

The Rhetoric and the discourse of poverty condition

Ph.D. Oscar Gonzalez Muñoz¹

Ph. D. Milagros Cano Flores²

Abstract:

The main aim of this work it's to show that the speech used to explain the problem of poverty, can be located in a rhetorical field, especially when you're looking to convince the acceptance of strategies based inhuman development with some axiological value. The rhetorical as a way of persuasion make the believing of what should correspond to each other in what we understood as fare (Aristóteles 1971, Foucault 1983, Pujante 1998, López and de Santiago 2000 and Teun Van Dijk 2005). Is the case of the actions that the State makes to persuade the necessity to give attention to some vulnerable groups by recognizing basic necessities and also with specific actions that allow us to attend between the ones that are experimenting it (Logue and Miller, 1995). And it initiates with the recognition of the basic needs of an heterogeneous auditorium, that besides of identifying a different ways to attend them, recognize the concern for others to cover their elementary necessities (eudaimon's spirit), that means, it stays with a Socratic approach (Gorgias 1992). From a rhetorical approach, the highly intention of social political instruments it's to facilitate the access to some resources as a way to materialize the minimum conditions of life of contingent conditions environment are poverty minimizers. It's A Sen. (1991) who's trying to increase social conciseness in the middle of axiological virtues of J. Rawls uses the social construction of the moral principles as poverty reducers and in justice situations. Both intentions allow to recognize the situations of justice as the result of integrating data, with no esculent but complementary for poverty issues.

Key words:

discourse, poverty, philosophy, moral principles.

JEL Classification System:

I31

Citation:

Munoz, Oscar Gonzalez; Flores, Milagros Cano (2018); The Rhetoric and the discourse of poverty condition; Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS), Vol.7, No.4, pp:250-259; <https://doi.org/10.25255/jss.2018.7.4.250.259>.

¹Académic-Researcher of IIESCA-Universidad Veracruzana. Email: oscgonzalez@uv.mx

²Académic-REsearcher of IIESCA-universidad Veracruzana. Email: mcano@uv.mx

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

I. INTRODUCTION

One line of investigation of political philosophy that allows distinguishing from a theoretical-methodological approach, conceptual logic and demonstrative reasoning it's the speech from a rhetorical approach, persuades and makes the believing of doing the right thing in a determinate reality in a coherent way. It's the case of the media that's why people try to attend social problems such as poverty.

The main aim of this work is to show that the speech used to explain the problem of poverty, can be located in rhetorical field, especially when you're looking to convince the acceptance of strategies based in human development with some axiological value.

Following Platoon's ideology, in some Socrates dialogs, he considered rhetorical as an instrument of population conduction, every time used with an ethical – political dimension with the purpose of persuade citizens to give direction to their behavior and follow the justice principals using the law as a way of perfection. (Gorgias 503.a y 504.d-e)

Therefore, it seems that this texts shows the strategies for poverty reduction, they're rhetorical and their purpose is to like to people by recognizing of their elementary goods and take them as socially needs, and try to give everyone wealth as a goal.

However, it's not questionable therelevance of the Wellness Theory as a frame of understanding to generate recommendation as a way of declarative trial about social politics. Their input shows the importance of building an economic system with the capacity to create opportunities for the less favored sectors, becoming an approach of politics that allows the government to lead their efforts and materialize the conduction of the citizen's souls (*psuchagogia*) in the right direction through the plausible. (Fedro, 261.a, ss.)

In this way, the rhetorical in a frame of understanding of the message that entails the action, and associates with the way of regulate in an ordered way to the pragmatic application of an affirmation or make it more sustainable; their purpose is to reach certain way of knowledge not identifiable with the truth, if not an opinion might be accepted as the real truth of for every reason (Van Eemeren y Houtlooser: 2002, p. 132-133). The rhetorical for the reasonable being, human, social, paradox and contextual, will look for the improvement and perfection of the human being, in the middle of a constant fight for the generic understanding of something and the convincement of what does exist for instance, the truth.

