NEWSLETTER

The Kenneth Burke Society

1993 KENNETH BURKE SOCIETY CONVENTION CALENDAR

June 1, 1992
SEMINAR PROPOSALS

Proposals for seminars must be received no later June 1, 1992. Details regarding requirements for submission are provided in the April 1991 (Volume 7, Number 1) issue of the *Kenneth Burke Society Newsletter*. Submit seminar proposals to: James W. Chesebro, Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Building E, Annandale, VA 22003.

September 1, 1992
PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF CONVENTION PAPERS

Designed for people whose ideas are at an exploratory stage in development and would like detailed attention and feedback to their paper before they submit a final draft, the Program and Paper Selection Committee will review and provide feedback to prelimnary drafts of convention papers. In order to be reviewed, papers must be received by September 1, 1992. Submit preliminary drafts of papers to: Bernard L. Brock, Department of Speech Communication, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202.

October 1, 1992
SEMINAR TOPICS ARE ANNOUNCED

Topics and descriptions of the seminars at the Convention are announced in the October 1992 issue of the Kenneth Burke Society Newsletter.

November 1, 1992
PRE-REGISTRATION BEGINS BY MAIL

Pre-registration for the convention begins. All participants must pre-register for the convention. Pre-registration includes room and meal reservations. Details regarding pre-registration will appear in the October 1992 issue of the Kenneth Burke Society Newsletter or are available from James W. Chesebro. Pre-registration materials should be submitted to: James W. Chesebro, Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Building E, Annandale, VA 22003.

SOME BURKEIAN SCENES IN JAPAN

by Keisuke Kurata

I would like to address how Kenneth Burke can be understood by the Japanese. If dramatistically translated, the questions would be: (1) Is the "act" of understanding Burke possible in the Japanese cultural scene which is so different from the American cultural scene? Or (2) Is there any way or "agency" peculiar to Japanese readers in understanding him?

Burke is appreciated in Japan today primarily in three ways. First we will look at the response of several prominant Japanese Burkeian scholars. Next, we will note how a significant portion of the Japanese creation myth can be analyzed the way Burke analyzed the combat myth of Python and Apollo. Finally, we will do a Burkeian analysis of a Japanese tanka poem.

It is important to note that two of Burke's books have been translated into Japanese by Joji Mori, Professor of English, Waseda University, (*The Philosophy of Literary Form and A Grammar of Motives*). This is small in number, compared with the works of Barthes, Derrida, Adorno, or Habermas. The fact that Burke is less well-known to the Japanese audience, however does not mean that he is less appreciated. Adequate responses to his philosophy are made by some leading scholars of various fields--notably sociology, anthropology and literary criticism.

First, let me call attention to Professor Mamoru Funatsu, a sociologist at Tohoku University.[1] He is a specialist in symbolic interactionism. When discussing the structural principles of the symbolic universe, he pays close attention to Burke's concept of symbolic action and dramatism. And he considers Burke, along with Mead, to be a forerunner of symbolic interaction, who had a great influence on H. Duncan, I. Goffman, and S. M. Lyman.

Funatsu notes how Burke analyzes literary works as ideal models of symbolic actions and discusses Burke's methodology as a means to approach the principles of the symbolic universe, thus emphasizing Burke's critical attack upon positivistic, behavioristic, and mechanistic methodologies.

Funatsu also says that Burke goes beyond Mead. Whereas Mead was so preoccupied with ideas and images

December 1, 1992
AWARD NOMINATIONS DUE

Nominations for Kenneth Burke Society Awards must be received by December 1, 1992. Send letters of nomination to: Mary Mino, The Pennsylvania State University, The DuBois Campus, College Place, DuBois, PA 15801

December 15, 1992
PROGRAM PROPOSAL AND PAPERS SUBMITTED

All convention program proposals and papers submitted for possible inclusion at the convention must be received by December 15, 1992. Submit proposals and papers to: Bernard L. Brock, Department of Speech Communication, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202.

January 1, 1993
SEMINAR REQUESTS MUST BE RECEIVED

Requests for positions in the seminars must be received no later than January 1, 1993. Submit requests for three preferred seminars (ranked in order of preference) to: James W. Chesebro, Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Building E, Annandale, VA 22003.

