on his fulfill-

ment of democratic values, including equality of opportunity, freedom with responsibility, full and free expression, and majority rule. They elaborate on various ethical principles that touch on Wallace's four "moralities," including competence and study, a broad knowledge as well as special preparation, a desire to communicate, honest thinking, and social obligations.70 However, they do not suggest that the ideals of a free society constitute the distinctive "substance" of rhetoric. Therefore, they derive their moral standards from a field outside practical discourse. Unlike Gray and Braden, Wallace constructed an ethical system within the discipline of rhetoric. In addition, his discussion of the relationship between democratic values and his criteria is more lucid and complete than theirs.

Like Wallace, Thomas R. Nilsen emphasizes the speaker's responsibility to preserve democratic values in practical discourse. Based on the ultimate criterion of the "degree of free, informed, rational, and critical choices that is fostered by our speaking," he discusses ethical principles encompassing Wallace's, including accuracy and fairness in the interpretation of data, honest, objective, and critical thinking, disclosure of private motivations, being well-

informed, and avoiding emotional gimmicks and false reasoning. He also considers the concept of appropriateness as the key to determining the use of rational or emotional methods. Yet, Nilsen does not accept democratic values as the autonomous content of rhetoric, a fact which places his ethic outside it. He also recommends that the rhetorical critic's primary moral judgment involves social effects and consequences rather than the "right" selection of materials, means, and purposes within the speech object itself. In contrast, Wallace retains unity and completeness in ethical judgments by applying his criterion to all aspects of an utterance. His standards are also within the field of popular discourse. Furthermore, his elucidation of the connections between his "moralities" and his ultimate ideal is clearer, more concise, and better organized than Nilsen's.

Like Wallace, Franklyn S. Haiman says that the communicative source is obligated to adhere to the democratic ideal of "individual worth and rationality." Except for certain circumstances, he opposes any rhetorical means that incapacitate man's ability to make free, rational choices.


Yet, Haiman is not clear about his method of applying his system. He does not fully explain, for example, how to determine those situations in which the persuader uses emotional appeals or how to estimate the differences between them and logical means. In not accepting democratic ideals as the unique content of rhetoric, he also advocates an ethics separate from the field of rhetoric. Unlike Haiman, Wallace explains his moral standards as a part of popular discourse. His view is also more clear and practical. Furthermore, Wallace's is less restrictive than Haiman's through his application of appropriateness. Hence, unlike Haiman, Wallace permits techniques such as suggestion and motive appeal.

Ralph T. Eubanks and Virgil T. Baker resemble Wallace not only in their focus on the responsibility of the speaker but also in advocating that democratic ideals, summed up as "individual human worth" and "full self-realization," provide an ethics within the field of rhetoric. They present eight categories of values relevant to moral judgments. Nevertheless, Eubanks and Baker show little re-


74 Eubanks and Baker, "Toward an Axiology," pp. 344, 347-
gard for popular opinions. Their system tends to prescribe ends that are too specific to be consistent with a free society that tolerates a larger variety of views than they allow.\textsuperscript{75} Consequently, they are not able to explain fully the relationship between their classification and democratic ideals. In addition, in focusing on ethical purposes, Eubanks and Baker fail to show how to apply their system to techniques. Furthermore, they do not fully clarify how to use their ethic other than to say that the speaker is required to advocate the specific values that they present or to oppose their "brutalizing opposites."\textsuperscript{76} In contrast, Wallace permits more freedom of expression and toleration of diverging opinions. He also elucidates the connections between democratic values and his standards for utterance. In addition, Wallace applies his criterion to methods as well as to materials and goals. Furthermore, his four "morailities" are a more specific means of evaluation.

Some contemporary writers focus on freedom of expression as the ultimate democratic ideal and neglect the speaker.


\textsuperscript{75} For a similar criticism of Eubanks and Baker, see Dennis G. Day, "The Ethics of Democratic Debate," \textit{Central States Speech Journal}, XVII (February, 1966), pp. 11-12.

\textsuperscript{76} Eubanks and Baker, \textit{Speech in Personal and Public Affairs}, pp. 103-107.
er's personal integrity. These scholars believe that it is the only way "truth" wins out in the "marketplace of ideas." James C. McCroskey lists ethical obligations for the communicator similar to Wallace's, including to speak if he believes he is right, to be silent if he is doubtful about his position, to be well-informed, and to be competent in the art of rhetoric. However, believing morality depends upon the character of the speaker, McCroskey lists a fifth criterion, namely, that the communicator determines his own accountability. He argues that this amoral view, wherein no specific technique is condemned, is the only one consistent with the ideals of a free society that "encourage free speech" and allow people to "have a right to choose between what they consider right and wrong." All prescribed moral standards, he asserts, are anti-democratic. Hence, his system places final responsibility on society. He does not hold the communicator responsible for anything. Furthermore, he does not view the values of a free society as the distinctive subject matter of rhetoric. Therefore, his system is outside it. Unlike McCroskey, Wallace focuses on the moral obligations of the speaker. Like McCroskey, he believes that freedom of expression is

the "best test of truth." However, in contrast, Wallace sees that it must be restricted by the social rules legislated by the majority of a democracy. In addition, unlike McCroskey, his ethic is within the field of communication.

