

Speeches against the Political: The ‘Logo-Pathos’ in the Ethos of Gandhi, Hitler and Castro

Ayan Chakraborty

PhD Research Scholar

Jawaharlal Nehru University

New Delhi

Abstract

Speech to the greater world of causation has always played a very significant role in understanding human existence. From the religious scripture informing divine revelation to the social conditioning of effective politics, the concept of speech has been deemed important not only in their form and content but also in the formation of identity. This identity is the ‘becoming’ of both the self and the other. Human identity that stands concomitant to human politics is a function of comprehension, cognition and expression; the basis for the conflict in essence and existence. The Greek classical notions of speech was investigated mostly through state politics and to that extent, Aristotle’s tripartite definition of speech contents are significant. The interplay of logos, pathos and ethos become central to revisiting modern political oratory in what constitutes a mimetic function by modernity of the classical age. In this paper, I take up three most notable politicians and statesmen across continents from the 20th century to look into definitive patterns of oratory behaviour. These figures span from the left of the political spectrum to the right. Hence, I investigate oration, speech and performance of M K Gandhi, Adolf Hitler and Fidel Castro to enquire into structures of similarities and differences in speech and oration.

Keywords: Speech, Politics, Logos, Ethos, Pathos, Ideology, Language, Performance

This world, to the Greeks, have largely been a product of an intelligent logos. A form of intelligence that has been present since the beginning of human life; a superior design that is eternal in all its plural but immutable function, an *eidōs* of the transcendent, a cognitive play in the greater structure of human understanding that cradles both speech and thought. This realization of a greater truth existing somewhere eternally is perhaps no better elucidated than in the Platonic traditions of antiquity; occasionally ruptured by Aristotelian dissent and the later Christian tradition.¹ But be it in the Stoic system of ‘assenting’ to the ‘natural’ method of life or the non-myopic ways of ‘pleasure’ that appealed to the Hedonists, whether ‘truth’ (through negation) be present within the debates of the Cynics or through the impossible assertions of the

¹ *The idea of logos is essentially one that has a divine commitment. It is about intelligence and comprehension and about the greater plan of life. While in Greek thought, there are different ways to approach the problem, Christian thought, both canonical and mystical draw themselves on obedience and grace, thus having a structure of*

‘descension’ in opposition to the Greek system of seeking. It is interesting to note that while Greek systems looked at ‘logos’ as knowledge driven intelligence, Christianity looked knowledge or ‘sophia’ as a primary adjunct to ‘original sin’.

Skeptics, the idea that some form of intelligibility persists, for all, has been a fulcrum of existence. This has provided some sort of commonality in regulating both the personal and the social world of the Greek conceptual plinth. This thought is further established by the belief that such presence is largely immutable, transcendent but nevertheless sought through ways of knowledge. These 'epistemes', significantly, deal with only matters of contemplation and either have been called 'wisdom' or observed closely in an empirical understanding and gradually been categorized under the field of knowledge.² Through broader ways, the genealogy of Greek thought would largely accept these knowledge systems as a mean to an end in wisdom. And this wisdom, to the Greeks, becomes the foundation of such worldview as a manifestation of 'logos'. From this brief discussion, there are a couple of things that I seek to point out to establish the premise of this paper. First, that the idea of a transcendental logos becomes a point of enquiry in Greek thought and that this conception is both related to cognition and speech (expression).

Further, that the wisdom of the transcendental is without human possibilities and can only be consummated through understanding.

