

9 The Lecture as Testimony: In a Technological Age

Ronald C. Arnett

Abstract

The question of this essay, shaped by a changing historical moment of a digital age, examines the old as garnering renewed importance. The text is old wine ever vital and now rediscovered in new wine skins of a digital age. This essay invites a creative opening for a historically important standpoint: the necessity of the understanding the rhetorical importance of the lecture as testimony in an era of technological change. The digital world in this case permits the old to find new energy and purpose in a changing rhetorical environment where the constant of text (that which matters) propels both a traditional and an ever-changing technological world. In a digital world of blurred issues of time, space, and speaker/audience, one must ask a basic question: Is there a rhetorical rationale for reliance on the lecture in a digital and information age? I contend that the connecting link between the lecture as a traditional form of rhetoric and digital modalities is the notion of text.

Marshall McLuhan (1993) considered the lecture a “hot medium,” which suggests that it excludes and denies participation. He advocated forms of education that include and invite active engagement, “cool media.” He wanted education to forego telling and invoke participatory discernment. “McLuhan advocated discovery learning, whereby students would find things out for themselves by working collaboratively on topics that interested them” (Kuskis, 2011, p. 319). The demand for a cool medium that invokes high participation made the lecture a prime enemy. The traditional assumption about the lecture is that it invites passive learning through mere knowledge transfer. In 1967, McLuhan contended that the lecture was finished. His criticism is not without numerous supporters. A simple search for the death of the lecture renders 31,000 titles since McLuhan’s announcement. However, the death of the lecture in reality aligns with the famous quote from Mark Twain, “The reports of my death have been greatly exaggerated” (quoted from Messent, 2007, p. 22). The exaggeration of Twain was two-fold: he was not dead and he did not offer the quote attributed to him (Messant, 2007). Concurrently, I contend that the lecture is not dead and repetitive predictions about its demise exaggerate reality. In a media age, the lecture acts as a testimony accessible to a much larger world.

Keywords: Lecture as testimony; Digital age; Testimonies of ghosts, Globalization

9.1 Introduction

Exaggerations are common fare, from statements about the usefulness of a given product to assertions tweeted by politicians on the world scene. With the advent of television, we witnessed predictions about the power of communication with a small number of channels dominating news. Predictions of the demise of radio were premature, as were the claims that television would become useless in an Internet age. The truth is that each form of media has a place and continues to contribute. Pejorative statements about the collapse of educational practices often generate initial confidence and then falter with their success. Predicted hegemony of influence is consistent with modernity’s unifying inclination with destruction invited by undue confidence; modernity kills that which comes to define banality or extreme

commonness. The critique of the lecture has reached this point, banality, making its resurgence possible and perhaps inevitable in a digital age.

In this essay, I offer a story about the lecture as testimony functioning as a cool medium in a media age. The first section, "Engaging the Text in a Digital Age," examines a place for unified ground of participation, which requires "text" as the pivotal point upon which information historically gathers its influence. The second section examines "Tradition that Matters" as a backdrop for understanding acknowledged diversity. The third section, "Testimony as Content and Sentiment," moves the lecture from a modern framework of control and imposition of information to attentiveness to ideas situated within a given perspective. The final section, "Testimonies of Ghosts," explores the 'not said' as a continuing companion to 'the said' of the lecture in a digital age; it is the 'inarticulate' that adds texture to the 'articulate' (Taylor, 1992).

