

Rhetorical Power in the Karmic Field of Field-Being Philosophy

Therese B. Dykeman

Introduction

We cannot help that firefly of an idea coming into the night of our existence. But as Einstein said, an idea cannot grow without language, unlike an emotion that waxes and wanes with or without verbal language. But ideas die immediately they appear if they do not reach the surface of words or if words don't catch them in flight.

Perhaps to reason and to speak in association with feeling are the most human of all human activities. "To speak," in particular to speak in terms of the art of rhetoric, will be the subject of this paper. Rhetoric itself will be investigated in terms of power, a concept central to Field-Being philosophy. Hence rhetoric will be analyzed in Field-Being terms as a "warp of power" or a "power element" in the metaphysical field of being i.e. the "field of power conrescence," "power" meaning activity rather than capacity.

The power of rhetoric arises from the power of human activity, hence it arises secondary to the power of being, but paradoxically rhetoric is a primary power in human activity and the activity of human becoming. Since, Field-Being philosophy defines being as activity, rhetoric must be defined then in relation to human becoming as a reflexive art of activity. Thus, being conceived of as human becoming, i.e., not merely arriving into existence but becoming more or less human, means engaging with and through the activity of rhetoric.

What then, is the power of rhetoric? Is it only a persuasive power? A power to prove, convince, or represent? Or in its differentiated oneness with becoming, does it become an ethical and/or epistemological power as well as a defining power? The argument presented here is that rhetoric as power in Field-Being Philosophy must be defined as a complex power: It is a defining power, and in that sense, a creative power. It is also a mediating power, in that it mediates between the I and the Other. Lastly, it is an effective power, one that both effects and affects human thoughts, actions, and passions.

This notion of the power of rhetoric has often been referred to in the rhetorical tradition established in ancient Greece as persuasive power. But, closer to what the power of rhetoric means in the theory of Field-Being Philosophy is the theory of 18th century rhetorician Adam Smith whose text on rhetoric was not discovered until the 20th century. Smith found that the very act of word choice in discourse, what he called the act of "propriety"¹ is as well an ethical act, one that is not only an individual act, but an act of community, a "sympathetic" act.² He also identified the hermeneutic power of propriety as taking on the heuristic tasks of invention. "Propriety" has some affinity to the Field-Being term "appropriation" which is an activity engaged in "affirming and defining itself in its self-becoming" but is inseparable from "the

appropriation of otherness.”³ Its activity is both transcendental and horizontal, and as hermeneutical, is engaged in *dao*-learning, and carried to the limits, pursues philosophical wisdom.

A figure of the Scottish Enlightenment, Adam Smith is known less for his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, *The Theory of Moral Sentiment*, and *Essays on Philosophical Subjects* than for his *The Wealth of Nations*, although these works are related and their meanings interdependent. Smith was knowledgeable in the 18th c. upsurge of science and social science; in fact, he is generally considered to have been a founder of modern social science. For him, rhetoric holds the “key position” in the interdisciplinary field of all human sciences.⁴ I have argued elsewhere that rhetoric itself also holds a “key position” in Field-Being philosophy.⁵ In defining rhetoric as a complex power in the karmic field of Field-Being, this paper considers Adam Smith’s insights into the process of rhetoric in relation to ethics and hermeneutics as they contribute to the understanding of rhetoric as power and of its meaning as power in Field-Being philosophy. Interestingly in the works of a more recent philosopher who has provided unique insights into language and power, Michel Foucault, there are back glances in Adam Smith’s mirror.⁶

1. Power and Language in Field-Being philosophy

The character of the field in the Field-Being metaphysical universe is a plenum “quintessentially actional and dynamic.”⁷ Power elements rise from its enduring center or concentration of power concrescence, power being “the ability of a thing to produce effects or to make a difference in other things or in the world.”⁸ Each power element determines and manifests power, and so “power, activity, and effects form an inseparable whole.”⁹ Hence, in terms of being a sphere of influence, each power element is a field.¹⁰