Some modern rhetoricians believe that only the actual opinions of the members of a free society constitute the primary source of morality. Accepting this view, Edward Rogge advocates that scholars empirically discover and describe current social values. He asserts that morality is evaluated according to the appropriateness of the speaker's conformity to the norms acceptable both to the immediate audience and to the larger society, the message's survival and utility value to them, the relationship between speaker and listeners, and the extent to which direct action has to be taken. Hence, he holds the audience ultimately accountable for the speaker's product. Believing that they eventually discover any violations of their values, Rogge does not specify any moral criteria for the communicator. Allowing any rhetorical technique acceptable to an audience, such as lying, his view implies that their ends and values are more important than the speaker's means.78 He does not view popular opinions as the peculiar content of practical discourse, a fact which places his ethic outside it. In

contrast, Wallace emphasizes the communicator's integrity and responsibility for his product. He believes that the highest ideals of a culture limit the speaker's adjustment to the values of his audience. He does not allow any method, such as lying, that is incompatible with these moral ideals. In addition, his ethic is within the field of rhetoric.

Wallace's Contribution to a View of Rhetorical Behavior

Wallace made a contribution to a view of rhetorical behavior. First, he presents what is probably one of the most complete explanations concerning communicative operations entailing the five canons of inventing, disposing, stylizing, "recalling," and delivering utterances. Consistent with his concept of practical discourse as a unified response to a situation, he clarifies the reason it emphasizes "material conditions." Consequently, his peculiar combination of Winans' "attention to meaning," Bacon's "imaginative reasoning," and the use of democratic ideals in the two preceding operations is apparently unique to modern thought. He also explains the relationship between delivery and "substance" more completely than many modern writers. Second, being one of the few modern writers to recognize a distinctive subject matter, he explains why rhetoric has an autonomous logic. Third, he presents an
extensive classification of the causes and conditions of the stylistic uniqueness of an utterance involving situation, content, and the speaker and his delivery. A comparison of Wallace's view of rhetorical behavior with that of other important contemporary writers follows. First it discusses those who contributed to a practical logic directly relevant to popular discourse and second, it considers those who have a view of delivery and style resembling Wallace's.

A "Substantive Logic" of Rhetoric

Some modern scholars discuss how to produce the subject matter of rhetoric through practical reasoning. Like Wallace, Chaim Perelman explains that conditions inherent in the situation, especially facts, opinions, and cultural values, are essential to an art of social cooperation and action. However, he argues that the only way to emphasize reason and morality is through the construction of an ideal, "universal audience," serving as an objective frame of reference for making and judging arguments. This group of listeners, he says, combines rationality and common agreements about information, assumptions, and social ideals. Consequently, he advocates that one of the rhetorician's tasks is studying audiences in order to build an ideal

model. Hence, he does not develop a specific criterion for determining relevance and appropriateness. In addition, his logic is not internal to rhetoric because he does not accept it as having any peculiar materials, forms, and purposes. In contrast, Wallace's logic is autonomous in that his rules of reasoning apply to the distinctive "substance" of practical discourse, the rational use of democratic ideals in communication. In addition, he applies them to both content and delivery.

Like Wallace, Stephen Toulmin worked on rules for creating and evaluating the arguments of practical discourse. In addition, he accepts social values as generally useful in determining their ethical fitness. Nevertheless, he does not regard rhetoric as having any peculiar content. Hence, his logic is not autonomous. On the other hand, Wallace's logic is distinctive because it applies to the unique materials, ends, and forms of popular discourse.

Delivery and Style

Many modern rhetoricians other than Wallace recognize the relationship between the communicative behaviors for

80 Chaim Perelman, "The New Rhetoric," Prospect of Rhetoric, ed. by Bitzer and Black, pp. 120-121.


82 Toulmin, An Examination of the Place of Reason in Ethics, p. 223.
producing content and those involving delivery and style. Like Wallace, James A. Winans, Charles Henry Woolbert, Giles W. Gray and Waldo W. Braden, and Huber W. Ellingsworth and Theodore Clevenger, Jr., among others, emphasize the connections between the speaker's internalization of meaning and his delivery. 83 Unlike them, Wallace more completely explains the relationships between situation, "substance," and the speaker and his delivery through Winans' "attention to meaning" and Bacon's "imaginative reasoning." He goes further than Winans and Bacon in directing the communicator to concentrate on the ideals of a modern democratic society.

Like Wallace, John Wilson and Caroll Arnold argue that style is inseparable from the whole speech act and is not just a way of adorning ideas.84 However, in contrast, Wallace more fully clarifies what causes a unique utterance through the interaction of occasion, subject matter, and the speaker and his voice and body action.


Summary

Wallace contributed to a modern "logic of rhetorical action." He explains its autonomy. He develops a system of topics as a part of a practical, unified approach to finding materials, getting attention, and establishing an inherently moral art of rhetoric. His principles guide the speaker in producing and justifying, and the listener in evaluating, not only subject matter and arguments but also delivery. Furthermore, Wallace clarifies the relationship between situation, "substance," and delivery and their roles in determining the stylistic uniqueness of utterance.
CHAPTER V

WALLACE'S EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

Influenced by Susanne Langer, Wallace believes that our modern technological society is endangering the integrity and harmony of personal and public life and that the best solution to the problem of developing "the whole man" is to be derived from a theory of symbolic behavior. Wallace proposes that:

What is needed in American education is a concept and goal which both humanist and scientist can appreciate and endorse, a method of education which is consistent with the concept, a method which emphasizes language—particularly spoken language—as the dominant mode of social control, interpersonal relationships and cooperative living, and a method which would improve the transfer of learning from the classroom to experience.