9.2 Engaging the Text in a Digital Era

In 2012, Peggy Jubien, wrote "A Phenomenology of the Podcast Lecture." The essay frames the nature of the lecture in a world of technological complexity. The podcast lecture displays differences between real time and recorded addresses. Jubien (2012) begins with a basic assumption: the two forms of lecture are different, and it is foolish to compare them. Technological media shift space, moving the conversation from the immediate to an enduring present that one can revisit. Shifting space defines the podcast lecture in an era marked by routine use of mobile devices. The "students' sense of place is not static" (Jubien, 2012, p. 77). Not only can the place in which one attends the lecture shift, but one's focus of attention can move between and among content, response, and surroundings. Listening with a mobile device also permits the current physical environment to fade, blurring into the background. When the lecture is done 'well' and captures the attention of the attendee, the presence of the person speaking captures the moment. If one's attention wanes for some reason, the technology permits one to rewind and provides a second chance at engagement with the speaker. The voice of the speaker invites awareness of content and organization; the sound either captivates or decreases interest in the lecture. Jubien cites Gardner Campbell's astute observation: "There is magic in the human voice" (Jubien, 2012, p. 80). The human voice accompanied by the flexibility of use of the mobile device announces the interplay of technology and person, permitting dexterous listening to a lecture repeatedly or in an order other than the expectations of the original speaker. Jubien (2012) reminds the reader of Harold Innis's (1991) understanding of new technologies as reconstituting space and time. Interestingly, the podcast invites forgetfulness of one's own corporeality; the voice of another moves one into another dimension. It seems that the physical moment is "completely forgotten" (Jubien, 2012, p. 82). One-way communication, propelled by the magic of a human voice, manifests an invitation to increasing insight with maneuverability of mobile devices through the ability to repeat visits to podcasts, which acts as an educational opportunity to revisit the demanding, the complex, and the initially unclear.

The changing nature of the lecture in a technological age announces the texture of such a moment, articulated insightfully by Jude Fransman and Richard Andrews (2012) in "Rhetoric and the Politics of Representation and Communication in the Digital Age." The authors discuss the shifting role of learners in a multimodal society. The audience and the speaker meet together via a "digitally mediated world" (Fransman & Andrews, 2012, p. 125). Fundamental to rhetoric is the text, which is the content artifact under observation. The context or place of

rhetoric is also a historical given. Mobility of devices permits the shifting of context within which one receives the text of a lecture. Text is a constantly crucial element in rhetoric. The text remains, but must now join a global media reality of shifting context from which reception occurs, altering the interpretive nature of the event.

Semiotic engagement with a text requires reading that shifts signification as the context shifts the reading act. The digital world no longer presupposes unity between text and context. Rhetoric in a digital age transforms from an epistemological question to an ontological issue as the context of being in the world shifts and recasts one's reading of a given text. In the examination of five essays featured in a special issue of *Learning, Media, and Technology*, one discovers the power of text in quite different locations and contexts. The essays move from the text of YouTube videos to Facebook conversations to PowerPoint presentations to the academic lecture. In each case, rhetoric centers around and responds to a given text. Additionally, the texts are "multimodal" (Fransman & Andrews 2012, p. 128) with questions pivoting on the relationship between those involved in the event of learning and the rhetoric of information presentation within a number of modalities. The constant in the examination of the interplay of rhetoric and the digital world is a basic fact: the text remains the center of examination. The digital world expands our conception of the text, as the notion of text remains the heart of rhetorical examination and conversation. The text houses what matters in the digital exchange; the power of rhetoric lives within text that gathers attention and announces what matters.

9.3 Tradition that Matters

I now pause from addressing the interplay of rhetoric and the digital world in order to explicate an older, traditional conception of text centered on the lecture, defined as presentation of and about what matters. The lecture has historically structured material that matters with the rhetorical objective of assisting the learning of another. My contention is that this historical moment situates the lecture as a crucial communicative form, announcing what matters and, additionally, requiring others to listen and discern between and among ideas worthy of response and those best left forgotten. This historical moment of constant narrative and virtue contention (MacIntyre, 2007) and ongoing acts of misinformation (Helfand, 2016) moves rhetoric from engaging a text that matters to doing so in a manner similar to the communicative act of testimony. Amit Pinchevski (2012) defines testimony as a public accounting for "the search for a missing record" (Pinchevski, 2012, p. 149). In order to explicate this position on the lecture as testimony, I turn to essays offering two quite different perspectives on the lecture, coming from 2015 and 1956, respectively. These two contrasting orientations yield an understanding of lecture as testimony suitable for engaging a communicative world of routine narrative and virtue contention. The assertion that the lecture is a form of testimony announces the intimate connection between rhetoric and a text that matters and the fact that both sentiment of position and temporal reasoned insight situated within a given narrative or paradigm offer insight void of Universal Truth. The following essay from Empedocles: *European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication* links lecture and testimony in a manner consistent with a world no longer enamored with modern assumptions of Universal Truth, too often unmasked as imposed and hegemonic power. Ramsey Eric Ramsey's (2015) essay, "Letters on the Hermeneutic Education of