Here, going back to Aristotle for a moment might be necessary. Aristotle made a fundamental distinction between those that can be constructed or made ("poesis") and that which is to be performed ("praxis"). Thereby, he looked upon art, craft and poetry as workings under the former conception while denoting ethics and politics to the latter design. However, both these conceptions are about creative performances and not really placed on a similar pedestal in the Platonic tradition as that of a more democratic and 'realist' Aristotle. Now if we go by the Aristotelian definition (for Plato's opinion on such knowledge systems appear rather punitive against both his contemplation and militant interests of the state), these forms of performative actions, to no degree, can be tantamount to 'wisdom' even in Aristotle's own definitions. What is important here lies in the proposition of Aristotle itself; that with poetry appealing to the mind and politics negotiating with the society, the idea of change is not sublime enough to affect the immutable conceptions of the logo-centric human world. But then to the empirical Aristotelian thought, a change is nevertheless inflicted within broader society in methods of poesis and praxis. Of course, we are nearing into the same problem of the binaries in philosophy that has had plagued global thought across trans-temporalities. The problem is again that of the mind/body, of immanence/transcendence and of noumena/phenomena. The change is this-worldly, governed by logos but one that allows a certain degree of pragmatic involvement with the possibilities of this life.

In this discussion, the philosophy of immanence shares a dialectical relationship with social formations and makes possible a 'mimicry' of the inexpressible intelligent world. Social formations, in this human world of recognition, have a peculiar 'logic' of conventions and of

² There has been since the times of Plato and his student Aristotle, a conflict between what can be termed as wisdom against knowledge and the methods of their acquisition. To Aristotle, empirical knowledge contributes to wisdom whereas Platonic thought deals with impressionistic idealism of forms and discards all methods of sense driven enquiry as mere reductionist knowledge.

belief systems that are run by popular and collective understanding . This is further aided by the conflict of and in power structures at different historical moments and constructed through geo-spatial and psycho-emotive political imagination . This collective praxis resulting in the urge for documenting history has an implicit economy of ‘desire’ and is regulated by an idea of ethics that determine ‘value’ for both ontological life and its subsequent ontic associations. Human ethics , thus, is not just a concept of a “given existence” in the Heideggarian sense of the term but revolves around choices and their consequences and those situations that serve as determinants of both. Thus , ‘ethos’ becomes an auto-poetic function on which society creates its own ‘meaning’ and organizes its tendencies of ‘judgement’.

Again, in this Greek understanding of immanence, the origins of creation is facilitated through speech (and the script) where the language of communication serves as the primary medium of engagement with both cognition and expression. Thus, it pertains to all human responses in deciphering the transcendental problem of illusion. This, in Western classical thought, is referred to as ‘pathos’ or the ability to create meaning against a possible ‘ethos’ that in turn indulges in a teleological reading of the existing ‘logos’.³ Of course, we are moving towards Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* which in politics is associated with the ‘reality’ of human life. Aristotle’s demarcation of moral virtues against practical virtues in his *Nichomachean Ethics* can be a subject of discussion here.⁴ To the Aristotelian conception of private virtues (like courage, honour, kindness, fear), public virtues of praxis is a direct dependent. Public excellence is determined by individual belief through defining what comprises justice in one’s own life and is furthered in maintaining the social order. In political rhetoric, these modes of public posturing becomes central to understanding a greater purpose of language. This is not only in terms of sophist interventions or the skills in formal logic but in the relation to and in the construction of history; within political ideologies and in generating ‘false consciousness’ and more importantly, against developing techniques for reading ineluctable identities. In this paper, I explore how structural notions of political speeches affect modernity and lead to astounding patterns of symmetry and change.

³ Interestingly, the idea of speech being synonymous to world , its transcendence and cognition has been a perennial idea in both polytheistic and monotheistic religious philosophies. In Hindu philosophy, for instance, the sphota theory relates the word to the world intelligence or as ‘shabda-bhraman’ . This has found extensive

discussion in the pens of Sanskrit scholars like Patanjali, Kattayana and Bhartihari. In Christian thought, the ‘word’ of God becomes central to all creative powers as much as the Judaic notions of mysticism that is present in Hebraic language and alphabets. Gersholm Scholem, the Judaic mystic and scholar who exchanged letters with Walter Benjamin talks about Hebraic language being just a development of the original single word in the Hebrew phonic system. The same was elaborated on by Dr. Michael Laitman. Similarly, the Islamic notion of Allah’s word is embodied in the holy Quran.