What would be the central, pervasive concept? I suggest that it would be the symbol.¹

He refers to the symbol as the central element of "all behavior that is peculiarly human," including man's unique expression of language and speech, mathematics, music, dance, and art. Wallace declares that "the individual's potentialities are best realized through the systematic development of his symbolic behavior" and that a democratic

¹Karl R. Wallace, "The Symbol as a Unifying Concept in Higher Education," Box 8, Folder 2, "Wallace Miss.," p. 10.
society committed to the "dignity and worth of the individual" and "full self-realization" should center its studies on symbols. Wallace appears to agree with Susanne Langer that only through the full and efficient functioning of symbolization do human beings find complete freedom "to carry on our natural, impulsive, intelligent life, to realize plans, to express ideas in action or in symbolic transformation, see and hear and interpret all things we encounter, without fear of confusion, and adjust our interests and expressions to each other." Advocating the concept of the symbol as a way of fusing scientific and humanistic learning, Wallace proposes that "symbolization should be the center of educational endeavors at all levels." Such an educational program, he says, focuses its learning activities "on the chief kinds of symbols: the native language (oral and written), musical notation, the algebraic and numerical symbol, gesture (the language of movement), and the symbol combining line and color."

Although he desires to include all symbols in his system, Wallace believes, with Langer and George Herbert Mead,

that of all symbolic behaviors, speech and language are the most distinctively human. He says that linguistic symbols serve to unify learning in two special ways. First, Wallace judges that language is essential to the synthesis and efficient management of knowledge and that it facilitates the generalization and classification of a large number of otherwise disconnected experiences. Second, basing his view on Mead's concept of socialization, he asserts that speech is central to the integration of the "whole man" and that a person's "private and public self," his sense of personal identity as well as of his social role, is developed through communication. In brief, Wallace concludes that "Speech is thus central to the nature of man, to the development of the person, and to the functioning of political, economic, and social institutions" and that


it is the key to achieving the "dignity and worth of the individual" and "full self-realization." Therefore, he advocates an educational program in which "speech behavior is central and other kinds of symbolic behavior are necessary and supportive."

Reflecting the classical view that he first encountered at Cornell University, Wallace advocates an Isocratean concept of rhetoric as the unifying core of learning, and he hopes that "systematic training in the native tongue . . . may come to occupy a central position in educational endeavor both in the public school and in the college." Wallace asserts that, "Upon those who profess to teach this art [speech-making] in a modern university devolves the duty, I believe . . . of conceiving the practice of classroom speaking as one way whereby an individual may take his place as an intelligent member of a democratic society." Thus, he believes that one of the primary aims of education


8 Wallace, "Education and Speech Education," p. 177. Wallace does not mention Isocrates in his writings. However, according to H. I. Marrou, the educational philosophy and practices of the western world, at least in the classical tradition, can be traced to Isocrates. See H. I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity, trans. by George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp. 79-80.

is practical training for public leadership and that popular discourse is central to it. Wallace's goal is the fully cultivated, democratic citizen, prepared to function efficiently in his private and public as well as his professional life. He sees in Francis Bacon the educational ideal, the "only great personality of the Renaissance" to combine the interests and activities of cyclopedist and theorist on communication and rhetoric with the practical experience of political speaker and participant in conference. He adds that Bacon was held in esteem as essayist, historian, philosopher, and orator. Thus, Wallace suggests that Bacon harmonized the generalist and the specialist in his private, professional, and public roles.

Wallace declares that "Among the values of public communication ... substance and social usefulness will always be primary," and that "the citizen-speaker should be both ready and responsible in the use of his native


language."14 Hence, he believes that moral training is essential to the "whole man" and that "nothing helps so much toward the practice of virtue as the study of political wisdom and eloquence."15 He also believes that "the essence of rhetoric constitutes the power to make better guesses rather than worse, arrive at better probabilities rather than lesser probabilities, and that the application of the appropriate means to accomplish an appropriate end entails ethics as well as logic." Thus, he recognizes that "The genuinely cultivated man . . . is the kind of person who has a gift of 'hitting' the right solution . . . or at least the solution most nearly right, the best in the circumstance . . . because he has the right 'opinion.'"16 He concludes, therefore, that rhetoric is essential to the development of practical judgment and personal and social responsibility.

