B3 Seminar: King

Reed:

Asgian: Neat!

Rumsey: Sign-off… brotherhood… hard to dispute…

Wheat: In terms of the Rogerian argument part. Goes on a great big long rant. That doesn’t sound Rogerian?

* Schumacher: But Rogerian = understanding the argument. Can’t compromise…
* Paz: Whole letter is like the game of Jenga.
* Reed: Probably attacked him anyways.
* Asgian: To add to Zac’s point… he addresses the opposite argument often. Very Pathos-based.
* Rumsey: But when he refutes the whole negotiation angle. King effectively says “We’ve made up our part of the bargain, the store owners haven’t.”
* Schumacher: Malcolm X quote. You don’t stick a knife 9 inches into a man’s back, then pull it out six inches and call it compromise. King = less punchy.
* Eble talked
* Chandler: Method = Rogerian; End result isn’t.
* Eble: No compromise?
* Shaffer: Specifically deciding on a Classical argument… Cicero reference. A combination, connection to the Venn diagram.
* Asgian: Paragraph 20… connection to Thoreau, read from it (missed Shaffer’s point…changed topic a bit…)
* Orkwis: Nature of letter itself = effective. King’s refutation = giant, seven-page essay. Does so in a respectful, educated manner. Goes against conventional, contemporary stereotypes.
* Rumsey: Written from a jail; builds on his ethos, also pathos.
* Eble: Without the interwebs…
* Kunkel: To connect with Orkwis… how he writes is like the whole idea of civil disobedience. He always writes respectfully. He doesn’t cross lines.
* Eble: How?
* Kunkel: Says “I can see where you’re coming from.”
* Eble: Tonally, he can vacillate between demonstrating respect to the eight clergymen and passion towards his topic.
* Joe Pappalardo: Read the last paragraph… or two… is he disrespectful, sarcastic?
	+ Asgian: End = respectful part. Read from the final paragraph—developed the “us.”
	+ Shaffer: His “guilt trip” moments are more showing that he’s a human who gets angry. Referenced Coach Rodenberg, who is most frightening when he’s whispered. King controls his anger well. Anyone who is extremely angry and offended.
	+ Dickens: Discussed the ending… shared the “begging for forgiveness”
	+ Eble: Nice work…that’s antithesis…

Asgian: Why question the length of this whole thing?

* Joe: He doesn’t respond to criticism often…
* Schumacher: More lightness…
* Rumsey: He’s being cordial. Clergymen’s letter = condescending. King’s letter = he’s looking eye-to-eye with them. Alludes to Paul, Daniel… also addresses them as his “fellow” clergymen.
* Chandler: I usually don’t respond to criticism… time period. Heavily criticized. Usually doesn’t respond, as emotion plays a big part.
* Kunkel: He’s saying that the letter he’s writing is more than just a response. This becomes like a credo for the entire thing.
* Paz: Perfect opportunity for him to write a response that would get country-wide attention.
* Chandler: Leader of the movement is in jail… big deal! Not usually responding to criticism.
* Schumacher… public. Some of the ministers are black. Referenced the periodic sentence. This supports the claim that he’s writing to more than just them.
* Orkwis: You can still use that line… retracts…
* Henry: Can use that line if he’s talking to more than just the black audience. The “we” is used… still understand where he’s coming from.
* Andrew Carmichael: Trying to talk to the black or white audience. Would piss off the white people.
	+ Shaffer: Do you know who he’s calling the white moderate?
	+ Carmichael: All whites?
	+ Eble: Paragraph 23…
	+ Carmichael: Quite the word to start with…
	+ Shaffer: Worse than the people who are oppressing us. In paragraph 23, he says (reads a quote from paragraph 23). He would rather that you oppress him that stand by…
	+ Carmichael: KKK = too far gone to change. Not a great strategy…
	+ Asgian: He’s calling you out to induce change. He makes the audience feel what he’s felt, then asks for help.
	+ Pappalardo: …
	+ Paz: Connection to Americans.
	+ Pappalardo: Everyone here is lukewarm. Voting…
	+ Schumacher: White moderate comment.
	+ Rumsey: That’s scare tactics…
	+ Strotman: He’s not trying to pander…
	+ Rumsey: Civil disobedience as his platform.
	+ Strotman: Order / justice… order is more important.
	+ Shaffer: Discusses tension created with nonviolence. Creating tension = harboring injustice. Read from paragraph 24. Explained—doesn’t want disorder, but explains that things have to become disorderly for justice. Explained the boil example.
	+ Schumacher: T.S. Eliot… last temptation. Order versus justice. Ends are negative…

Paz: Sounds much like Thoreau. Why didn’t he quote Thoreau? Paragraph 15 / 16…

* Orkwis: I agree
* Asgian: Thoreau wasn’t that mainstream.
* Eble: yeah, not as mainstream.
* Nick Reed: This could be off… he’s already “out there”… Thoreau was arguing that he didn’t want to pay the taxes. Doesn’t want to associate with people … could have hurt
* Eble: Look at his allusions.
* Shaffer: Eight clergymen… Transcendentalist writings don’t appeal to them.
* Eble: Allusions… explained Biblical, national, faith-based allusions as Rogerian.
	+ Bonn: Connection… they don’t forget his ethos…
	+ Eble: He never condescends…
	+ Orkwis: Thoreau = Jesus’s actions. Civil disobedience. Like Eve’s actions.
	+ Eble: Jesus = an activist?
	+ Orkwis: Would make more sense to reference Jesus than Thoreau.
	+ Asgian: Jesus is the big one. Not the most mainstream guy. Many people didn’t like him. Questioning the Pharisees…
	+ Henry: Challenging = revolutionary…
	+ Eble: King / Jesus… expectations of Christ as military leader.
	+ Asgian / Strotman: Uses words.

Strotman: Many modifiers… cited the “fear-drenched” communities line.

Melee ensued. People talked. Schumacher came out on top.

Bonn: Wordiness separates him from others at the time.

* Orkwis: Brilliant rhetorically.
* Asgian: Deep-rooted in culture… history of North America. Blacks have been free for a short period of our time.

Did a read-around of the periodic sentence… Eble: What about it is effective?

* Asgian: Anaphora… like “I Have a Dream” speech
* Wheat: King’s voice works well. Can immediately connect to the power of the voice.
* Reed: He was a good public speaker. Same with Obama… good at public speaking.
* Melee of anti-Obama speaking tripe.
* Paz: Examples are … visceral. Violence = big. Case with his son…daughter… innocence of a child. Doesn’t focus on the violence part as much.
* Reed: Relatable instances. Difficult for parents to tell their kids that they can’t do something…little control doesn’t help.
* Paz: Shows disrespect…
* Orkwis: He doesn’t exaggerate it either; I hate a sob story.
* Eble: Any trend?
* Davis: Family… many people can connect with it…
* Asgian: Children… reiterated Reed’s point of view.
* Paz: The audience… gives people the idea of what is actually happening.
* Eble: This is like climax—building from physical elements to a more metaphysical one.
* Wheat: Starts with lynch mobs, moves to more modern issues…motel, coffee, Funtown…
* Paz: Gives an implicit reason of why black people might hate white people. Cited the example with his daughter…
* Schumacher: Shows how it affects both sides. Not just about whites towards blacks; it’s about how evolves on both sides. Feeling becomes mutual.

Asgian: Cup of endurance. Perfectly closes it out.