Dwelling,” asserts that the lecture is public testimony. The lecture is a public test of opinions, moving ideas from the private space of reading, writing, and self-talk to collective engagement. In order to make his case about the power of testimony, Ramsey locates the lecture between two extremes: abstract pure logic and the sermon. He provides an intellectual landscape that unifies content and conviction. The lecture as rhetoric about a text that matters resembles public testimony that dwells within the interspace of evidence/facts and uniqueness of perspective and standpoint; such discourse seeks an audience and simultaneously expects response.

The lecture is one of the traditional conceptions of rhetoric in action, invoking a tradition about public discourse over questions that matter as they influence an audience that participates in response. The notion of testimony invokes the importance of tradition and standpoint; one testifies to something greater than one’s own opinion. Granted, there is considerable questioning about the importance of tradition in a contemporary society – a digital age. Argument over tradition directed significant public conversations, such as the debate between Hans-Georg Gadamer and Jürgen Habermas, where they parted on the role of “tradition” (Teigas, 1995). Habermas critically rejected the vitality of tradition; he stressed the necessity of enacting discourse ethics with the objective of discerning temporal truth pointing to universal applicability. Gadamer, on the other hand, emphasized an existential fact – we are already part of an ongoing conversation, nominally termed “tradition.” Multiple conversations reflect the reality of multiple traditions. We live in more than one conversation and tradition, and we engage others situated within traditions different from our own. Gadamer redirected our modern focus of attention back to tradition without assuming that only one hegemonic perspective triumphs. Gadamer’s understanding of tradition is plural, tradition(s), in contrast to a single metanarrative or universal. Gadamer, like Hannah Arendt (1961), placed tradition(s) as the embodiment of a living connection between past and future. Tradition is the connecting link between past and future; tradition testifies to the reality of each. Traditions provide rhetorical power that testifies to what matters. Traditions provide the ground from which one pushes off, permitting movement to and fro between past and future. Such a perspective on tradition permitted Immanuel Kant (1798/2012) to differentiate between ‘imagination’ and ‘fantasy’, with the former housing the heart of genuine creativity. Imagination requires pushing off something real that calls forth a response; the real is tradition. Traditions make imagination possible. The lecture functions as public testimony of a given tradition that situates the significance of events. As a lecture engages a given tradition and frames a text that matters, we invite the unleashing of human imagination. From the perspective of lecture as testimony responsive to a tradition that matters, rhetoric understands a text as something capable of propelling the minds and hearts of an audience in a particular direction. Lecture as rhetorical testimony announces a given tradition via a distinctive standpoint. Lectures, understood as testimony, do not solidify or reify truth; they offer ideas and potential actions from a situated perspective that calls forth public hearing where ideas must bear the test of public scrutiny in the midst of empirical and phenomenologically congregated witnesses.

9.4 Testimony as Content and Sentiment

The lecture as testimony functions as a communicative voice for an inescapable interplay of evidence and standpoint of tradition. Presenting an informed account of a tradition requires

students to attend and listen to a particular rhetorical interpretation. The information is a testimony of responsiveness to learning garnered from the solitude of studying and learning. The lecture as testimony functions as a fulcrum of insight, enhancing public engagement and opinion with the objective of facilitating further conversation. The public testimony of the lecture joins the rhetorical functions of perspective/interpretation with responsive internal student learning.