Wallace asserts that "meanings and values shared by all, that become the property of every child's state of being . . . are the materials and experiences that make


cooperative living a reality."¹⁷ In other words, Wallace believes that the members of a society are united primarily through communication and through their common ethical ideals. Therefore, he recommends that educational institutions concerned with the "social welfare" focus on the "substance" and practice of rhetoric through discourse on universal, noble, and enduring social issues.¹⁸

Wallace declares that "the study of rhetoric provides the modern undergraduate his only opportunity of seeing . . . what unity there may still be among the studies of his higher education" and that "the nature of public discourse is virtually the same as the nature of what used to be called liberal education." Thus, he argues that the development of the complete person requires broad, interdisciplinary studies for which rhetoric provides the synthesis.¹⁹

Wallace recognizes that "the business and intercourse of living are still managed primarily through talk and discussion" and that "speech is the only subject of instruction in the school and college in which communication and the


verbal symbol come together in learning situations that are essentially similar to what is talked about in everyday living." Hence, he advises that education focus on the communicative experiences of the everyday affairs of life.20

In order to explain why rhetoric is the unifying core of learning, Wallace applies Aristotle's four causes and conditions.21 In addition, he consistently promoted his philosophy of rhetorical education in the speech programs he administered at the University of Virginia and the University of Illinois as well as in his textbook, Fundamentals of Public Speaking.

To set Wallace's educational philosophy in proper context, this chapter first considers some trends in modern education that Wallace opposes; second, it examines his explanation of the unique position of rhetoric in education; third, it assesses his contribution.

Modern Trends in Education that Wallace Resists

In many of his publications, Wallace withstands the increasingly isolated and disconnected view of learning


in American education that began in the latter half of the
nineteenth century. He opposes the emphasis on profes-
sional training rather than on general education as rep-
resented, for example, in American colleges in the eigh-
teenth and nineteenth centuries. Wallace resists the
growing dominance of technical courses over the humani-
ties that accompanied the rise of science and technology
and the increasing emphasis on material and economic pur-
suits in preference to cultural training.22

Wallace opposes those of the general education move-
ment in America who perceive communication courses as hav-
ing no content and as separate from other liberal arts
requirements.23

He takes issue with the tendency to focus less and less
on speech as the center of learning.24

He questions speech and language arts teachers who em-

22Ibid., pp. 98-99. See Michael R. Harris, Five Count-
ernovationists in Higher Education (Corvallis, Oregon

See General Education in a Free Society: Report of the
Harvard Committee (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University

"The Symbol as a Unifying Concept," pp. 1-9. See George V.
Bohman, "Rhetorical Practice in Colonial America," pp. 165-
172 and Gladys L. Borchers and Lillian R. Wagner, "Speech
Education in Nineteenth-Century Schools," pp. 294-297, both
in A History of Speech Education in America: Background
Studies, ed. by Karl R. Wallace (New York: Appleton-Cen-
phrasesize literature and the development of the "private self" rather than practical communication and the matur-
ation of the "social self."^25

Finally, Wallace argues against the disconnected view of man's knowledge generated through increasing specialization and the development of isolated departments. Like Everett Lee Hunt, he opposes the concept of public speaking as primarily a technical—or hard—science, rather than as an interdisciplinary, liberal art.26

The Unique Position of Rhetoric in Education

In order to unify learning in American education, Wallace advocates that rhetoric be placed at the center of the curriculum. Applying Aristotle's four causes, he explains the unique position of popular discourse by the interaction of three elements—the rhetorical situation, "substance," and teacher.


The Rhetorical Situation

In considering the rhetorical situation, Wallace suggests that it controls learning in two ways. First, it determines the goals, methods, and "substance" of education. Reflecting the classical emphasis on social and cultural maturation, Wallace agrees with modern educators, such as those represented by the "Harvard Report," that democratic ideals, summed up in the phrases "the dignity and worth of the individual" and "full self-realization," determine the conditions of learning in a free society. He concurs with the "Harvard Report" concerning the need for students to encounter "the actual difficulties of governing by democracy," and that the preparation of responsible and capable citizens requires four abilities: practical problem-solving, communication, making relevant judg-

ments, and choosing and applying values in particular situations. Wallace also argues that the occasion determines not only the primary goals and means but also the materials and forms of learning. Viewing problematic situations as generating practical judgment and action in real life, he believes that teachers should provide "contexts comparable" to everyday affairs. Because speech is the dominant experience of private and public living, he recommends an emphasis on rhetoric. Second, Wallace discerns that situation controls a fixed sequence of learning conditions. Seeing practical problem-solving as entailing the application of general principles to a specific issue, he argues that students must first possess basic information and values before finding a solution and communicating it.

Wallace recommends two ways to make the conditions of learning practical and relevant to real life. In the first place, he agrees with the "Harvard Report" that high priority be given to communication and to the integration of courses relating to persisting social issues with other

28 General Education in a Free Society, pp. 64-74, 172.


general education requirements. However, unlike most modern educators, Wallace recommends that the substantive course in public speaking be merged into the liberal arts curriculum. He advises the utilization of the "general course in the social sciences because, as usually presented it deals with the problems arising from man's attempt to understand himself and to live with himself and others economically, politically, and culturally." Through the coordination of assignments, Wallace believes, the student could study cultural problems in his social science course and talk and write about them in his courses in practical discourse. Wallace asserts that what he sought after was "a kind of modern dialectic such as is used at St. John's College in discussions based on the Great Books."  

31 General Education in a Free Society, pp. 92, 117, 199, 215-218.

32 Wallace, "Education and Speech Education," pp. 180-181. Wallace focuses on the integration of a "fundamentals" course with a social science course as a general education requirement. However, he recommends many specific public address courses for those majoring in speech, including voice and articulation, parliamentary procedures, phonetics and linguistics, oral interpretation, argumentation, persuasion, rhetorical theory, and American and British public address. See Karl Wallace, "Major in Public Address," Box 20, Folder 1, "Wallace Mss.,” p. 1.