⁴ See: Aristotle, *The Nichomachen Ethics*, translated and edited by WD Ross and Lesley Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2009.

While discussing the three structural units of speech; they being the intelligent ‘logos’, the expressive ‘pathos’ and a dialectical ‘ethos’, there are a couple of points that I regard as important to mention. The idea of ‘ethos’ is partly conducted by the logocentric imagination of a historical polity with respect to its political identities (of the ruler and the ruled and the conduits in between) and partly through the system of linguistic (emotive) arrangement. Language, in its fidelity to classical notions of ‘truth’ or ‘logos’ is inexorably associated with the idea of executing a decision. Decision, in its etymological provisions (from Latin *de+ caedere*), is about ‘cutting down’ on possibilities of existence and of redefining human essence. While exercising the right or the leeway to make choices, one might possibly doubt the notions that lead to the offering of any such possibilities to begin with. Is it due to the range of human executions in history and thus a function of anthropological study? Is it rather about the ecological limiting factors of survival and thus grossly biological, even Darwinian? Or is it rather human endeavours at creating situations through conflicts and co-ordination and thus starkly political? Is there an alternative notion of ‘pre-giveness’ and thus supernatural? These contentious positions remain to be investigated and has often been studied through a more syncretic element in thought.

Whatever intricacies might be associated with the engendering of possibilities, there remains an ‘ethos’ or a cultural view of life that interacts with such decision making processes. This ethos is the ‘normative undefinable’, often anti-rational and cultic and thus communicates both with the pathetic and the logo-centric in defining cultural spaces. It goes beyond to inform Walter Benjamin’s ‘angel of History’ and the spoils of civilizational dreams.

However, this long elaboration on antiquity and structures of speech is equally pertinent to study modern political history. Of course, modernity takes up both processes of structuring centres and breaking down already existent edifices, however, the urge for modern rhetoric is arguably located in a mimetic function. This mimesis is not just of antiquity but also of politics as a greater discipline. And this can well be established citing modernity (since Renaissance) being a mimetic product of classical antiquity itself. Thus, I contend that modern political speeches may well be read in terms of ancient components of rhetorical persuasion.

In this paper, I take up three political figures that have re-defined global history in terms of affective oral outreach and through the enactment of the ‘historical irreversible’ resulting in often strident conceptions of political resistance/expansion. Separated across continents, all the three figures hail from the twentieth century political imagination and influence existent ideologies to an extent where they sire strong cultic experiences. These experiences are that which, within themselves, bear the seeds of furthering ramified ideological formations. My objective in this paper is to locate definite patterns of behavioral ethics across these very different ideological movements. I will attempt to study their language while locating their speeches and the inherent pathos within the latter.

These three figures extend over and across the right-left political perspectives and move beyond every amorphous eccentricities that ‘in-between’ political ideologies combine. Hence, I look at Adolf Hitler, the German Nazi statesman and the most significant figure of global right wing

dictatorial rule and his speeches along with Fidel Castro, the Cuban left wing revolutionary autocrat and MK Gandhi, the Indian political mystic. All these three figures have had immense popularity in their own political spheres at defined moments of history. In this, their popularity oscillates between functions of power (Foucauldian) and the penetrability into mass cultures. I understand the co-ordinates of power as lying in 'transference', 'replication' and 'reproduction' of ideologies. The point of commonality, perhaps, lies in attempts to 'de-centre' the very definitions of power from an imposed and state-centred political ethos to a more mass-based emotive praxis.⁵ With respect to this, I propose that the will to appeal and authority becomes alternative points of loci at different moments in their movements that positions themselves across stages of the movements. These witness comparative shifts in attention ranging from the appeal to reason till the appeal to personal passion. I investigate a story of rationality against issues and blind followership as an outcome of passion towards the leader. All these locate the different stages of the movements I look into and measure techniques in comparative success.