In simplified terms, in Field-Being being is conceived of as a process rather than as a thing, and that process or activity is one of power. It follows that the language of Field-Being “is not a language of substantial entities, that is, rigidly definable structural units which are sharply distinct and separable from each other by virtue of their clear-cut boundaries. It is rather a language of activity and power-or more decisively put, empowered activity” where each *enduring center of activity* is a concentration of power concrescence or “a growing-together of power elements and field individuals” owing to nodal formations of quintessential action.¹¹

Every power element including language “has a meaning to every other power element in the universe to the extent of their fielded tactility.”¹² So by its very nature as power element, the linguistic field of Field-Being is actional, relational, and compelling. In being relational, it bears meaning one element to another. “Meaning” is defined as a “configuration of relevance or significance serving as a medium of connectivity or interconnectivity in the universe of empowered activity” as it affects the dynamic direction and dispenses energy.¹³ Reflected in a symbolic medium or language, the meaning of a thing is its “perceived identity to a percipient

subject.”¹⁴ Hence, activity and power are foundational in Field-Being metaphysics, and language is a karmic manifestation of “significance” and “interconnectivity.”

Since Field-Being is a philosophy akin to the Einsteinian rather than the Newtonian universe, Albert Einstein’s thoughts on language are of interest: Language, Einstein believed, came about through linking commutable signs to sense-impressions, inventing further signs to establish relations between those other signs designating sense impressions. Not unlike Adam Smith, he supposed that rules were established to gain inner coherence and abstract concepts in language, lifting language from direct connection with sense impressions. While there may be thinking prior to language, mental growth and reasoning depend on language. Language, in its principles and laws, when simple and economical, for Einstein, probably held as much “religious mystery” as any physical concept.¹⁵

But more than language, rhetoric in its philosophical and aesthetic nature, being a power of words, is yet beyond words, hence beyond description. Still, rhetoric may be defined. Adam Smith’s second lecture defines rhetoric as the “propriety of language” aimed to achieve perspicuity in discourse.¹⁶ Rhetoric, therefore, means choosing ever evolving vocabulary, grammar, and style. By the “beauty” of style Smith means the “sentiment” the author wishes to convey and communicate “by sympathy to his hearers.”¹⁷ “Propriety” is the excellence in rhetoric. Necessary for “perspicuity” and “beauty,” “propriety” is formed democratically by the “custom of the people” and is acquired by a process of “association” formed “betwixt” words and behavior.¹⁸

Rhetoric is also involved with choices of logic or reasoning for both its discourse and organization.¹⁹ Smith’s rhetoric centers on two kinds of discourse, narrative and argument, claiming that all discourse seeks either to narrate facts or to prove propositions. This means that “narrative” subsumes as well description and exposition, which in a substantialist theory would be thus differentiated as forms. But discourses, for Smith, are not parts of a whole but rather modes of activity: either of narrating or proving. For this reason the examples Smith cites are often sought across disciplines as well as across “forms” of discourse. For the purpose here, the focus on rhetoric will be neither as “propriety” nor as discourse, but rather only on rhetoric as power.

2. Rhetoric as a Power in Field-Being Philosophy

Rhetoric as a power of the power of language of the power of the field, has in it undoubtedly, “religious mystery!” Analogous to the Field-Being “vital force,” the art of rhetoric synthesizes the transcendental or the “continuum of empowered activity” and karmic matter. The mystery also resides in the creative process born in the silence of the mind and ending in the silence of the world. Whereas rhetoric is created through human power, the most mankind can create of silence itself is to point to it through creating sound. Perhaps, like Beethoven, in repeating the closing chords of a symphony, announces in the end, silence.²⁰ In a sense music dies for silence. While rhetoric is capable of incorporating silence, undisciplined noise, though it may be

scintillating and pleasing, serves as mere distraction from silence. Although mystery lies as much in the power of silence as it does in the power of rhetoric, rhetoric unlike silence can be rationally understood in so far as it can be investigated, e.g. in its creative, mediating, and effective powers.²¹

1. First, rhetoric is a creative power. The nature of rhetoric as creative discourse is complex. It is creative in the sense that it discovers arguments, detects connections, and invents ways to continue its own creativity through its “convincing nature” but as important, through its “nodal forming.” For Adam Smith, because rhetoric is created by us, rhetoric which is most like each of ourselves is the most creative of all natures, hence styled as ourselves particularly not styled after another. In the same way it cannot be systematized from another. Thus, the creative system and coherence is one that arises from the principle of the particular rhetoric, rather than from some imposed organization.

