

Public Speaking as a Liberal Art: Confronting Polarization and Addressing the Composite Audience

- David A. Frank
- Professor of Rhetoric
- Email: dfrank@uoregon.edu
- Phone: 541-346-34198
- Office: 210 Chapman
- Office Hours: Winter Term: Monday – 9:00-9:50
Monday – 2:00-5:00

Short Statement







This course features the study and practice of public speaking as grounded in the five rhetorical canons of invention, arrangement, style, delivery, and memory.

Course Description:

This course is designed to provide students with the equipment they need to understand the theory and practice of public speaking as a liberal art. The course will feature the five canons of rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, delivery and memory. As a liberal art, a command of public speaking is accomplished through studies of its models, theories, and practice.

Learning Objectives

Through careful analysis of outstanding public speeches, students will come to understand how public address works and moves audiences to acts of justice and injustice. Students will receive thorough evidence-based instruction on how to control the fear of public speaking. Weekly readings will consist of short explanations of key rhetorical notions and a diverse set of political opinions. Students will write a major written rhetorical criticism of 10 pages on an oratorical masterpiece. Students will learn how to engage in 1) Impromptu speaking. 2) Extempore speaking. 3) Rhetorical Criticism. 5) Public Address.

▾ Assignments	
⋮	 Monday January 6. Central Thought Method. Audience Analysis. Advocacy Due Jan 6 at 10am
⋮	 Wednesday, January 22: Written Examination on the Rhetorical Bestiary. Due Jan 22 at 10am 10 pts
⋮	 Monday, January 27: Oral exam on the Rhetorical Bestiary. Due Jan 27 at 11:59pm 10 pts
⋮	 Wednesday, February 5: Impromptu Speeches on New York Times/Fox News Headlines. Not available until Feb 5 10 pts
⋮	 Sunday, February 9: 11:45 PM Rhetorical Criticisms written version Due Feb 9 at 11:59pm 15 pts
⋮	 Monday, February 10 Oral versions of Rhetorical Criticisms Due Feb 10 at 10am 20 pts
⋮	 Monday, March 2: Formal Public Address Due Mar 2 at 10am 30 pts
⋮	 Rhetorical Critique of Partner's Formal Address Due Mar 13 at 4pm 5 pts

Team One

Clifford, Patrick O
Elliott, Gracyn E

McEachern, Monter

Post, Richard C

Team Two

Fang, Evelyn
Figlio, Elizabeth T

Team Nine

Jarvis, Lyle F
Rofael, Angela L

Team Three

Goerlich, Sierra Y
Gould, Gracie E

Team 10

Schminke, Henry
Wann, Taylor

Team Four

Hirasawa, Karen
Hobbs, Lauren E

Team 11

White, Hannah
Wong, Lexi

Team Five

Hobson, Cecile A
Jacobson, Kira L

Team Six

Putnam, Claire E
Jones, Michael G

Team Seven

Kaplan, Aaron D
Khan, Omar S

Team Eight

Week One

Monday, January 6: Central Thought Method. Audience analysis and advocacy.

Each student will make the case for each student's partner to enter the heavenly gates making use of the CTM.

Wednesday, January 8: An Introduction to the Rhetorical Bestiary.

An overview of the "Rhetorical Bestiary" – Partners should meet before class to prepare for "cold calling."

Week Two

Monday, January 13: The Theory, Model, and Practice of Rhetoric: Martin Luther King, "The March" and King's "Vicious Racists" speech.

Wednesday, January 15: No Class

Week Three

Wednesday, January 22: Written Examination on the Rhetorical Bestiary. 15 Points

Week Four:

Monday, January 27: Oral exam on the Rhetorical Bestiary. 15 Points
 Wednesday, January 29: Oral exam on the Rhetorical Bestiary

Week Five

Monday, February 3: The Theory, Model, and Practice of Rhetoric: Donald Trump at Jansville Wisconsin.

Wednesday, February 5: Impromptu Speeches on *New York Times* Headlines
 5 Points

Week Six

Written Version due 15 Points

Sunday, February 9: 11:45 PM

Oral versions 15 Points

Monday, February 10: Rhetorical Criticisms – 16 Minutes per team.