In my hypothesis, I propose that all these three leaders, from very different political spectra use similar patterns of political oratory at similar stages of their movements. All the three figures become massively popular and establish almost cultic sub culture groups within the larger

movement. They commence their leadership through citing or 'manufacturing' logo-centric discourse, work to frame newer ethos within the masses and utilize their own appeal at moments of crisis (or pathos). Importantly, I believe all the three movements that I refer to here are not mass based movements in the real sense of the term but are 'imposed' to be made 'popular'. Be it Gnanthian non-violence that most Indian masses never understood, Castro's dictatorial socialism that many equated with just another anti-colonial movement or Hitler's sudden proclamation as the fuhrer that masses took for a leader who could fight the relative instability in the 1930s Germany. Intriguingly, these cults were imposed and made popular only through the 'rationalising' discourse that I call logo-centric. This establishment of logo centric meaning in the masses create psyche that generate a newer ethos or perspective towards both power and life. And at moments when this ethos comes under threat, pathos is used to perpetuate the precarious system that is neither logocentric nor ethos driven but completely based on the 'word' of the leader figure. This discussed, now I look at these figures and their speeches.

To begin with, I look into the language of MK Gandhi and trace his oratory itinerary with the progressive course of the Indian anti-colonial movement. I shall take up five prominent speeches by M K Gandhi over the five most significant events in his political career. I study his language with reference to the dynamic dialogue between the elements of 'logos' and 'pathos' and attempt to investigate intriguing patterns within both individual and collective political imagination.

⁵ In this paper, my intention would be to look at the stages where leaders use different components of speech to re-establish their political relevance. They create or work under an existent ethos to modify them. They use logos to legitimize their leadership. They use pathos to hold onto public appeal when all means of political rationalizing look precarious.

Before studying Gandhi's speeches in detail, it might be pertinent to briefly outline Gandhi's eclectic ideological concerns. M K Gandhi has largely been credited with mass consolidation of the Indian hinterlands within the movement for Indian political independence. While one may debate on Gandhi's rather amorphous social and political beliefs (he would come closer to the Gramscian definition of an 'organic' intellectual and arguably follow Fanon in his search for a 'revolutionary intellectual' albeit with severe caveats.⁶ While the other political figures that I discuss in this paper root their anti-colonial or nationalist struggles on teleocentric 'logos', Gandhian ideology peculiarly places itself in an umbrella tradition of Hindu spirituality and even religious occupation. Interestingly, Gandhi's political spirituality was inclusive and largely revolved around 'secular' (in the modern political sense) modes of confrontation, those involving problems of livelihood and economic labour. His idea of the cottage industry, rural polity and economic independence are major theoretical discourses of contention on grounds of materiality. But what is most radically placed in Gandhi is his non-radical ethical system that was largely based on religious convention but nevertheless radically followed (and preached) with a goal for social inclusion and cultural cohesion. Of course, his 'ahimsa' and 'sarvodaya' are well known conceptions in international politics and still engage with modern theories of conflict resolution. However, in this paper, I am concerned with his speeches and the 'tria-lectics' of the three classical components of the logo-etho-pathetic understanding. That I shall place with the progress of the Indian national movement.

To start with, let us read through an earlier speech of Gandhi, the one that remains significant due to his passion in oratory and one that garnered a positive reception among a section of the educated population in India. Delivered at the Banaras Hindu University on the 4th of February, 1916, Gandhi stood tall with a speech that was addressed not only to young learners (whom Gandhi mentioned as "the harbingers of change") but also to other notable attendees like Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy of India, and the Maharaja of Dharbhanga. Against this backdrop of colonial/anti-colonial tension within a small room and a contention of microcosmic forces in colonial India, Gandhi delivered his speech.

"I wish to tender my humble apology for the long delay that took place before I was able to reach this place. And you will readily accept the apology when I tell you that I am not responsible for the delay nor is any human agency responsible for it. The fact is that I am like an animal on show, and my keepers in their over kindness always manage to neglect a necessary chapter in this life, and, that is, pure accident. In this case, they did not provide for the series of accidents that happened to us-to me, keepers, and my carriers. Hence this delay.