Language comes into being according to both Adam Smith and Michel Foucault “at the point where the verb first appears” e.g. *go*, *run*.²² Since, the species of verb can be reduced to the verb form *to be*, the verb itself indicates “discourse” in that its essential function is to affirm an idea. On the other hand, without language there would be no verb *to be*. That creative power of signs and the creative power of sign connecting with the signified brings into being the possibility for the creative power of rhetoric. It is in Foucault’s view of language as spatial and hence “l’ordre du discours” and of power in its actualization, that his view differs from Smith’s.²³ So, although Foucault’s notion of discourse as a field of specialist ideas is insightful, it is not as amenable to Field-Being.²⁴

Rhetorical discourse as part of the fabric of essays, drama, poetry and as wholly the fabric of orations is one of the great powers of language creation. Rhetorical discourse embodies a connectiveness, and an effectiveness, i.e. a persuasiveness and a meaningfulness that when eloquent, generates as well intellectual and sensual pleasure. Hence, in its karmic labor the power of rhetoric may be defined as a managing power of discipline and art. This definition proves similar in its labor to Aristotle’s choosing of “available means.”²⁵

Power of creative choice is an initiating one, for it is forever propagating, i.e. from rhetoric is bred further thought, action, and/or passion, i.e. further rhetoric in words or action. A narrative, for instance, with its choices of fact and fiction, causes new thinking and verbal journeying involving the human abilities for “sympathy, imagination, reason and reflection.”²⁶ Those who hear or read the narrative are convinced or confounded or not-convinced, but they are nevertheless continuing the creative process simply by engaging in the experience of hearing or reading, as well as re-thinking, re-feeling, and re-telling the narrative in some fashion. This can be partly explained in Field-Being terms: living power elements, or vital strands, empower elements of rhetoric that recursively empower vital strands.

From the time ancient Greek Sophists turned their gaze from the stars to the human mind and heart, the inquiry into the defining character of what it means to be human became as well, what is the nature of rhetoric? What is this power to speak and to speak convincingly? How is it done,

how is it done well? The mystery leads us on in the sciences and the arts to discover answers. From the artists of high ability to the prosaic inquiries of politicians and advertising agencies with serious purposes, the desire is for creative rhetoric, though novelty often suffices. Novelty, however, is created only for its own sake and unlike rhetoric is thus barren.

The creative power of rhetoric is not confined to the act of writing or speaking, but arises in part of its own accord in its own time through thought.²⁷ It lies in both the idea and the articulation of the idea: the discovery of or insight into truth and the articulation of that “truth.” The nature of truth in Field-Being is an evolving truth, a truth in process, but when it is committed to karmic rhetoric, it becomes in one sense substantial, i.e. paradoxically in the committing of it to words, it as yet continues as process. Though Socrates was a consummate rhetorician, his fear was the mortality of truth in the karmic word, yet he demonstrated the living, active nature of it despite the karmic word, as this discussion here and now illustrates.²⁸

Perhaps great philosophers and scientists labored on enhancing their ideas through rhetorical expression in order that their ideas succeed. Darwin made his case rhetorically through descriptions of “tangled banks,” Priestly in descriptions of chemical experiments through nuances of color, Descartes with his both profound and eloquent argument “I think therefore I am.” But as Hegel believed, it is not “enhancement” ultimately, but the integral power of an idea interacting with the power of words in the “gradual taking on of form.”²⁹ Not fifty years later, Hegel appears to have reached some compatibility with Smith when he claimed that figuration was central to the activity of philosophy: “the process of *Bildung* is inseparable from an inherently rhetorical act of doubling and representation—in the three forms of figuration, hermeneutics, stylistics, and polemical disputation with an Other,”³⁰ [*Bildung* meaning in this case a process of adapting power, of self formation, and understanding.] Perhaps, it would follow from Smith’s dictum that philosophy, like that rhetoric which is most similar to the one who created it, is truly a most creative human activity. The mystery remains in the necessity of rhetoric’s creative power’s joining the human becoming with the becoming of the universe.