33 Wallace, "Symbol as a Unifying Concept," p. 21. Wallace's reference to the discussions on Great Books at St. John's College is the only remark he makes concerning the influence of the Great Books advocates, such as Robert M. Hutchins, Mortimer J. Adler, Alexander Meikljohn, Norman Foerster, Mark Van Doren, and Scott Buchanan. Wallace was familiar with the writings of these educators.
Wallace thinks that courses in communication and vocational education are likewise capable of being integrated. In addition, he suggests that it is even easier to synthesize rhetoric and subject matter courses in the public schools than in the colleges. He believes that in the elementary schools, the teacher trained in practical discourse is able to manage both communicative and subject matter functions. He adds that it is also possible to integrate rhetoric in high school, where the language arts teacher is essential to the core units of instruction.34

In the second place, Wallace believes that assimilation and transfer of learning would accrue if teachers would build their courses "around problems that have value today and have their analogues in the past." Reflecting his classes under Everett Lee Hunt at Cornell University, Wallace says that a course on the American constitution involving the problem of "federal vs. local power," for example, might investigate the conflicts surrounding the creation of the constitution in its historical context, the ethical values applicable to the situation, and the relevance of the original difficulties concerning the constitution to questions about it today.35 In summary, placing education in a cultural and political context, Wallace

believes in the importance of the rhetorical situation because it determines the causes and conditions of learning necessary to achieving the ideals of a free society.

The Substantive Causes of Learning

The second way that Wallace explains the unique position of rhetoric in education is through the purposes, materials, and forms—the "substance"—of popular discourse. He believes that the ultimate matter of rhetoric, democratic ideals, determines the educational goals of a free society. Envisioning the primary task as "leading the young to understand and develop their humanity," he argues that the schools should simultaneously develop the student's capacity for social cooperation with his fellow citizens and his own dignity and worth as an individual. Wallace declares that educational institutions fulfill their social and political responsibilities through building an orderly and lawful community of citizens who embody common cultural values.37

Wallace observes that the child needs more social and cultural development than the adult.38 Hence, he recommends


37 Wallace, Understanding Discourse, pp. 105-106.

that the earlier grades focus primarily on building the public and distinctively human characteristics of the child. He persistently opposes an emphasis on technical training in the public schools, but he adds that after high school, education should combine social purposes with an increasing emphasis on the professional and technical goals of the student.39

Wallace believes that the public, private, and professional selves are built primarily through the "substance" and practice of popular discourse. He thinks that materials, "the social fundamentals of living," are crucial to the humane and cultural development of the child, that its forms are essential to practical reasoning and judgment through communication, and that its habitual practice is necessary to participation in policy-making in a free society.40 On the college level, he believes that professional preparation requires more specialized materials and that the teacher of rhetoric aids the pupil in communicating with technical, specialized audiences "from whom he derives his sense of fraternity and wins professional respect."

However, Wallace consistently refers to the communication instructor's main task as helping the technical student to


40Wallace, "Rhetoric, Politics, and Education of the Ready Man," pp. 92, 94.
communicate with nonspecialized audiences "from whom he derives his economic success and wins family and community esteem."  

Wallace argues that rhetoric furnishes two kinds of materials necessary for democratic decision-making. First, he says that the citizen needs to understand basic information concerning "the enduring and unresolved problems of our civilization and culture which arise when individuals try to live together in the family, community, state, nation, and the world at large. They are the problems of war and peace, of race and creed, of poverty, wealth and population, of democracy and communism . . . of religion and morality, of political and economic life, of education and learning." Although the form of these conflicts varies in particular situations, he adds, their fundamental conditions and causes are universal from "culture to culture and from generation to generation."  

Second, Wallace believes that the student of popular discourse learns the ethical and political values essential to the communicative adjustment of these social problems.

The Teacher

The third way that Wallace points out the distinctive

42Wallace, Understanding Discourse, p. 104.
43Wallace, "Primacy of Substance," p. 3.
position of rhetoric in learning is through the teacher of communication. Seeing the instructor as the "controlling force" in education, Wallace agrees with the "Harvard Report" that there are two types of teachers: (1) the teacher of rhetoric and (2) the subject matter teacher.\textsuperscript{44} He recommends that they coordinate their efforts to educate the whole child. Wallace points out that in the public schools the teacher of technical materials develops both "the private and the public self," while the instructor of literature emphasizes the "private self" and the teacher of rhetoric primarily serves the "public self."\textsuperscript{45}

Wallace also discusses the cooperative effort of these two kinds of teachers on the college level in serving "the needs of specialized man." The teacher of communication, he says, aids in the achievement of social and professional goals of the student.\textsuperscript{46}

Believing speech to be the key to realizing the dominant educational goal, "the development of a complete human being," Wallace argues that the teacher of rhetoric is the most essential factor in learning. He worked persistently to generate interest in preparing instructors of popular discourse. He concludes that the elementary school teacher,

\textsuperscript{44}General Education in a Free Society, p. 200.
\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p. 98.
the most important instructor in education, is essentially a teacher of rhetoric. Believing also that practical discourse is the center of high school education, he admonishes teacher training institutes to prepare adequately public school teachers to build public-minded citizens through rhetorical discourse.47