The lecture is an open letter that testifies by inviting others into 'why', the importance of something, and the practical implications of the 'how' of doing something (Ramsey, 2015). The specific gathering of how and why is important in a world defined by Alasdair MacIntyre (1981/2007) as routinely contentious and without agreement on what should be the narrative and virtue structures guiding this historical moment. One loses the importance of ideas and events when the 'why' and the 'how' fragment into separate and discrete acts. The lecture as a form of rhetorical testimony addresses an era of fragmentation by attempting to unite the why and how of ideas through the announcement of standpoint, tradition, and position. Such public discourse requires student participation that is attentive and responsive. The field of communication has a long tradition of argument and debate, lending insight into pragmatic navigation of an era defined by disagreement. The lecture in this historical moment illuminates conversations propelled by content and sentiment in the pursuit of truth(s) that defies a final word. The lecture as testimony ever invites responses to the text.

The lecture in an age of narrative and virtue contention unites an Age of Reason with an Age of Sentiment (Arnett, 2014); there is an integration of organized evidence situated within commitments that announce 'why' something matters. Lectures of import point us to ideas of value; they introduce an audience to sentiments of profound significance. The French Enlightenment and the Scottish Enlightenment of reason and sentiment, respectively, function in tandem; the combination of reason and sentiment nurture the lecture as testimony. The lecture as the rhetoric of testimony brings together information, data, and evidence situated on and within sentiment of standpoint. A rhetor testifies with performative integration of reasoned ideas and human sentiment, inviting students to become active witnesses capable of addressing elements of the presentation. Linking of reason and sentiment acknowledges awareness of a 21st century given: we live in an era composed of multiple traditions and competing truths that constitute truth with a small 't', and efforts to claim a universal Truth with a capital 'T' require unmasking.

The lecture in this historical moment humbly brings forth ideas with conviction, akin to the labor of a poet of communication, who offers a pragmatic assessment of a given subject coupled with a reminder that the world no longer operates with undisputed clarity of direction. In an era of routine uncertainty, public examination of multiple positions necessitates reflective and thoughtful examination of opinions. Education in such an era takes on the pragmatic charge of discerning between and among testimonies provided by a testimonial rhetoric. The lecture as testimony acts as a performative explication of the how and why, forging temporal insight in a world defined by perpetual quandary. The rhetorical importance of the lecture centers on testimony that unites reason and sentiment with a basic educational assertion central to this historical moment: listening with a questioning ear is a prerequisite for learning in a time of unprecedented dispute. Few modes of communication are better equipped to contribute to the public domain of learning than the lecture as

testimony. Understanding in an era of difference must take seriously perspectives of content and standpoints of sentiment; one must comprehend the influence of each.

In a media age, rhetoric remains tied to the text, and the lecture testifies to a text composed of reason and sentiment that demands active and critical listening. In such a moment of technological diversity in communication channels, one asks, 'Why continue to use such a medium of communication; why enact the rhetoric of lecture?' Contextualizing an answer to this seemingly perennial question prompts revisiting critiques about the lecture rendered more than a half century earlier. To make this point, I pivot to a provocative essay on the lecture by Ken-Etsu Dato (1956), the "Pressure to Lecture," published in 1956. Dato (1956) actively and loudly disagreed with the demand to lecture; he called the lecture an accommodation to a commercial need in order to address a rising number of students at minimal cost. Dato (1956) used the phrase "nose-count per dollar" (Dato, 1956, p. 364) in order to emphasize his critical perspective on a lecture-centered approach to education. He considered the lecture a commercially tainted rhetoric that corralled a thundering herd of students into a large space and then stuffed them into multiple sections in the same class and in a single large location. According to Dato, the lecture met a financial need mandated by administrators, who sought to manipulate a captive audience, which yielded joy for bean-counters and textbook publishers desiring large sales. Grand assemblies of students, according to Dato, suffered through blurred acts of dramatization and content; professors too often substituted conservative readings of evidence for entertaining presentations that were far too dependent upon emotive surface examinations. The lecture sought entertainment. Dato's portrayal of the lecture unmasked two major concerns: 1) monopoly over and hegemony of ideas and students, and 2) the assertion that the lecture was a communication channel used to carry out a compulsory commercial enterprise. Students became hostages herded into a single space.