February 1, 1993
FINAL DATE TO REGISTER FOR THE CONVENTION

Pre-registration for the convention must be received by February 1, 1993. On site convention, room, and meal registration will not be available. The pre-registration convention form is available in the October 1992 issue of the Kenneth Burke Society Newsletter or from James W. Chesebro. Submit pre-registrations to: James W. Chesebro, Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Building E, Annandale, VA 22003.

March 1, 1993
SEMINAR POSITION PAPERS ARE RECEIVED

Each seminar participant mails a copy of his/her position paper to the other members of the seminar.

May 6-9, 1993
CONVENTION DATES AND TIMES

The 1993 Kenneth Burke Society Convention will be held at Airlie House in Airlie, Virginia, from Thursday afternoon, May 6, 1993, through Sunday noon, May 9, 1993. The following events are scheduled for Thursday afternoon and evening: Registration is held from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.; the first seminar session is held from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.; the No-Host Cocktail Hour is held from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.; and Dinner with a Keynote Speaker begins at 7:00 p.m. The complete convention calendar will appear in the October 1992 issue of the Kenneth Burke Society Newsletter. The convention concludes on Sunday, May 9, 1993, following the 12:15 lunch.

QUESTIONS

Any questons regarding the 1993 Kenneth Burke Society Convention should be submitted to the Chief Convention Planner: James W. Chesebro, Speech Comunication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Building E, Annandale, VA 22003.

THE KENNETH BURKE SOCIETY ISSUES CALL FOR AWARDS NOMINATIONS

The Kenneth Burke Society invites nominations for its Distinguished Service and Lifetime Achievement awards. Awards will be presented at the 1993 National Kenneth Burke Society Convention, May 6-9, at the Airlie House, in Airlie Virginia.

The Distinguished Service Award honors individuals with notable professional service. Nominees must be members of The Kenneth Burke Society who have made outstanding contributions at the regional or national level.

Letters of nomination should contain a detailed statement of how the nominee is particularly qualified for this award. A detailed vita that highlights the nominee's service may also be submitted.

The Lifetime Achievement Award is designed to recognize distinguished contributions of Kenneth Burke Society members for a lifetime career of outstanding Burkeian research, scholarship, and teaching.

All nominees must have a minimum of twenty-five years service as a speech communication professional at the time the nomination is made. Additionally, all letters of nomination must include documentation of excellence in research, scholarship, teaching (such as letters of recommendation from colleagues or students; and descriptions of quality of convention papers and published articles). A detailed vita that highlights the nominee's contributions may also be submitted.

All letters of nomination and supporting documentation must be received no later than **December 1, 1992.**

Send all nominations to the Chair of the Kenneth Burke Society Awards Selection Committee: Mary Mino, The Pennsylvania State University, The DuBois Campus, College Place, DuBois, PA 15801. Other members of the committee are Timothy N. Thompson and Ellen Quandahl.

TAX EXEMPT STATUS

We have recently been informed by the Internal Revenue Service has determined the Kenneth Burke Society is exempt from federal income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as a publicly supported organization. Because the Kenneth Burke Society is considered a newly created orgainzation, no final determination of our foundation status has been made. However, they have determined that we can reasonably expect to be a publicly supported organizaiton and not a private foundation. We will be treated as such during the advance ruling period ending December, 1994.

This means that donors may deduct contributions to the Kenneth Burke Society as provided in section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code. Bequests legacies, devises, transfers, and gifts to the Kenneth Burke Society are deductible for Federal estate and gift tax purposes.

If you have any questions, please contact D. Bowen of the Internal Revenue Service at (301)962-4773.

of a harmonious society that he did not consciously deal with social conflicts and oppositions, Burke focuses close and constant attention on those who are opposed and in conflict with each other in human relations. His dialectical concern with what is inherent in them leads him to the problem of victimage or scapegoat as social activator, and to the possibility of forming a new reality in the symbolic universe.

In the final analysis, Funatsu's study of Burke amounts to a well-balanced compendium. I will not repeat its Burkean details with which you are familiar – especially as they appear in *The Philosophy of Literary Form* and *A Grammar of Motives*. His main aim has been to draw an accurate map of the symbolic interaction theories established and developed in the United States and to place Burke accurately on the map.