2. Now to the second, or mediating power of rhetoric. John F. Kennedy’s rhetorical question, “Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country” demonstrates the power of rhetoric that mediates in this case as a public intervening agent or oration between Kennedy and his fellow citizens. By the mediating power I mean that public reach between human beings that can also be privately communicated as “I adore you” “Please believe me” “I hear your pain.” In Field-Being terms, the power element of rhetoric, in this way becomes a mediating power engaged in the activity of forming relation-fields. This mediating power retains, especially through imagination, creativity.

If the power of rhetoric arises from the power of human beings, then it in turn must be a mediating power which performs what Adam Smith referred to as *sympathy*. *Sympathy*, for Smith meant interesting oneself in the fortunes of another and rendering their happiness necessary to one’s own.³¹ For Smith *propriety* is the stylistic mode of action by which *sympathy* can be won, that is, by communicating correctly, clearly, and appropriately.

Rhetoric is as well the genus to which all communication is species, and it is the mode which wins the internalized audience, the “impartial spectator” of conscience. Hence, rhetoric as a mediating power involves choices at once communicative and ethical. It extends the creative choices of “available means” for *logos* to *pathos/ethos* with its sense of *sympathy*. In fact, Smith breathes the eighteenth century terms *sympathy*, *propriety*, and *sentiment*, from the essence of rhetoric.

Propriety has a long history as Stephen McKenna summarizes it. The word has meant “what appears before the eye” denoting inwardly receptive and outwardly projective, and has also meant “what is fitting in time, place, and circumstance” which reveals *propriety*’s emotional and cognitive features as well as its hermeneutic and ethical features, distinguishable but not separate. Here *propriety*’s affinity to the Field-Being “art of appropriation” where the activity of “I” can only be so by addressing the “non-I,” i.e. “*I am* only possible in connection with the *they are*.”³²

The single most important aspect of effective communication for Smith is the appropriate expression of sentiment. By *sentiments* Smith meant emotions that also function as judgments.³³

As we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the manner in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation...it is by the imagination only that we can form any conception of what are his sensations.³⁴

Recent neuroscientists believe that human brains contain mirror neuron systems that permit social meaning of behavior and emotions that transmit biologically. When you see someone in pain, pain is activated in you because of these mirror neurons. Activated at birth, these systems provide a basis for language and thus linguistic interaction. Patricia Greenfield, U.C.L.A. psychologist, believes that, “Mirror neurons provide a powerful biological foundation for the evolution of culture.”³⁵ Hence biology and culture are not fundamentally separate, for “mirror neurons absorb culture directly.” The knowledge that brain cells fire when behaviors are witnessed, e.g. a basketball player missing a shot, or a rival kissing one’s lover, does not contradict but rather adds the biological connection more immediately than common sense dictated. For what Smith said concerned “conceptions” of feeling rather than merely biological reaction, which may, on occasion, be based on miss-seeing, misreading, or misunderstanding. Still, the “inner connectiveness” remains.³⁶

With conception also comes judgment. We judge of any affection proportionately to the cause as it tallies with our own: “every faculty in one man is the measure by which he judges of the like faculty in another...I neither have, nor can have, any other way of judging about them.”³⁷ Both sympathy and judgment engage ethics. Smith agrees with modern science that there are principles in human nature which compel interest in another’s fortune. But to have knowledge about what that fortune is and what the other’s true sentiments [feelings that function with judgment] are, necessarily relies on discourse.

One question for judgment is then, what is the just response to a particular cause? Of all rules of morality, justice, to which Smith likens the rules of grammar, is the most precise, the others more indeterminate like the rules of critics. This system of justice is rooted in *propriety* rather than in prudence or benevolence. Hence justice becomes the ethical effect of *propriety* or of the mediating power of rhetoric.