This document has the next sections: backgrounds, where it describes "The studies about rhetoric allow us to know the importance of the speeches related with specific social issues". It shows "the methodology, the epistemological perspective and ethic" that creates a hermeneutic vision of rhetoric. By accepting that the dialectic as a reasonable method supports the rhetoric achieving reasons and argumentations, the evidence of their virtue for the persuasion and their axiological approach. In the last two topics it's

The Rhetoric and the discourse of poverty condition

been evidenced the virtue of the rhetoric for persuasion and attribute a dogmatic value in the speech used for accepting the strategies to reduce poverty.

Approbation is basically of Amartya Sen and John Rawls. For what they mentioned in their work of investigation, the process of argumentation, controversy and argumentations, are shown in this work.

II. BACKGROUNDS

The way which can secure a state of conviction through the speech of rhetoric. This discipline, gives credit to the capacity of reasoning from one person that using a theoretical resource looks for the facilitation of understanding and acceptance of communicative messages; consist in the art of extract of each subject their composition. Cf. Paul Ricoeur (1975) y Cf. Roland Barthes (1970)

Aristoteles mentioned in Topics, that rhetoric it wasn't just shown as a technic, but as a "Faculty of considering in each case the most convenient" remarking with this, the low importance and attributing a way of strengthening of the passions as responsible for man to make their judgment voluble; a way of pleasure (*hoishepetailúpekaihedon*). (Ret. 1378a 20)

However, for Van Eemeren and Houtlooser (2002, p.138) supporting Meyer (2004) it does exist the necessity to integrate the rhetorical dimension in the method pragmadialethic of analysis. That's why argumentation is one part of rhetoric, where the participants of an argumentative speech are orientated to solve a difference of opinion and in this way, they are committed with instrumental rules to reach that purpose, interested in solve the difference, each one, to his favor, this means, concluding in a rhetoric-dialectic demonstration. There's no reason to think that the rhetoric rules of persuasion are necessarily contradicting, with the dialectic ideal of reasoning, although in the real practice both of this trending are in tension. (Van Eemeren y Houtlooser, 2002, p. 9)

For Aristoteles, rhetoric it's a way of conviction to the socially acceptable where the argumentation and logic are considered as essential elements subjects of dialectics, given how likely go before the truth. At the same time, the truth has an ideal relation with what it's good in the frame of polis. The man as a political animal requires convincing and for that has to argument with what result necessary to achieve our goals.

Meyer (2004) considers that the old frontiers that Aristoteles propose has vanished, that's why dialectic it's involved with argumentation and this one with rhetoric. A substantial aspect of his theory consist in sustain that the genesis of argumentation it's given by a problematic issue that marks, in first place the difference between the speaker and listener. The point of this problem is the measure of the symbolic distance that is against the protagonist "Therefore -Meyer says- the rhetoric is the analysis of issues that are establish in interpersonal communication. (Meyer, 2004, p.11)

Gainsay, in rhetoric field isn't an instrument of power and dominance, which only purpose it's just to persuade. Rhetoric goes in a theory of action that connects with ethic and politics; according with the first, rhetoric moves men's to act looking for a common good; according to the second one, convinces ones or another's (in some cases most of them or everyone) to protect everything that will be in benefit of the polis. (Beuchot 1998: 12)

III. CLASSIC DOCTRINE OF POVERTY FROM A MARXIST VISION

From a Marxist perspective, the believing in individuals, are the consequences of the richness for ones and the disadvantage from others, it's used for others to provide of benefits. In this economic ideology, the accumulation of capital demands obvious disadvantage, between the ones that sells their workforce and the ones that posse ways of production. Once the income difference it's created, problems between social classes starts, generated by hate of rational beings.