Summary

In order to explain the unique position of rhetoric as the unifying core of modern education, Wallace applies Aristotle’s four causes—materials, forms, purpose, and agent. Wallace believes that the political ideals of a democratic society, which are best achieved through the study and application of popular discourse, determine the goals and means of learning. Hence, he sees the situation, content, forms, and instructor of rhetoric as the necessary prerequisites and as the main driving forces in realizing the democratic ideal of making available to each individual

47Karl R. Wallace, "The Central Position of Rhetoric and Speech in the Public Schools," Box 2, Folder 2, "Wallace Mss.," pp. 4-7. Cf. Wallace, "Goals, Concepts," pp. 99-100; Wallace, "Primacy of Substance," pp. 8-9. Wallace was the chairman of a national committee sponsored by the Speech Communication Association and the National Council of Teachers of English and organized to "look into the teaching of rhetoric in the public schools." The conclusion that the elementary school teacher is the most important was drawn by the committee. They also conclude that "rhetoric should be at the center of elementary education." Since the committee did not get around to rhetoric in high schools, the view concerning the high school teacher was Wallace's alone.
the best means for his fullest personal, social, and professional development.

Wallace's Contributions to Modern Educational Philosophy

Wallace's first contribution to modern educational philosophy is his recommendation that the symbol be the unifying concept of education at all levels. Second, Wallace is apparently one of the few educators who argues that democratic ideals constitute the peculiar content of courses in communication and that rhetorical studies should be integrated as a general education requirement. Third, while attempting to improve liberal education, he gives more due consideration to vocational training than many other modern educators. He is able to handle the complexities of this problem by focusing on cultural development in the public schools. With the social maturation of the high school student maximized, he is then able to attend to the professional aims of colleges. Finally, Wallace presents what is probably one of the most concise and complete explanations of the unique position of popular discourse through the interaction of three elements—the rhetorical situation, "substance," and the teacher. A comparison of Wallace's view with that of other eminent modern teachers who sought to improve American education by making it consistent with democratic ideals follows.
Like Wallace, Everett Lee Hunt advocates the classical view of rhetoric as the unifying concept of education and the integration of the substantive courses in practical discourse with interdisciplinary studies. However, unlike Wallace, he does not explain the unique content of popular discourse as democratic ideals. Furthermore, Hunt does not attempt to cope with the problems of unifying general and vocational education. Hunt also neglects the public schools. In contrast, Wallace recommends that the special content of popular discourse, that is, the values of a free society, serve as the primary subject matter of education. He also stresses liberal education while allowing for the current demand for vocational training at the college level.

In his book, Educating Liberally, Hoyt Hudson expresses a classical view corresponding to Wallace's. Unlike Wallace, however, Hudson advocates that communication be taught as a part of all courses and omitted from the curriculum as a separate subject. Other than a "universal knowledge" that links the past, present, and future of American culture, he

does not specify the fundamental content of education. In particular, Hudson does not believe that rhetoric has a unique subject matter. He also appears to be more interested in improving liberal education than in solving the practical problems of harmonizing general and vocational training. In contrast, Wallace advocates rhetoric as a general education requirement simultaneously taught with social science courses. He also sees in democratic ideals the peculiar content of popular discourse and of liberal education. Furthermore, he deals with the problems of the public schools as well as with vocational training.

Along with Wallace, A. Craig Baird emphasizes the study of cultural values and social problems in rhetorical courses. Unlike Baird, Wallace desires to integrate practical discourse and its special content into the curriculum.

In agreement with Wallace, the "Harvard Report" recommends that democratic ideals serve as the concept for uni-

49 Hoyt Hudson, Educating Liberally (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1945), pp. 4-5, 51, 70, 85, 97, 105-120.

fying general and specialized education. It also recognizes the importance of communication and of integrating social science courses in the persisting social problems of a free society with other liberal arts studies. However, unlike the "Harvard Report," Wallace believes rhetoric to be the core of education at all levels. He also emphasizes the integration of the substantive course in practical discourse with other courses.

Robert Hutchins, Mortimer J. Adler, Alexander Meikljohn, Norman Foerster, Mark Van Doren, and Scott Buchanan are among the more significant advocates of the "Great Books Program" for improving the rational and cultural development of the common man in a democratic society. These educators argue that the content of liberal education consists of the "Great Books of the Western World." Perhaps influencing Wallace, they propound a need for ra-


tional discussion of social ideas and values. However, going beyond them, Wallace recommends that rhetoric is the core of learning with special subject matter capable of being merged with other courses. He also focuses on the public schools as a way of unifying general and vocational education.

Consistent with Wallace, James Bryant Conant emphasizes courses in democratic citizenship and communication in the public schools. Yet, in contrast to him, Wallace accepts rhetoric as the substantive core of learning. He also advocates that communication courses be integrated with general and technical studies. Wallace recommends that the language arts teacher be specifically equipped to teach the values of a free society.

Like Wallace, Howard Mumford Jones emphasizes social values of a free society, but he does not specify a particular method for achieving this goal beyond improving teacher preparation in the graduate schools. In contrast to Jones, Wallace advocates a practical approach to cultural development while retaining the importance of vocational training.