With perspicacious insight, Smith also contended another close relationship connection between language and “sympathy” or empathy: “Society and conversation ...are the most powerful remedies for restoring the mind to its tranquility, if, at any time it has lost it.”³⁸ This insightful notion has now been developed to an art in the healing consolation theories and practices of modern psychology.

Communication, insofar as it creates a standard of public discourse, engages the power of rhetoric in its heuristics and ethics. However, when communication remains in the disengaged power of the media itself, rather than in its rhetorical discourse of “truth” and morals, its mediating power of *sympathy* in Smith’s sense of the word cannot exist.

Rhetoric’s power to tell something to another person and its power to tell something of the inner person, is a mediating power to at once reveal and educate. The “something” is its protreptic subject and heuristic method in that it imparts direction and knowability from one to another. The “something” involves the *perspicuity*, the necessary complement to *propriety*, “what appears before the eye.” *Perspicuity*, which originally meant the power of being seen through, can be compared to light for the eye of the body and the eye of the mind that makes possible seeing clearly and profoundly.

3. Third is the effective power of rhetoric and probably the power most often the subject of discussion. Effectiveness, involves an audience as Lloyd Bitzer has eloquently stated:

Rhetoric always requires an audience, even in those cases when a person engages himself or ideal mind as an audience.³⁹

Within this effective power lie both the aesthetic dimension which moves the passions of an audience and the rational dimension which convinces an audience. Withstanding its creative and meditative power, an audience responds best with an effective power of rhetoric—the beautiful, the elegant, the memorable, the striking, the clearest and most logical or in Adam Smith’s terms that which has the most *propriety*. Smith’s interest is not in logic per se in his rhetoric, but logic as it is employed appropriately and thus most effectively.⁴⁰ The rhetoric with the most *propriety* is that which is perspicacious, offering perfect rendering and aptness. Hence, as effective power, rhetoric appeals appropriately to both the feelings or passions and the mind. Still the point is that rhetoric’s effective power, though enclosing a creative and sympathetic mediating power, appropriates a “dynamic direction and dispenses energy” to bring about effects.

While in a sense there is no distinction in Field-Being philosophy between speaker-rhetoric-audience as they participate in the field of being or the awesome fabric, but in the karmic sense,

the three are separate and impinging on one another. In one way this “impinging” is brought about by the effective power of rhetoric. Here we arrive at the ethical dilemma of this effective power that began with Socrates’ questions about rhetoric, does rhetoric make things appear beautiful or be beautiful? Rhetoric as a right action in face of the possibility of deception, is it a good thing or a bad thing, or is it by its very nature an art of deception?

Why is there need, therefore, for rhetoric at all? Not primarily from the first principle of human nature, self-preservation, for we can with minimal language, perhaps accomplish this; although, a powerful drama or speech might momentarily save lives. Primarily, the need for rhetoric arises from the second principle of human nature, the need for distinction, that is, self-perpetuation through influence.⁴¹ Perhaps, the first consideration is the simplest expressed in the most abstract and metaphysical verb “to be.” In saying, “I am” we are saying that we are “self-preserved” i.e., exist! But how we say “I am” with distinction, is by saying in what way we exist—beautifully, grandly, intelligently etc. Thus with rhetoric as an effective power, we seek to distinguish ourselves by impressing our audience. No matter how much we seek to affect our audience with the truth, goodness, or beauty of something, we are as well seeking for ourselves recognition. Hence, such a metaphysical issue as this is at once shaded with ethical issues.

Humankind’s rhetorical activity for self-preservation beams through the—arranged, structured, and stylized—Altamira cave drawings and Summerian clay tablets giving distinction not only to the cave artists and tablet writers, but to the whole of humankind. Through rhetoric’s appropriating power, Shakespeare’s question, “To be or not to be?”—effects, reflection and Grant Wood’s “American Gothic” – effects questioning who are we, what is our relationship with each other within and without our houses, our relationship to the land? In other words, how we should or should not be?