Another Japanese scholar , Masao Yamaguchi[2], is regarded as a leading figure in the fields of symbolic anthropology and cultural semiotics. Like Burke, he is a prolific and panoramic writer. His references to Burke occur so frequently that it would be impossible for me to gather them together. We will address the key concept of his cultural theory developed in his most important writing and focus on how it is related to Burke's theory. His major work is entitled *Culture and Ambiguity*. In this work he posits a dialectical relationship between the "center " and "periphery" in a culture.

The center is, according to Yamaguchi, the term for a symbolic or value structure publicly shared in social communication with regard to politics, economy and law, as well as morals. In a word, it is a sense of social order. The periphery, on the other hand is a scene excluded by the social order. Members of the social order side think that this scene is chaos. Mythologically, it is a place where terrible monsters would appear. A mental function designed to objectify or reify chaos was humanity's first step towards the creation of order or cosmos. While chaos is to be excluded as evil, it is at the same time a darkness rich in resources. By containing chaos, the human mind may find a new possibility to re-identifying things and for establishing new relationships among them.

The ideas of what are placed a the center of a culture tend to be definite and distinctive. By contrast, those which are on the periphery tend to be ambiguous and hidden from conscious awareness. In this ambiguity are hidden the resources that may produce new meanings, thus bringing about a newly identified social order. According to Yamaguchi, the conflict between the center and the periphery is a most important factor which may lead to, the "activation of culture." He uses metaphorical terms for the dichotomy between them, the "thought of the day" and the "thought of the night," and explains the two terms as follows:

The Day (the surface structure): order, cosmos, harmony, light, beaurocracy, etc.

The Night (the depth structure): disorder, chaos, violence, magic, imagination, creativity, etc.

A threat to order is intrinsic to our sense of order. Crimes being committed are an inextricable part of an established society.

As you will immediately notice, there is a striking resemblance between Yamaguchi's cultural theory and Burke's logology. In *The Rhetoric of Religion*, Burke says that order implicitly has the idea of disorder within it. What connects both ideas is the principle of the negative, which provides a universal mode of human thought based on opposing factors. If you translate this logical principle of antitheses into terms of a narrative development, you will set the conditions for a purposive development. Thus by temporalizing this logic or essence, you have a pattern of mythology. For instance, the principle of disorder can be pictured as aiming to win over the principle of order, and vice versa (LSA 387). Following Burke's analysis of the combat myth of Python in "Myth, Poetry and Philosopy," Yamaguchi interprets the Japanese myth, Susanoo.[3] There are the two main characters in this myth. Amaterasu is God of the Sun, Ruler of Heaven, and the first ancestor of the so-called Imperial family, properly known as the Tenno family, which is how I shall refer to them. Susanoo is a younger brother of Amaterasu. Here are the main themes of the Susanoo myth:

1.) Susanoo disobeyed his father's order to rule the Ocean, and went down into the Underworld to become the ruler there. (In Hades, deeper below, was his mother.)

2.) He rose to Heaven to reconcile himself with Amaterasu. After they had made peace (this act may be interpreted as cosmological incest), Susanoo committed many brutal, violent deeds against Amaterasu. Because of his sacrilege, he was exiled to Japan, the Middleland between Heaven and the Underworld.

3.) He wandered from place to place until he arrived at Izumo, where he found that the daughter of the tribal chief was about to be offered as a victim to Yamata-no-Orochi, the eight-headed and eight-tailed dragon. In order to save her, he fought the dragon and killed it with wit and valor.

4.) When he cut off one of its tails, he discovered a glorious sword, which was later presented to Amaterasu.

5.) He married the daughter. At the wedding he composed a song or poem which was supposed to be the origin of Japanese poetry. Susanoo was king of Izumo.

6.) When the descendant gods of Amaterasu (the original Tenno family) came down to Japan, the descendants of Susanoo gave way to them.

7.) Thus Susanoo became a peripheral god and was worshipped as such.

Yamaguchi interprets the Susanoo myth as follows: Stages 1 and 2 characterize Susanoo as a symbol of disorder. His wanderings in Stage 3 describe a transitional stage or periphery. Being now transformed, he became a symbol of order himself in Stages 4 and 5. In Stage 6 and 7, when the Tenno family begins to rule and govern the Middleland (Japan), as the Center Symbol, he becomes a Periphery Symbol. The most significant point, Yamaguchi insists, is that Tenno's governance as a whole contained this peripheral role within its circumference, and Susanoo thus continued to act ambiguously as an introducer of disorder and a founder of order as well.