Despites that Marxism thoughts predispose the existence of the problem of lack levels, Marx, didn't have any definition of poverty and proposed it as an increasing force of richness, where the less benefited, thief or homeless, exist when the other force of value as a way of exchange has displaced his job Sen(1979). For Boragina (2007) Marx's idea in his book published in 1967, is that the poverty situation, achieves in an individual way, caused by the limited profits of workforce class, that restrict the access to the good derivate from state's production. Considering the payment of retribution, the main cause of difference between the workforce and the capitalist, this means, where the state it's the only one who can witness this.

Therefore, poverty according to Marx, quoted by Sleeper (1983), this derivate from a situation of extreme poverty or having none profits and as a conflict between the value for work and price. It's a misery condition of fee- that represents the incapacity of get goods besides the elementary ones-, given the benefit to the higher class. As the none profit in the unoccupied, created by the search of capitalist productivity that makes the poor in a permanent mass, with possibilities of been unable to reach fundamental goods. The concept of State of Marx it's an structure that using an administrator (government) will supervise how high class behaves oriented to administrate regular business.

Against the above, Marx doesn't question the existence of poverty and the poor, but he understands it as a part of a natural process of scabby interest of high class.

In this way, Seebohm (1901) criticized and quoted in Sen (1982), hereefer to poverty with a biological approach and as a situation where there are families whose total income, result insufficient to cover those necessities related with maintenance of simple physic efficiency. However, that in 1901 the apportion of Seebohm, creates to the problem of economics deficiency in one biological, his apportion serve to create maps of misery about places where people live, given the deficient consume of goods that puts in risk physic performance.

The Rhetoric and the discourse of poverty condition

Associated with the needs with the achievement of physic efficiency, Maslow (1943) considered, that the attention to the lacks achieves in the frame of hierarchy structure. Initiating with those of biological nature and ascending to new levels of satisfaction in an individual frame; capable of express life quality in peoples.

In this way, recognizing the stablished for Marxist doctrine, the comprehension of poverty achieves with the study of the income perceived for the labor payment. Thereupon, identifying the number of poor, evaluates individual capacities to consume goods y acceptable quantities and in some environments; initiating with the ones in elemental order as the biological.

Strengthen the above, Townsend (1979) understood poverty “as the situation in which you found home, when the possibleways don’t let access to the type of diets that they’re used to or at least are highly promoted or approved in the societies where they belong.” (p.39)

Besides that in 1979, Townsend just captured the ways considered enough to access to satisfiers in the level of social perception- separated from formal questioning of anthropologic science-, accomplished substitute minimum needs, in nutritional requirements using stipends. And translate in an economic order, nutrimental value of the Basic Food Basket (BFB), as a referent of the level of minimum resources to gain.

In Mexico, the studies about the number of people in poverty conditions from 2000 to 2006, developed by Hernandez-Laos (2010), in the face of the National Council of Social Political Evaluation, analyze the level of income of the population and their capacity to demand certain goods, initiating with the definition of BFB for urban and rural zones. This means , using the method known as Poverty Lines (PL) determines the number of poor people, from a macroeconomic vision. Considering the income necessary to have access determined by BFB and their poverty sill.

Starting with the determination of the income necessary to have access to BFB that creates the PL alimentary. After that, it identifies the next LP or income level necessary to develop capacities, and allows to know the level of resources enough to have access to BFB, including needed disbursements to access to health and education satisfiers, creating a PL of capacities. And finally, having the necessary income to attend a BFB including health services, education and the generation of resources that benefits the perceived income, that generates the LP for heritage.

Once stablished the necessary income to have access to a BFB, that determine the next PL, and for that, the income necessary per family to attend other necessities besides the elementary ones. This allows assisting poverty studies, there’s other instruments as Engel Coefficient (EC), that stablishes the proportion that represents a BFB from a EC. Defined as $EC = BFB / BC$, shows the capacities of consume of a BFB, given the level of necessary income of the next BC. And in the same way, there’s an inverse coefficient of Engel (ICE), as the reason that express the capacity to absorb the elementary goods of

the BFB) with other goods besides food; proposing as $ICE = BC/BFB$, it shows the number of times that it can consume an BFB, in BC terms.