Conclusion:

Adam Smith concluded that the last verb to be instituted in the history of language, must have been the verb to-be, *I am* being a most abstract and metaphysical concept, hence a most philosophical. In philosophy, the power of rhetoric, initiated in the surprise, wonder, and admiration generated in the meeting of the mind with the universe, is developed in the making of connections in what at first is always disjointed and separate as in *I* and *am*, *I* and *not-I*. As rhetoric is integral to both the most abstract and the most concrete connective-ness in Field-Being theory, it is so, as this paper has argued, in its power to define or create, to mediate, and to effect, which power then develops respectively the generative, the ethical, and the aesthetic. The power of rhetoric, arising from the sub-verbal power in the universe and from the power of the human mind and passion in its formation,⁴² with nudging power at once reveals the present as it illuminates the pathway into future. In all, rhetoric as a power of activity promotes *activity*.

NOTES

1. In Confucianism, “propriety” is an oft repeated term referring to a state of virtue. Smith defines the term as being closer to a Daoist interactive power between oneness and manifestation, between man and “heaven,” ever being worked out, one human being to another; yet, he keeps the essential Confucian meaning.

2. Adam Smith, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, ed. J.C. Bryce (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1985), p.40. While Smith had been Chair of Logic and Rhetoric at the University of Glasgow, note these lectures, “reported by a student in 1762-63” were not discovered until 1958 and not published until 1963, hence neglected for centuries as opposed to Smith’s books on ethics and economics and unavailable for analyzing them with his theory in mind. Yet Smith remarks at the beginning of *his The Wealth of Nations*: “The propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another” seems to be rather than an original principle in human nature to be “the necessary consequence of the faculties of reason and speech” and “to be found in no other race of animals.” *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, ed. Edwin Cannan (New York: The Modern Library, 1937), p.13.

3. Lik Kuen Tong, “The Art of Appropriation: Towards a Field-Being Conception of Philosophy” *International Journal for Field-Being* 1, no.1 (2000), p. 1.

4. As indicated in the above note, the discipline of economics would be included.

5. Unpublished essay, “Rhetoric in Field-Being: The Apophatic Turn,” delivered at the 2005 APA meeting in New York City.

6. Foucault had said, “Language turns back upon itself; it encounters something like a mirror...it possesses but a single power: That of giving birth to its own image in a play of mirrors that has no time limit” *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1977), p. 54.

7. Lik Kuen Tong, “The Field-Being Vision and the Field Principle: What is Distinctive About Field-Being Philosophy?” January 9, 2005.

8. Lik Kuen Tong, “3. The Analytics of Empower Activity (I) Power and Power Elements: What is a Thing.”

9. Lik Kuen Tong, “3. The Analytics of Empower Activity (I) Power and Power Elements: What is a Thing.”

10. Lik Kuen Tong, “6. The Analytics of Empowered Activity (IV): Diremptions or Procreative Events: The Self-Definition of Power Concrescence.”

11. Lik Kuen Tong, “The Field-Being Vision and the Field Principle: What is Distinctive About Field-Being Philosophy?” January 9, 2005.

12. Lik Kuen Tong, “The Dynamic Plenum: The Unfolding of Empowered Activity in the Openness of Truth.”

13. Lik Kuen Tong, “The Field-Being Preference.”

14. Lik Kuen Tong, “The Dynamic Plenum: The Unfolding of Empowered Activity in the Openness of Truth.”

15. Albert Einstein., *Ideas and Opinions* (New York: Bonanza, 1954) pp. 335-37.

16. Adam Smith, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, pp. 4-5.

17. Ibid. p.25.

18. Ibid., pp. 4-5. Note: It is the “better sort,” i.e. gentlemen, lady “from which the rules of purity of stile are to be drawn” and standards formed.

19. Ibid. For Smith, discourse is of two kinds, narrative and argument, and argument of two kinds, didactic and rhetorical. The method of narrative being description, and of argument logic, the emphasis in the one is on event and in the other proving a proposition, hence for both the emphasis is on activity. N.b. pp. 62 -63. The didactic offers opposing arguments; the rhetorical but one. The didactic, appropriate

for science, uses both the Socratic and the Aristotelian methods, 97-147. The emphasis here is how logic is used convincingly.