Dato's criticism of 1956 was germane to his time and to any moment when commercial considerations triumph over learning. The communicative channel of the lecture offers an important counter in this historical era to one-sided proclamation propelled by universal assertions. The lecture as testimony announces the interplay of content and commitment from the speaker that necessitates critical listening and discernment from attentive listeners. The lecture does not presuppose that all in an audience will agree or even find the material of great significance. A lecture invokes audience interest that ranges from modest concern to intense attentiveness. The exposure, however fragmented, introduces an audience to the content and sentiment of a speaker that requires the audience to wade through information and passion that contribute insights and opinions to the public domain. Dato's warning is of ongoing importance; when the commercial eclipses learning, education suffers. Nevertheless, the culprit is not the lecture, through which students encounter the value of attending to content from a position of standpoint. Students must decide what to believe; encountering content and sentiment as testimony outweighs the limits and problems associated with Dato's caution.

My contention is that in this historical moment the lecture as testimony warrants reconsideration in an era defined by narrative and virtue contention in a time of information isolation. One needs to hear multiple and contrary perspectives in an era of increasing media selectivity to position and voice. Dato's commercial critique centered on duping students with entertainment; we live in a historical moment in which such a concern continues and the lecture as testimony offers a counter.

The lecture as testimony unites evidence and situates positions of import in the pursuit of temporal insight and consideration. The lecture as testimony requires an audience to acknowledge and respond to a multitude of positions and standpoints. The lecture as testimony in this historical moment is an ongoing practice for living in an age of difference, requiring the full participation of speaker and audience. Indeed, the world has shifted dramatically since Dato's 1956 critique, but what remains is an ongoing reservation about commercial and knowledge acquisition. My contention is that the practice of intellectual liberation begins with content and sentiment offered as testimony that requires witnesses intent on discernment between and among ideas. The lecture as testimony suggests that ideas matter, and sentiment tells us 'why' to listen and learn.

9.5 Testimonies of Ghosts

In a digital age, we can archive everything; this reality can obscure the fact that interpretation continues. Archived information does not come to us pre-packaged in its meaning and signification. The key to interpretation remains acknowledgment of a ghost of insight that lingers in shadows, which goes missed when efforts of undue quick and surface reads fail to recognize that which remains out of facile sight. Such information carries an interpretive *bienvenue* that begins conversation anew. Carolyn L. Kane interviewed John Durham Peters (2010) on the implications of a digital age, taking us to the implications of ghostly testimony. Kane interviewed Peters on questions in a digital age; its archiving urge seeks to eradicate interpretive ghosts. Peters underscored the signification power of ghosts, lamenting the loss of analog media composed of "scratches, hisses, and noise" (Kane & Peters, 2010, p. 127). Kane then countered with the assertion that computer viruses and system failures are ghosts. Peters disagreed; he differentiates a ghost from terror and insecurity. A ghost haunts without imposing. Digital precision moves the interpretive act of meeting and welcoming ghosts to active efforts to ensure their eradication.

Ghosts in the shadows dwell in the interface between the seen and the not yet comprehended. Peters contended that Hegel offered a phenomenology of ghosts in his efforts to understand the world before us; again, he laments, stating that the digital archive is the ghost buster of the 21st century. A digital age seeks to eradicate ghosts and keep them outside interpretive engagement. Peters suggests that ghosts are, however, difficult to kill. Ghosts function phenomenologically, not empirically, and evade capture by empirical recordings. Emmanuel Levinas (1961/1969) details repeatedly the fact that the physical face points to something beyond it, with an emphasis on the enigma of the phenomenological face. A digital archive holds yet another phenomenological enigma; there is something beyond the empirical recording, a ghost that lingers in the shadows.