Thereupon, the study of poverty from a classic school, considers the income as the instrument that allow counting the number of poor people using a LP. Starting with the determining the capacity to absorb a BFB using a ICE, as the factor that shows the capacity to attend it in terms of the received income or the next BC.

III. MODERN POVERTY DOCTRINE

According to the modern theory of poverty, headed by Sen (1978), referring to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the limited quantity of goods shows poverty, and allows restricted capacities to access to elementary satisfiers as a BFB, they don't accomplish only with economic conditions, like the income and job. There are other factors, like ideology, personality, freedom and personal rights, they're recognized as ownerships that allows generation of resources to attend the necessities called capacities. Using this technics we can comprehend poverty in a relative and absolute way. In this way, Sen (1978) concludes:

I understand absolute poverty as the level of lack that put on risk the maintenance of physical existence and it will manifest in starving, malnourished and visible penumbra, without having to search on a relative panorama... As a consequence, the idea of relative poverty completes and not supplement the absolutist approach of poverty... relative poverty it's a feeling of having less according of what everyone else have, this means, according of what you've got in comparison with others. (P.133)

Studying the level of lacks, according with Sen in 1978, the implicates two appreciations, obtained when there's a lack of minimum resources to attend irrevocable satisfiers, and the one where the good ion possession, express inequality in comparison of what others have. This means, absolute poverty, treats the lacks that impede generate incomes, considered possessions and rights converted in incomes; and the relative, it's a condition achieved with the perception about the good obtained.

Thereby, absolute poverty, substitute the concept of poverty of classical school, referring to lack conditions of lack of goods that are irrevocable. Such as the ones that infringe physical existence and represents a set of actives to attend other necessities or capacities. While the relative poverty, it's a perceived and determinate situation by thinking structures of getting more or less according to others.

III.THE RECOGNITION OF WHAT'S FAIR TO UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY

As it was described, in 1978 Sen considered that one of the ownerships that allows to obtain certain goods, to attend necessities –referring to the capacities-, are the liberties known for the citizens. Through these, it exploit those resources that allow overcome levels of lack, and turn in the aim to pursuit in societies to reach superiors levels of economic growth and change.

The Rhetoric and the discourse of poverty condition

Therefore, a person in a society becomes in an agent of transformation that fights the recognition of his liberties. Turning this, in an aim of that humanity aware of better future possibilities that reflex their own conceptions of fair. According to Sen (2000)

The individuals may set up their own faith and help mutually. They don't have to conceive as passive receptors of the presentations of ingenious development programs. They have to participate of creation and implementation of social justice.

For that it's not only necessary that they can participate in the design of plans, but in the formulation of the priorities and values which will be based on. It exist powerful reasons to recognize the positive roll that agency does, free and viable, and also constructive impatient (P.28)

In the same way that in 2000, Sen considered the individual motor of liberties to develop capacities and achieve socially fair conditions, Rawls (2006) recognize the roll of the person as generator of liberties and adds the reassignment of goods, the benefit of the less provided to build the socially fair in the reflection of the liberty.

"... The first principle generator of justice, is the one that in each person must have a right equal to the scheme more extensive of basic liberties that match with an scheme similar to others liberties; the second one, it's the one where social and economic inequalities must be conformed in a way that at the same time: A) It's expected that are advantage reasonable for everyone B) Are linked with jobs and affordable for everyone" (P.67-68). Therefore, the concept of liberty and the reach for social equality, become in fundamentals of social justice, with the implicit creation of institutions and liberties recognized to the solution for a inequality problem

Even Rawls (1971) haven't referred to the definition of the phenome of poverty- but inequality-, attributed the problem to the lack of inequality justice that must favor to the less benefited in a society. Whereby, Rawls (1958) quoted by Wolf (1981) had considered that the generation of more benefits for the les benefited, it's based in the recognition of lacks using institutional practices that has as main aim offer positions, functions, faculties, responsibilities, rights and obligations, trying to generate equality. This means, the generation of bigger advantages for the poor ones, implicates a differenced system of justice that includes a new order of privileges for the ones that achieve it. As evidence of the constant struggle trying to solve inequality. Accepting privileges, as social goods must distribute to the ones considered in social disadvantage.