53 Conant, Education in a Dividing World, chapter 1, p. 70.

In essential agreement with Wallace, Ralph Barton Perry stresses practical training for the "harmonious integration of social members" of a free society through communication. Unlike Perry, Wallace believes that rhetoric has a distinctive subject matter that should be integrated into the curriculum at all levels. He also pays closer attention to the problems of public schools and technical education.

Summary

In summary, Wallace advocates a classical view of rhetoric as the unifying center of learning, and he attempts to explain its unique position through the interaction of situation, "substance," and teacher. He believes that courses in popular discourse have a peculiar content that can be coordinated with other general education requirements. He appears to advocate a practical and efficient means of emphasizing social and cultural development while considering the professional aims of students in college. Consistent with his concept of rhetorical education, Wallace also recommends that symbolization be the central concept of instruction. His approach seems to provide one viable means of achieving democratic ideals.


CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Throughout his career, Karl Richards Wallace persistently opposed the modern trend toward a disunified, incomplete, and incoherent view of rhetoric and of education. Believing that the inculcation of social values is essential to the full development of the humane and public-minded democratic citizen, he especially withstood those who neglected the content and ethics of practical discourse. Influenced by the classical concept he first encountered at Cornell University, Wallace attempted to unify the field of speech and contemporary education, to define the uniqueness of communication, and to establish rhetoric as the core of learning by viewing popular discourse broadly as "the art and act of oral communication."

Wallace advocates an Aristotelian view of rhetoric as an art of practical, popular discourse, an art of social adaptation that is audience-centered and interdisciplinary.

Borrowing Aristotle's view of rhetoric as a unified act entailing four causes--materials, forms, purpose, and agent--Wallace explains the unity and distinctive nature of
practical discourse and its chief objects, the speech act and rhetorical action, through the peculiar interaction of speaker, situation, and "substance." Consistent with his focus on the individual communicator and on oral discourse, he argues that a speaker, or agent, is essential to communicative studies.

Influenced by his studies in Aristotle and Francis Bacon as well as in modern ethics, Wallace believes that the facts and values, especially political ideals, inherent in a rhetorical situation determine the speaker's potentiality for resolving social conflict through communication. These "material conditions and causes" control utterance, he says, because they set up a fixed sequence of communicative actions and because they constitute the primary "source of energy" generating practical discourse. Hence, Wallace declares that a rhetorical situation is a necessary part of any speech act.

Consistent with his emphasis on developing the communicator's capacity for audience adaptation, Wallace uses the term "substance" to refer to the peculiar processes and products of rhetorical behavior. Reflecting Bacon's concept of "imaginative reason," he says that the speaker produces his subject matter through a fixed sequence of actions: discover materials shared by himself and his audience, judge the relevance and appropriateness and truth and validity of these materials, and imaginatively word them in language fit-
tling to the audience. Wallace borrows the term "good reasons" from modern ethicists such as Stephen Toulmin, Paul Edwards, P. H. Nowell-Smith, R. M. Hare, and Kurt Baier to refer to the distinctive content of rhetoric. He says that, ultimately, the concept of "good reasons" entails the determination of the relevance and appropriateness of utterances through the rational application of ethical values. Hence, he explains the uniqueness of the "substance" of rhetoric in terms of its ultimate materials, or democratic ideals, its basic forms, or deductive, inductive, causal, and analogical reasoning, and its fundamental end of upholding the goals of a free society through communication. In brief, Wallace points out that rhetoric is a unified act because it necessarily requires a speaker, an occasion, and "substance." He also explains that the study of communication is unique because it is the only discipline that applies reason to popular opinions in practical discourse.

Wallace clarifies the relationship between the speech act and the rhetorical action by saying that the former refers to short, informal, impromptu conversations or to the elemental units of a rhetorical action, and that the latter refers to complete discourses that emphasize planned audience adaptation.

Influenced by Aristotle, Wallace attempts to establish rhetoric as a substantive and moral art by merging it
with politics. Striving to construct a single theory through incorporation of the materials of two other fields—ethics and politics, he consistently emphasizes that popular discourse in a free society promotes the social welfare by upholding democratic ideals.

Wallace attempts to unify modern education, like Isocrates, by placing rhetoric at the core of the curriculum, and he endeavors to establish the distinctive position of popular discourse through its situation, "substance," and teacher. Placing pedagogy in a cultural context, Wallace argues that democratic ideals, which respect full self-realization of the individual, determine the goals and means of education in a free society. Influenced by Susanne Langer and George Herbert Mead, Wallace holds that the development of symbolic behavior is the key to the complete maturation of the human being. He agrees with them that the use of language symbols is the most characteristically human activity. He also believes that rhetoric is necessary to the development of the socially responsible, democratic citizen. Wallace maintains that practice in a substantive art of practical discourse inculcates the values of a free society. He argues that the rhetorical situation is essential to making the classroom practical and relevant to real life through integrating the course in popular discourse with general and vocational studies and through emphasizing repetitive communicative exercises on subjects corresponding
to everyday life. Wallace believes that the teacher of rhetoric who is prepared with both content and skills is crucial to education, especially to the public schools where the child's cultural maturation is most important.