Yamaguchi concludes that the structure of the Susanoo myth is a prototype or "representative anecdote" of the Tenno system, namely the notion of Japanese kingship. The Tenno system has stabilized the surface structure of the center. However, it has also played its own peripheral or marginal part in the depth structure. With this mythological pattern in mind, he holds that by containing provocative peripheral powers structurally, the Tenno system, today's imperial system, has persisted independently of historical changes.

Yamaguchi's argument caused a lively controversy, as any argument on the Tenno system always does. Here is one such criticism: Yamaguchi's theory merely repeats a proposition about kingship in general, it is in no sense a discovery of the structure peculiar to the Tenno system.

We do not have to dwell on this issue as such but to confirm that the Japanese imperial faimily system, kingship, undoubtedly has quite an interesting and resourceful ambiguity. If I may borrow a Burkeian metaphor, it is a kind of alchemic center.

I would like now to remind you of Yamaguchi's cultural dichotomy between the "day" and "night." Immediately after his definition he says:

> What should be noted is the fact that the night is not absolutely opposed to the day, but is a potential bridge-builder between the day and the void or the nothingness lying beyond the night.

This "ultimate nothing" combines everything. Could we, like Burke, call it "ultimate cause(ation)?" I think of his poem, "Creation Myth" -- In the beginning, there was Universal Nothing . . . The flow of this thought further induces me to boldly make an addition to Burke's pithy Dramatistic formula: If action, then drama; if drama, then conflict; if conflict, then victimage; if victimage, then ultimate nothing. Isn't "ultimate nothing" his metaphysical speculation of grounding when he was writing "Dissolution of Drama" after the completion of his theeory of dramatism, in the last chapter of *A Grammar of Motives*?

"Ultimate nothing" also reminds me of Dogen, the founder of the Japanese Zen Buddism in the 13th Century. He writes in *Shobogenzo*:

> To learn Buddism is to know yourself
> To know yourself is to forget yourself
> To forget yourself is to identify yourself

> With the law of the universe -- one with the universe
> To be one with the universe is to "drop" the notion
> That you are one with the universe
> Along with the body and mind of yourself and others.

This notion of dropping any and every notion, obviously a paradox, describes a peak experience, or Satori enlightenment achieved by sheer sitting -- Zazen . That is what Burke would call a "pure act."

How would it be related to Burke's own philosophy? After discussing the dissolution of drama, he refers to his attitude towards life, as that of hypochondriasis. By employing a comi corrective, he later calls it "smiling hypochondriasis."

In contrast with Dogen's pure act, Zazen (Shikantaza), Burke has achieved his attitude by the discernment and appreciation of linguistic resources, namely dramatistic critique. The former is concerned with religious self-discipline; the latter secular terminology. But they both stand on the same ultimate "scene" of motivation. In that sense, both attitudes might be close to each other. Or, I'd even say that Burke's smiling hypochondriasis could be a secularized, comic version of the enlightenment of Satori.

Finally, let me turn to literary criticism. First, we will explore the Bentham-Coleridge issue, and then we will conclude with a Burkeian analysis of a Japanese poem. The scholar I have chosen to speak about is the late Kimiyoshi Yura, Professor Emeritus of Tokyo University, who died last year. He was well-known as a specialist of Coleridge and English Romanticism. But his greatest interest was in Burke and he was going to write a book on Burke. He and I had been friends for many years and we had been translating *Permanence and Change*. Unfortunately, this project has now been suspended.

His writings about Burke were not many, compared with his other works. But he was one of the few scholars in Japan who could grasp the whole Burke, not a partial Burke. In one essay[5], he asks himself:

> Who is Kenneth Burke?
> He is a designer of the most original dialectic; he is an inventive founder of human studies, attempting to combine symbols, imagination, and social institutions within dramatic moments which never cease to connect these three factors. Is there any other way of summarizing Burke's world?

> He has developed Aristotelian resources by relating them to modern sciences in the best possible way. He is an innovative 20th century strategist who by means of symbols has bridged over that unhappy division between Bentham and Coleridge in the 19th century.