Wednesday, February 12: Rhetorical Criticisms – 16 Minutes per team

Week Seven

Monday, February 17: Rhetorical Criticisms – 16 Minutes per team

Wednesday, February 19: Rhetorical Criticisms – 16 Minutes per team

Week Eight

Monday, February 24: The Devil's Advocate: An Argument – Rehearsal

Wednesday, February 26: An Argument

Week Nine:

Monday, March 2: Formal Public Address 35 Points – 10 Minutes,
 Critique: 5 Points

Wednesday, March 5: Formal Public Address
 Critique: 5 Points

Week Ten:

Monday, March 9: Formal Public Address
 Critique: 5 Points

Wednesday, March 11: Formal Public Address
 Critique: 5 Points

Assignments

Impromptu Speeches

Week Five

Wednesday, February 5: Impromptu Speeches on *New York Times* and <https://www.foxnews.com> Headlines
5 Points

Each student will present a five-minute impromptu presentation drawn from the headlines of the *New York Times*. Using the central thought method, each student will offer a two to three-point analysis to answer the question posed by the impromptu question. The questions will draw from a careful reading of articles in the *New York Times*, the Fox News website (<https://www.foxnews.com>) and address the theme of polarization. Students will be judged with the criteria set forth on the Oral Exam Criteria. Students must turn in a self-evaluation within 24 hours.¹

Rhetorical Criticism

Rhetorical Criticism of a Trump Rally, Selected Speeches from the Iowa Liberty and Justice Celebration, and a Juxtaposition.

The research team will conduct a rhetorical criticism of the assigned Trump Rally, **Selected Speeches from the Iowa Liberty and Justice Celebration**, and a Juxtaposition of the Trump Rally with the speeches from the Iowa celebration. The rhetorical criticism will describe, interpret, and evaluate Trump's address as it is delivered in the context of the rally and the select speeches from the Iowa celebration. The research will conclude with a juxtaposition (a comparison) of the rally with the speeches from the Iowa celebration, using criteria the team believes are appropriate. The team will present an argument about the Trump rally and the **best speech delivered to the Iowa dinner speeches**. In this argument, the team will make a claim with evidence about relative effectiveness and morality of the rhetoric under study.

I. Written Presentation

Structure of Paper (4,000 words – excluding citations)
Word counts below are **suggested not required**.

- I. Introduction - 250 words
 - II. Analysis of Trump Rally - 1500 words
 - III. Analysis of Speech(es) from Iowa Celebration - 1500 words
 - IV. Juxtaposition - 500 words
 - V. Conclusions - 250 words
- Assessment Criteria (100 points)

Criterion One: Meets minimum scholarly standards

- 4,000-word essay that develops a well-developed judgment
- Use of MLA citation style

¹ Jared Sexton, *The People Are Going to Rise Like the Waters Upon Your Shore: A Story of American Rage* (Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint Press, 2017).

- Submitted to Canvas on due date
- Criterion Two: Quality of Scholarly Research
- Citations to the best research on the rhetorical situation
 - Evidence on the audience's exigence
 - Economic conditions of audience
 - Cultural backdrop of the audience
 - Transcript of Trump Rally included as appendix One
 - Transcript of Iowa Celebration Speech included as appendix Two
- Criterion Three: Quality of rhetorical criticism
- Description and interpretation of the rhetorical situation prompting the rally
 - Exigence (situation)
 - Audience
 - Speaker
 - Message
 - Judgment of Speech
 - Morality
 - Effectiveness

Criterion Four: The quality of the juxtaposition judgment: What to make of Trump's rhetoric and that of his democratic opponents?

In developing the rhetorical criticism, please:

- 1) Make use of concepts from the Rhetorical Bestiary.
- 2) Describe, interpret, and evaluate the relationship between Trump and his audience during MAGA and KMG rallies making use of Jarod Sexton's observations below.

"Making matters worse, the networks were covering these Trump rallies as if they were like any other political event from years past. The media was penned into an area by railings and the reporters made notes on legal pads or tapped out their reports on laptops while, a few feet away, supporters in the scrum by the stage were busy venting their anger and spewing racist and misogynistic slurs. Before I went into the crowds and reported, there was very little in the way of eyewitness accounts as to just what was brewing among Trump supporters. This meant that for months, the gathered crowds were able to spout one bigoted thing after another without repercussion. Meaning they got comfortable and daring in their hate.

I first saw this when an opening speaker referred to "Crooked Hillary Clinton" and a man yelled "Bitch!" At first, he seemed almost as surprised as anybody that the word had escaped his mouth, but when he took stock of the crowd and heard the others cheering and laughing, a smile broke across his face. Somebody clapped him on the back.