Consistent with his peculiar view of rhetoric and its place in contemporary education, Wallace believes that rhetoric has an autonomous logic that focuses on determining the relevance and appropriateness of the peculiar intentions, materials, and structures of utterances. From his study of modern philosophers such as Stephen Toulmin, Chaim Perelman, and Gideon Gottlieb, Wallace regards a rhetorical logic as constituting rules for directing communicative behavior. Basing his theory on Francis Bacon's "imaginative reason," he believes that producing content entails a fixed sequence of mutually interdependent operations encompassing four of the five classical canons: discovering or recalling relevant materials and creating purpose, and disposing and wording them. In addition, Wallace concurs with James A. Winans that the fifth canon, delivery, is integrally related to meaning. Furthermore, he maintains that "style" involves not only language usage, but also the uniqueness of an utterance as determined by the peculiar interaction of situation, "substance," and speaker and his delivery.

Influenced by Aristotle and Francis Bacon, Wallace argues that a speaker responds to a situation by first
searching for meanings common to all men through their social and political experiences and that a topical scheme prompted his imagination and memory in locating them. Hence, Wallace developed (1) an index of the major elements of the situation: subject, audience, and speaker, and (2) a classification of values that contains the fundamental materials of argument, of attention and interest, and of ethics. Borrowing from modern ethicist Richard Brandt, Wallace constructed three categories of values: the "desirable," the "obligatory," and the "commendable." He also applied Abraham Maslow's concept of hierarchy of individual needs to his "desirable" list.

Wallace says that his topics furnish the primary sources of attention and interest. Influenced primarily by Aristotle and James A. Winans, and possibly by A. E. Phillips and Kenneth Burke, he believes that establishing common ground through experiences shared by speaker and audience is the most important principle of persuasion. He recommends a practical and unified approach to securing interest: develop a classification of values and rank order those most important to the communicator and his listeners.

Suggesting that his topical scheme supplies an ethics within the field of rhetoric, Wallace explains his moral system in terms of the three essential elements--situation, "substance," and speaker. Influenced by modern ethicists such as B. J. Diggs, Richard Brandt, P. H. Nowell-Smith, and Kurt Baier, he considers most rhetorical occasions as choice-
situations, and he recommends that popular discourse be viewed generally as an art of advising that requires the speaker to justify his decisions rationally. Reflecting Aristotle, who recognizes a social purpose as controlling morality, Wallace asserts that the content of practical discourse—democratic ideals—determines the appropriateness of all aspects of utterance. He believes that the speaker's integrity is more important than private goals and that the communicator is responsible for knowing the moral standards of rhetoric. Therefore, basing his theory on the perception of modern political theorists such as Harold Lasswell, M. A. McDougal, and A. T. Mason that the ultimate values of a free society are summed up as "the dignity and worth of the individual" and "mutually shared respect, knowledge, and power," Wallace develops four ethical criteria for the speaker.

Wallace explains the relationship between the creation of subject matter and the use of voice and body action. Influenced by James A. Winans and Francis Bacon, he says that the speaker's attention to the audience's values and their relationship to the speaker's purpose, before and during utterance, is the primary force generating a lively and audience-centered delivery.

Wallace modifies his view of rhetoric through changes in his concept of the situation and its relationship to
the speaker and his subject matter. Converting from modern psychology to modern ethics, his later theory represents a greater emphasis on the occasion as the controlling factor of utterance.

Wallace made contributions to modern rhetoric through his peculiar concept, his system of topics, his ethics, his theory of attention and interest, and his view of rhetorical behavior. He has a unified, consistent, complete, and practical philosophy of popular discourse. Wallace applies Aristotle's four causes to explain the peculiar interaction of situation, "substance," and speaker. He also clarifies the autonomy of rhetoric's content through its distinctive materials, forms, and purposes. Wallace is probably one of the few modern scholars to merge rhetoric and the ideals of a free society while retaining the unity of the essential elements of communication.

Wallace develops both an index of the situation and a classification of values that reflect the occasion as the generator of utterance. In addition, his system represents a creative approach to ready, effective, and moral rhetorical adjustment consistent with democratic ideals.

Wallace's four moral standards are among the clearest, most concise, and most practical among contemporary writers in modern communication. In addition, he has a speaker-centered ethics that is within the field of rhetoric, consistent with democratic ideals, and applicable to all aspects of utterance.
Wallace produced a unified and practical concept of communicative behavior. His application of Francis Bacon's "imaginative reason," entailing a fixed sequence of operations peculiar to rhetoric, appears to be unique to contemporary thought. In addition, he explains the autonomy of a "substantive logic" of rhetoric through its distinctive materials, forms, and purposes. Furthermore, he creates a new view of delivery and its relationship to content by combining James A. Winans' idea of "attention to meaning," Bacon's "imaginative reason," and democratic ideals. Moreover, Wallace presents what seems to be one of the most complete explanations of the connections between situation, "substance," and the speaker and his delivery.

Wallace also made contributions to a contemporary philosophy of education. His view appears to be a practical and efficient way to achieve the ideals of a free society. He advises that the symbol be the center of education at all levels. In addition, he seems to have one of the most concise and complete explanations of the unique position of rhetoric in the curriculum. Wallace believes that democratic ideals constitute the peculiar content of communication and that substantive courses in rhetoric should be integrated with other general and vocational studies. Furthermore, he attempts to improve liberal education without ignoring the current emphasis on vocational training.
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