The last reference he makes here to the commments of Burke on Bentham and Coleridge, is my present concern because no one else has touched upon this issue. John Stuart Mill in the 19th century painstakingly tried to reconcile the two opposed positions. According to Raymond Williams, Mill's attempt to absorb and unify the truths of

these positions is a prologue to a very large part of the subsequent history of English thinking.[6]

Our question is: how did Burke build the bridge?

In short, he translated the opposition between Bentham and Coleridge from the terms peculiar to English social thought into the universal terms of language or symbolic action. The opposition came thus to be treated as a dialectical pair, say, scientific language and poetic language. Yura says that Burke discovered a method of re-reading Bentham not as a utilitarian jurist but as a systematic expounder of language and motives. I'll follow Burke's view along the lines of the chapters on Bentham in *Permanence and Change* and *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Bentham divides our vocabulary into two kinds of terms regarding human motivation: "neutral" and "censorial." The latter is further subdivided into "eulogistic" and "dyslogistic." When people are motivated in some way or other, they tend to avoid neutral words and to select eulogistic or dyslogistic ones, according to their bias for their persuasive purpose (PC 189). Classifying our vocabulary in this way, Bentham unmasks devices which conceal real motives. He particularly scrutinizes the most abstract of legal terms and he searches for images that underly the use of abstractions. He calls these images "archetypes" (RM90), thus warning us to look for the images that overtly and covertly serve as models of ideas (RM88). Here we must note Burke's keen eye on the relationship between images and ideas. Burke says elsewhere that images in poetry are related to ideas, and ideas are related to ideology and rhetoric. It is his understanding of this connection that must have led Burke to say that I.A. Richards repoetized Bentham's essentially rhetorical concerns. What Bentham actually aimed at was to debunk latent images for persuasion by his linguistic analysis, while ironically, he stumbled on the rich resources of rhetoric (RM 90-91). Immediately after this remark, Burke speaks, by contrast, of Coleridge's *The Constitution of Church and State, According to the Idea of Each*, observing that "Coleridge could discover a perfect archetypal design lying behind the imperfection of his contemporary society, hence could lay more weight upon such perfect spirit than upon actual conditions." Coleridge used an idealistic resource of language which could "embody true ideas of value" or spiritual perfection.

In the Prologue of *Permanence and Change*, written some 20 years after its first edition, Burke recollects that he was once a Benthamite, presumably in the early 30's when he was preparing for the book. The repercussions of the Great Depression were raging. At the time he observed that "issues that might have been rationally solved by deliberation and compromise were made agonizingly unwieldly by appeals to what Bentham called "interest-begotten prejudice."

Further in the Prologue he writes: "But whereas he (Burke) had been mulling over the possibility of a neutralized language, a language with no clenched fists, he could not help seeing that Poetry uses to perfection a weighted language. Its winged words are weighted words." Burke must have been thinking about Bentham as a representa-

tive theorist of neutralized language, and Coleridge of weighted language. Furthermore, he must have been thinking of embracing them both instead of divorcing them, in order to build a general theory of ideal poetic communication. Burke's unique both/and attitude is vividly seen in this example. In the final analysis, however, Burke is at bottom Coleridgean, as Mill was, after all a Benthamite.

One last example of literary criticism, and this is more specific, is an application of the dramatistic pentad of a Japanese poem. In introducing this, I have to mention a book on Japanese culture written by Lee O-Young[7], a Korean literary critic and scholar. This brilliant book is entitled *The Shrinking-Oriented Japanese* (1982). Lee points out that an outstanding characteristic of the Japanese is their ability to make things small--to shrink them--and he gives such examples as folded umbrellas, folded fans, bonsai, transistor radios and televisions, small cars, and computer parts. He also describes the tea ceremony and flower arranging as shrinking arts. In flower arranging, for instance, the beauty of nature is made small enough to be enjoyed at home. Transformations of this sort are peculiar to Japanese culture. Lee then discusses Japanese language and draws special attention to its small genitive particle "no," the equivalent of the English apostrophe "s", which functions powerfully to make things small. He cites a Japanese poem written by Takuboku Ishikawa.[8]

Upon the beach of white sand
Of a little isle
Of the Eastern Sea,
  O how I weep
  And play
  With a crab!

Here the word order is crucial: In English, you'd say, for instance, "the legs of a table," but in Japanese, "table no legs."