However, according to Walzer (1983), achieve the equality trough equity distribution of goods, yet between unfortunate it's not possible. This can only happen through delimitation of the concept of justice for each social right. So that, social equality it's created in a complex reality, determined for the independence of social goods, with different judgements of distribution. Where none good, might be above another. For Walzer (1993) "When the meaning it's different, the distribution is autonomous. Every Social good or groups of social rights, in a matter of speaking, creates a distributive sphere inside the one just certain judgements and dispositions are appropriated" (P.23)

Thereby, the public resource on favor to the ones with less income, it's delimited by the judgement of distribution, that answer for the aim of improving incomes; and it cannot be founded, in other goals of distribution, contingent to interest and individual capacities, created in beneficiaries.

Summarizing, considering the established in 2006 by Rawls, the social politics that are established to overcome poverty conditions, will be fair when the fundamentals are trying to create bigger inversions to the poorest ones. And, according to Walzer (1993), social spending in favor to the poor, might be considered fair when you achieve the pupose of it; without been above of other distribution judgements.

References

- [1] Cf. Paul Ricoeur, *La Métaphore vive*, París, Seuil, 1975.
- [2] Cf. Roland Barthes, "L'Ancienne Rhétorique", *Communications*, 16 (1970)
- [3] Meyer, Michel 2004, *La rhétorique*, Paris, Puf, *Que sais-je?*
- [4] Machinea, J. L. & Martin H. (2005). *La esquiiva equidad en el desarrollo latinoamericano: una visión estructural, una aproximación multifacética*. Serie Informes y estudios especiales, Nº 14 (LC/L.2414-P), Santiago de Chile, Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL). Publicación de las Naciones Unidas, Nº de venta: S.05.II.G.158 pp. 79-89.
- [5] Maslow, A. H. (1943). *A Theory of Human Motivation*. Originally Published in *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- [6] Martner, R. & V. Tromben (2003). *Tax reforms and fiscal stabilisation in Latin America*.
- [7] Banca d'Italia, *TaxPolicy*, Quinto taller de finanzas públicas, Perugia, Italia, 3 a 5 de abril de 2003.
- [8] Martínez L. A. (1998). *El efecto de la inflación en la distribución del ingreso*. Documento de Investigación Nº 9806. México: Banco de México.
- [9] Marx, K. (1967). *El capital*. Vol. I. FCE. México
- [10] Marx, K. (1973). *Grundrisse*. Penguin, Harmondsworth. Edición en español (1992):
- [11] *Elementos Fundamentales para la Crítica de la Economía Política (Grundrisse) 1857-1858*. México: Siglo XXI.
- [12] OCDE Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económico (2008). *Resultados de la evaluación PISA 2006 y el marco de la evaluación*. Recuperado el 20 de diciembre de 2008, de <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/59/2/39732471.pdf>.
- [13] ONU DAES Organización de las Naciones Unidas Departamento de Asuntos Económicos y Sociales (2007). *Políticas macroeconómicas y el crecimiento*. Nueva York, junio de 2007, Naciones Unidas, DAES.
- [14] Oportunidades (2002). *Evaluación del Programa Oportunidades*. México: SEDESOL.
- [15] Oportunidades (2006) Dirección General de Padrón y Liquidación del Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades. México: SEDESOL.
- [16] Ordóñez, G. (2002). *La política social y el combate a la pobreza en México*. México: Ed. CEIICH- UNAM.
- [17] Parker, S. (2007). *Evaluación del impacto de Oportunidades 2001-2006*. Serie de documentos de investigación. México: SEDESOL.
- [18] Parker, S. & McGinnis, L. (2001). *Children and youth unit, development network*. Washington, D.C.: TheWorld Bank. 2001.