20. Perhaps “silence” unifies with sound and is changed by it, e.g. the silence evolved at the end of a speech, in the intermittence of conversation, or music, or wherever it is experienced appears to be in a sense to be part of and yet to differ.

21. Susanne K. Langer has given insight into the underlying universe of both rhetoric and music as one of symbols, which she claims “render our world” giving us pain as well as power. In agreement with Smith, she sees morals as evolving. (Note her *Philosophical Sketches* and *Philosophy in a New Key*).

22. Michel Foucault refers to Adam Smith’s “Considerations Concerning the Forming of Language,” *The Order of Things*, ed. R.D. Laing (NY: Pantheon Books, 1970), p. 93. Discourse is a central term for Foucault, defined in a number of different ways in various texts: as language, as the product of groups of signs, as a group of statements belonging to a single system of formation, etc.

23. Edward W. Said, “Foucault and the Imagination of Power,” pp. 149-55, *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, ed. David Couzens Hoy (New York: Basil Blackwell, Ltd., 1986).

24. Note Foucault’s *The Archeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. Sheridan (New York: Pantheon, 1972).

25. Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric: “the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatsoever” (*Rhetoric*, Bk. I, ii, 1).

26. For Adam Smith, the same basic principles (abilities necessary for the process of forming an opinion as to one’s own conduct) are also involved in the process of propriety in the creation of rhetoric.

27. The poet Wallace Stevens, when asked if he didn’t feel guilty writing poetry on insurance company time, assuaged his questioner by responding, “Sometimes in the evening when I am walking in the park, I think about actuarial tables.” Thinking in words or numbers cannot be limited by arbitrary time constraints. Ironically, the power of Stevens’ rhetoric remains in his poetry not in his insurance tables.

28. I understand that there is no Chinese word/idea for absolute “Truth,” that so preoccupies western thought.

29. Education and development as well as taking on form or *Bildung*, the philosophical concept in G.W.F. Hegel, appropriates and reflects his traditional rhetorical training. Hegel’s philosophy as the story of *Bildung* “sees the act of figuration as central to the philosophical activity,” for Hegel argues “The power of the Spirit is only as great as its expression.” 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit* focus of John H. Smith’s *The Spirit and its Letter: Traces of Rhetoric in Hegel’s Bildung* (Ithaca, Cornell U: 1988): 10.

30. Ibid. p.28.

31. Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* 1759 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1971), p. 2.

32. Lik Kuen Tong.” The Art of Appropriation: Towards a Field-Being Conception of Philosophy,” *International Journal for Field-Being* 1, no. 1 (2002).

33. Stephen J. McKenna, *Adam Smith: The Rhetoric of Propriety* (Albany: SUNY, 2006), pp.88-90.

34. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, p. 2. My underlining.

35. Sandra Blakeslee, “Cells That Read Minds,” *The New York Times*. (January 10, 2006; Section F1, Science Desk.).

36. Adam Smith’s thinking is reflected in his theory of economics as a creative enterprise as he explains, a synthetic system, a “circular flow” that involves “processes of adjustment rather than equilibrium states,” and “interdependence of economic phenomena.” *The Wealth of Nations*, Books I-III [1776] (London: Penguin Books, 1997), pp. 83, 81.

37. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, p. 29.

38. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, p. 40.

39. McKenna, p.119.

40. In Lecture 25 of his *Rhetoric* Smith argues that before an audience, arguments “cannot be very intricate,” so he proposes rather to focus on the “method of choosing them” and the “manner of arranging them,” p. 138, this after he has distinguished the Socratic method from the Aristotelian, Newtonian from Cartesian, pp. 146-7.

41. “Distinction” was particularly noted as an ethical-political concept in the 18th century, especially in the philosophy of Mercy Otis Warren’s 1788 *Observations on the Constitution*.

42. Adam Smith believed that even our economic pursuits are a “necessary consequence of the faculties of reason and speech,” *Wealth of Nations* and that it is a natural desire to direct others, an instinct upon which the faculty of speech may be founded, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* .