The poem begins with the Eastern Sea. Connected with the genitive particle "no," it shrinks to a small island which another "no" shrinks into a beach. Still another "no" shrinks it into white sand where the poet is weeping. Otherwise put, the thrice repeated "no" reduces the infinite sea to the poet's tears. The tears become equated with the sea which symbolizes a universal motive. The poet's melancholy is thus synecdochically contained in the universal melancholy.

Isn't this a way of thinking by Scene-Act ratio? If a Japanese cameraman were to render this lyric cinematically, he wouldn't start with the poet weeping, but rather with a long shot of the largest scene turning the lens to smaller scenes, to finally focus on the poet, giving the impression that he himself is part of the whole scene. By contrast, a typical American movie would start with a close-up of the subject or "agent" of the story, then zoom out or pan until finally a long shot would cover the scene. This is obviously an Agent-Scene ratio. The two approaches are quite opposite. By the way, Americans often complain about Japanese indirection or ambiguity in communicative style. This seems due partly to a Japanese pattern of rhetoric which lays much weight on "Scene"

leading to "Purpose" to the extent that the Japanese sometimes prefer to leave the Purpose unstated. This kind of "indirection" is, a "roundabout" way of indicating Purpose. For the Japanese the scene itself may be the ground of Yes, or No, or Maybe.

We can look at the poem from a different angle--an Act-Act ratio. We have two verbs, "weep" and "play." The paradoxical relationship between the two acts makes the poem ironic, and so transcends the poet's sentimental motive (the incipient act) to a universal one. A new meaning is born, or a new order is formed in this tiny 31 syllable poem.

I hope that I have shown how Burke's theory helps us to understand or analyze some important aspects of Japanese culture which is so different from American culture. Why is his critique applicable to Japanese culture? I'd answer that Burke is not only method-conscious but a genuine methodologist. He says somewhere that methodology is the method of methods. His methodology of dramatism and logology seems universal. To that extent at least, I can understand and appreciate him in spite of the fact that he is so recondite even to American readers.

NOTES

1. Funatsu, Mamoru, *Jiga no Shakai Riron* (Social Theories of Self), Koseisha Koseikaku,1983.
2. Yamaguchi, Masao, *Buaka to Ryogisci* (Culture and Ambiguity), Iwanami, 1975.
   Yamaguchi, Masao, *Chi no Enkinho* (Perspectives of the Mind), Iwanami, 1978.
3. The Susanoo Myth.
4. Dogen, *Shobogenzo*.
5. Yura, Kimiyoshi "Kenesu Baku no Ayumi" (Development in Kenneth Burke) in the September, 1967 issue and the February, 1968 issue of *Eigo Bungaku Sekai* (The World of English Literature), Eichosha.
6. Williams, Raymond, "Mill on Bentham and Coleridge" in *Culture and Society 1780-1950*, Penguin Books, 1961.
7. Lee O-Young, *Chijimi Shiko no Nihonjin* (The Shrinking-Oriented Japanese), Gakuseisha, 1982.
8. Tanka Poem by Isikawa, Takuboku.

NEWS AND NOTES

Membership Renewal
Membership renewals for the Kenneth Burke Society were mailed in November, 1991. If you received your membership renewal, please fill it out and return it as soon as possible.

Michael Burke Exhibits Artwork
We would like to congratulate Michael Burke on the two recent exhibitions of his sculpture, prints and collage. He had an exhibit of his work at The Shipley School in Bryn Mawr in the Fall, and a second show at the Cast Iron Gallery in the SoHo district of New York City in February.

Thank You
The editor wishes to thank his students for their helpful suggestions and diligent efforts in making this newsletter possible. Graduate students Jennifer Schlagle, Jo DeMarco, and Mary Pelak have contributed much and deserve a heartfelt thank you!

(tear off this form and mail it in)

Kenneth Burke Society
One Year Membership

Name: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip Code: _____

For a one year membership in the Kenneth Burke Society, please mail this form and a check for $10 made payable to the Kenneth Burke Society to: Dr. James W. Chesebro, Membership Committee, Kenneth Burke Society, Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Rd., Suite #E, Annandale, VA 22003. An undergraduate or graduate student membership in the KBS is $5 per year, one-half the regular membership rate.