This was a change from the Trump rally in South Carolina aboard the USS Yorktown, where the crowd took their cues from the candidate and cheered on his racist rhetoric before retiring to the parking lot and harassing protestors. There, in Greensboro, I could tell Trump voters were beginning to feed off each other and Trump was able to take them up to the line of good taste and

let them take over where he could not. As a result, the rallies grew darker, more hateful, the atmosphere simmering with anger and pent-up rage.²

II. Oral Presentation: 16 minutes

The team will divide the speaking time evenly (approximately 8 minutes for each team member). Each team will:

1. Provide an overview of the conclusions they reached.
2. Explain what the team found in the Trump Rally.
3. Highlight the insights drawn from watching the speakers addressing the Iowa dinner.
4. Present a juxtaposition of the Trump rally with the speakers who addressed the Iowa dinner.
5. Offer one or two visual complements to illustrate the argument the team will make.

Team One

Clifford, Patrick O
Elliott, Gracyn E

Tuesday, March 29, 2016

Janesville, WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?407408-1/donald-trump-town-hall-meeting-janesville-wisconsin>

Team Two

Fang, Evelyn
Figlio, Elizabeth T

Wednesday, March 30, 2016

Eau Claire, WI

<https://factba.se/transcript/donald-trump-speech-eau-claire-wi-april-2-2016>

Team Three

Goerlich, Sierra Y
Gould, Gracie E

Monday, April 4, 2016

Milwaukee, WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?407634-1/donald-trump-campaign-rally-milwaukee-wisconsin>

General Election Rallies

Team Four

Hirasawa, Karen
Hobbs, Lauren E

Friday, August 5, 2016

Green Bay, WI

² Ibid., 92.

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?413593-1/donald-trump-endorses-speaker-ryan-ahead-primary>

Team Five

Hobson, Cecile A
Jacobson, Kira L

Wednesday, September 28, 2016, Waukesha, WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?415990-1/donald-trump-campaigns-waukesha-wisconsin>

Team Six

Putnam, Claire E
Jones, Michael G

Monday, October 17, 2016, Green Bay, WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?417019-1/donald-trump-campaigns-green-bay-wisconsin>

Team Seven

Kaplan, Aaron D
Khan, Omar S

Tuesday, November 1, 2016 Eau Claire, WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?417801-1/donald-trump-campaigns-eau-claire-wisconsin>

Post-Election Rallies

Team Eight

McEachern, Monter
Post, Richard C

Tuesday, December 13, 2016 West Allis, WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?420078-1/president-elect-trump-vice-president-elect-pence-deliver-remarks-west-allis-wisconsin>

Team Nine

Schminke, Henry
Wann, Taylor

Wednesday, October 24, 2018, Mosinee WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?453502-1/president-trump-political-violence-attack-democracy>

Team 10

White, Hannah
Wong, Lexi

Saturday, April 27, 2019

Green Bay WI

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?459875-1/president-trump-holds-rally-green-bay-wisconsin>

Team 11

Jarvis, Lyle F

Rofael, Angela L

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Milwaukee WI

Iowa Liberty and Justice Dinner

Pete Buttigieg speaking at the Liberty and Justice Dinner

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4827295/user-clip-pete-buttigieg-speaking-liberty-justice-dinner>

Transcript

<https://blog.4president.org/2020/2019/11/pete-buttigieg-addresses-iowa-democratic-party-liberty-and-justice-celebration.html>

Joe Biden speaking at the Liberty and Justice Dinner

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4828384/user-clip-joe-biden-speech>

Elizabeth Warren speaking at the Liberty and Justice Dinner

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4827150/user-clip-elizabeth-warrens-speech-iowa-liberty-justice-celebration>

Bernie Sanders speaking at the Liberty and Justice Dinner

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4827116/user-clip-bernie-speaking-iowa-liberty-justice-event-1-nov-2019>

Andrew Yang speaking at the Liberty and Justice Dinner

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4827059/user-clip-andrew-yang-speaks-iowa-democratic-party-liberty-justice-celebration>

Corey Booker speaking at the Liberty and Justice Dinner

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4827093/user-clip-cory-booker-makes-case>

Amy Klobuchar

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4827258/user-clip-amy-iowa-democratic-party-liberty-justice-celebration>

Final Public Address

Requirement:

Formal address with formal attire

10 Minutes

Use of problem-solution format
Presentation of peer-reviewed evidence
Eloquence as defined in class

All speakers will address this theme:

Polarization and its discontents: The Role of Public Address

I. All speakers will identify a problem that seems to have polarized the US audience. Here are some examples:

- A). Gun Control
- B). Immigration
- C). Impeachment
- D). Climate Change
- E). Political Correctness
- F). Health Care
- G). Socialism
- H). Capitalism

II. All speakers will identify a solution, one that addresses the composite audience.