The Rhetoric and the discourse of poverty condition

- [19] Parker, S. (2010). Evaluación del impacto de Oportunidades 2001-2006. Serie de documentos de investigación. México: SEDESOL
- [20] PND Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2001-2006. Recuperado el 9 de febrero del 2010 de <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/benson/lagovdocs/mexico/federal/presidente/pnd/PNDmex01-06.pdf>.
- [21] Ramírez M. (2008) Program as an Incentive for Poor Families to Invest in Child Health. *The American Journal of Education*, vol. 113, 1–29.
- [22] Rawls, J. (2006). *El derecho de gentes*. España: Paidós pp. 67-68.
- [23] Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. U.S.A.: Belknap Harvard University Press.
- [24] Rebelo, S. (1991). Long-Run policy analysis and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 99, pp.500-521.
- [25] Reglas de operación del programa Oportunidades (2005). Consultado el 3 de junio del 2010.
<http://www.normateca.gob.mx/Archivos/REGLAS%20DE%20OPERACION%20DEL%20PROGRAMA%20DE%20DESARROLLO%20HUMANO%20OPORTUNIDADES%20PARA%20EL%20EJERCICIO%20FISCAL%202005.PDF>
- [26] Rey, B. (1987). *El país que perdimos*. México: Siglo XXI Editores.
- [27] Romer, D. (2002). *Macroeconomía Avanzada*. (2ª. Ed.). México D.F.: Mc Graw-Hill. (p.68).
- [28] SHCP Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (1989). *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo, 1989-1994*.
- [29] SHCP Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (2001). *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo, 2001-2006*.
- [30] Sleeper R. (1983). *The rate of profit must fall, A Lexicon of Marxist-Leninist Semantics* Alexandria, VA Ed: Western Goals, p. 30.
- [31] Sen, A. (1978). Three notes of concept of poberty, Documento de trabajo de investigación del Programa Mundial del Empleo, WEP22-239 ILO, Genova. pp.133.
- [32] Sen, A. (1983). Poor, relatively speaking, *Oxford Economic Papers*. Vol. 35, p.133–134.
- [33] Sen, A. (1989). Concepto y medida de pobreza, *Comercio Exterior*. vol. 42, núm. 23. 1989.
- [34] Sen, A. (1987). *Poverty and famines: an essay on entitlement and deprivation*, Oxford University Press. New York. 1987 p. 203.
- [35] Sen, A. (1982). *On economic inequality*, UK: University Press.
- [36] Sen, A. (1982). *Inequality Reexamined*. UK: Oxford: Clarenton Press.
- [37] Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality Reexamined*. UK: Oxford: Clarenton Press.
- [38] Sen, A. (2000). *Desarrollo como Libertad*. España: Editorial Planeta p. 28.
- [39] Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. Harmondsworth, Gran Bretaña: Penguin, (p.11).
- [40] Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, (UNAM, 2009). *La superación de la pobreza en México, en el sexenio de Vicente Fox*. Recuperado el 27 de noviembre del 2009 de 2011 de: <http://info4.juridicas.unam.mx/ijure/fed/269/default.htm?s=l>.
- [41] Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice. A defense of pluralism and equality*, Basic Books, Nueva York. Versión en castellano: (1987) *Las esferas de la justicia. Una defensa del pluralismo y la igualdad*, traducción H. Rubio, colección Política y Derecho, México: Ed. FCE.

[42] Walzer, M. (1993). Las esferas de la justicia. Una defensa del pluralismo y la ignorancia. México: FCE, p. 24.

[43] Walzer, M. (2001). Las esferas de la justicia. (2ª Edición) México: FCE, pp. 31-33.

[44] Wolff, R. (1981). Para comprender a Rawls: una reconstrucción y una crítica de la teoría de la justicia, México: FCE.

[45] Zedillo, Ponce de León E. (2000). Ultimo informe de gobierno. México: Poder Ejecutivo.

[46] Van Eemeren, F. y Houtlosser, P. (2000). "Rhetoric in pragma-dialectics" en Argumentation, Interpretation, Rhetoric 1; 1.