The lecture as testimony reflects a public and digital reminder in our technological time – the interpretive power of ghosts remains. Mei Zhang (2011), in "Inspiring American and Global Audiences: The Rhetorical Power of Randy Pausch's Last Lecture in the Digital Age," makes this case both empirically and phenomenologically. Her essay examines the impact of Pausch's last lecture and his book by that name; he delivered a last lecture shortly before he died of pancreatic cancer. Pausch was a professor of computer science at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He conveyed his last lecture from that campus, which many listened to throughout the world via online access and widespread media coverage. Zhang

(2011) offers an outline of Pausch's final lecture, "Really Achieving Your Childhood Dreams." In the lecture, Pausch initially detailed his dreams, from his hope of playing professional football to meeting Captain Kirk of Star Trek. His stories announced disappointments that generally led to discovery of new paths. His address covered a wide range of topics, from computers and programming to the ongoing importance of persons and service. His life of learning and service kept gratitude at the center of a life of thoughtful action and contribution. He emphasized the importance of hard work as a fundamental ingredient for personal and professional success. Pausch continued an emphasis on service to others, stating that he often stayed late to work and assist his students. He contended that when met with limits, disappointments, and obstacles that acted like brick walls, one must continue moving, engaging in determined struggle. Much of life requires meeting and passing a seemingly unending series of life tests. For instance, as a prospective undergraduate student, he did not receive admission to CMU; yet, later he was successful when an interview opened doors for his work in their Ph.D. program. Tenacity guided his career with a simultaneous stress on service, fun, and enjoyment. Pausch stated: "I mean I don't know how [not to] have fun. I'm dying and I'm having fun" (quoted from Zhang, 2011, p. 61). Each day his actions announced love and care in his love of family, friends, and his projects. His lecture functioned as a testimony that united and did not divide; his speech crossed national boundaries and centered on "family values, everyday happiness, and dream fulfillment" (Zhang, 2011, p. 61). The lecture manifested coherence and fidelity (Fisher, 1984). His stories displayed a sound of truth that declared experiences that others found understandable and assisted their lives. In addressing the issue of death, "he challenged the audiences to decide whether they are a Tigger or an Eeyore from the Disney cartoon *Winnie the Pooh*, the happy character who is eager to share his zest for life or the gloomy character who keeps knowledge to himself" (Zhang, 2011, p. 61). He also used the comparison of a fish in water. Talking about fun is like a fish talking about water; the discussion is minimal and the reality of the importance of fun and water is equally fundamental to a good life. The style of his speech kept the conversation going and the audience attentive to his message; Pausch was down to earth as he discussed the inevitable end of his own life. His informal style not only kept his audience paying attention, it invited them to do something with their own lives. He pointed to transcendent values necessary for a good life: "hard work, perseverance, and enthusiasm for life" (Zhang, 2011, p. 62). The speech announced intercultural connections that united people of difference in reflection on the reality of death and the importance of living life with gratitude. The speech made him a global hero, as he transcended differences and united us with what Clifford Christians called "protonorms" (Christians & Traber, 1997). In a digital age, Pausch's lecture reached across borders. His words embraced the locality of his place and moment and simultaneously opened a conversation that many wanted to hear and to reflect upon. The power of the speech rests in Drucker and Gumpert's (2008) use of the term "glocalization" (Gumpert, 2008, p. 63). The digital world permits the lecture as testimony to reach a larger world without doing disservice to the local; the digital world can invoke the local while influencing well beyond the moment of saying. The interplay of local and otherwise is an empirical fact in a digital age, and the interpretive implications of the lecture as testimony carries within it phenomenological ghosts that call forth imagination sparked by the power of content and sentiment.

The lecture as testimony unites content and a committed position that matters, which govern the rhetoric of a text. The essay by Ramsey announced the importance of testimony,

framing the lecture as a “love letter” to students. Working within support of the lecture, Corina Stan (2016) suggests that we cannot forget the importance of Alasdair MacIntyre’s (1990) emphasis on difference discussed in *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry*. One cannot forget the importance of content that differs with one’s own perspective. There is within a lecture of testimony more than one interpretive ghost. The lecture as testimony rejects the assumption that the student is emotionally fragile and limited to a single perspective. Problems within a complex global community require attending to what we do not want to hear, making ever more salient the interpretive richness of the lecture as testimony.

The digital world brings multiple testimonies to us, permitting an archiving of testimonies that matter in sentiment and content that house, but do not eliminate, interpretive ghosts of implications. The digital world does not jettison the lecture; it makes the lecture as testimony an increasingly accessible gift. As with any gift, one must appreciate the generosity of lecture as testimony and use it responsibly, enacting the instruction of Immanuel Kant (1996) by embracing the responsibility of ‘self-legislation’. In an era defined by rival traditions, the student, the listener, and the citizen must discern with thoughtful and reasoned care the phenomenological ghosts that uphold interpretive keys of imagination. The lecture as testimony reminds us that content and sentiment matter, and, simultaneously, an organized presentation is but one position. Responsibility in discerning temporal truth grows as access to information expands. The lecture as testimony ignites other testimonies made available to a global community in a digital age. It requires responsibility of self-legislation as we seek to understand a potential temporal truth coupled with a democratic reminder of the importance of eternal vigilance in the meeting and discerning between and among rival traditions. The lecture as testimony is a home for content and sentiment, responsible imagination, and interpretive insights that meet us as phenomenological ghosts. This digital age of rhetoric permits a computer professor to speak from a phenomenological place, calling for love of work, persons, and service.

References

- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future*. New York: The Viking Press.
- Arnett, R. C. (2014). A Rhetoric of Sentiment: The House the Scots Built. In R. C. Arnett & P. Arneson (Eds.), *Philosophy of Communication Ethics: Alterity and the Other* (pp. 25-54). Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Christians, C. G. & Traber, M. (1997). *Communication ethics and universal values*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dato, K. (1956). The pressure to lecture. *The Journal of Higher Education* 27(7), 364-366.
- Drucker, S. J. & Gumpert, G. (2008). The global communication environment of heroes. In S. J. Drucker & G. Gumpert (Eds.), *Heroes in a global world* (pp. 1-16). Cresskill: Hampton Press.
- Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case for public moral argument. *Communication Monographs* 51, 1-22.
- Fransman, J. & Andrews, R. (2012). Rhetoric and the politics of representation and communication in the digital age. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 37(2), 125-130.
- Helfand, D.J. (2016). *A survival guide to the misinformation age: Scientific habits of mind*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Innis, H. (1991). *The bias of communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Jubien, P. (2012). A phenomenology of the podcast lecture. *Explorations in Media Ecology* 1(1), 73-85.
- Kane, C. L. & Peters, J. D. (2010). Speaking into the iPhone: An interview with John Durham Peters, or ghostly cessation for the digital age. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 34(2), 119-133.
- Kant, I. (1996). *Practical philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (1798/2012). *Lectures on Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuskis, A. (2011). Marshall McLuhan as educationist: Institutional learning in the postliterate era. *Explorations in Media Ecology* 10(3&4), 313-333.
- Levinas, E. (1961/1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1990). Three rival versions of moral enquiry: Encyclopaedia, genealogy, and tradition. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After Virtue*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Messent, P. (2007). *The Cambridge introduction to Mark Twain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1969). *Counterblast*. Berkeley: Gingko Press, Incorporated.
- McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Pinchevski, A. (2012). The audiovisual unconscious: Media and trauma in the video archive for Holocaust testimonies. *Critical Inquiry* 39, 142-166.
- Ramsey, R. E. (2015). Letters on the hermeneutic education of dwelling. *Empedocles: European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication* 6(1), 77-90.
- Stan, C. (2016). Listening with mental doors ajar, interpassive learning, political correctness: Rethinking the lecture today. *Empedocles: European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication* 7(1), 91-97.
- Taylor, C. (1992). *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Teigas, D. (1995). Knowledge and hermeneutic understanding: A study of the Habermas-Gadamer debate. Bucknell: Bucknell University Press.
- Zhang, M. (2011). Inspiring American and global audiences: The rhetorical power of Randy Pausch's last lecture in the digital age. *China Media Research* 7(1), 57-64.