Friends, under the influence of the matchless eloquence of Mrs. Besant who has just sat down, pray, do not believe that our University has become a finished product, and that all the young

⁶ Gandhi was educated in Britain. Though Gandhi's revolutionary ideals hardly follows Marxist line of thought, Gandhi's appearance, his dress code, his symbolic gestures and value systems were not typically in allegiance to colonial values. Hence, Gandhi might come close to Fanon's character though with disagreements on several nodes of Fanon's understanding.

men who are to come to the University, that has yet to rise and come into existence, have also come and returned from it finished citizens of a great empire. Do not go away with any such impression, and if you, the student world to which my remarks are supposed to be addressed this evening, consider for one moment that the spiritual life, for which this country is noted and for which this country has no rival, can be transmitted through the lip, pray, believe me, you are wrong. You will never be able merely through the lip, to give the message that India, I hope, will one day deliver to the world. I myself have been fed up with speeches and lectures. I except the lectures that have been delivered here during the last two days from this category, because they are necessary. But I do venture to suggest to you that we have now reached almost the end of our resources in speech-making; it is not enough that our ears are feasted, that our eyes are feasted, but it is necessary that our hearts have got to be touched and that our hands and feet have got to be moved. We have been told during the last two days how necessary it is, if we are to retain our hold upon the simplicity of Indian character, that our hands and feet should move in unison with our hearts. But this is only by way of preface. I wanted to say it is a matter of deep humiliation and shame for us that I am compelled this evening under the shadow of this great college, in this sacred city, to address my countrymen in a language that is foreign to me. I know that if I was appointed an examiner, to examine all those who have been attending during these two days this series of lectures, most of those who might be examined upon these lectures would fail. And why? Because they have not been touched.

I was present at the sessions of the great Congress in the month of December. There was a much vaster audience, and will you believe me when I tell you that the only speeches that touched the huge audience in Bombay were the speeches that were delivered in Hindustani? In Bombay, mind you, not in Benaras where everybody speaks Hindi. But between the vernaculars of the Bombay Presidency on the one hand and Hindi on the other, no such great dividing line exists as there does between English and the sister language of India; and the Congress audience was better able to follow the speakers in Hindi. I am hoping that this University will see to it that the youths who come to it will receive their instruction through the medium of their vernaculars. Our languages the reflection of ourselves, and if you tell me that our languages are too poor to express the best thought, then say that the sooner we are wiped out of existence the better for us. Is there a man who dreams that English can ever become the national language of India? Why this handicap on the nation? Just consider for one moment what an equal race our lads have to run with every English lad

I had the privilege of a close conversation with some Poona professors. They assured me that every Indian youth, because he reached his knowledge through the English language, lost at least six precious years of life. Multiply that by the numbers of students turned out by our schools and colleges, and find out for yourselves how many thousand years have been lost to the nation. The charge against us is that we have no initiative. How can we have any, if we are to devote the precious years of our life to the mastery of a foreign tongue? We fail in this attempt also. Was it possible for any speaker yesterday and today to impress his audience as was possible for Mr. Higginbotham? It was not the fault of the previous speakers that they could not engage the

audience. They had more than substance enough for us in their addresses. But their addresses could not go home to us. I have heard it said that after all it is English educated India which is leading and which is leading and which is doing all the things for the nation. It would be monstrous if it were otherwise. The only education we receive is English education. Surely we must show something for it. But suppose that we had been receiving during the past fifty years education through our vernaculars, what should we have today? We should have today a free India, we should have our educated men, not as if they were foreigners in their own land but speaking to the heart of the nation; they would be working amongst the poorest of the poor, and whatever they would have gained during these fifty years would be a heritage for the nation.

Today even our wives are not the sharers in our best thought. Look at Professor Bose and Professor Ray and their brilliant researches. Is it not a shame that their researches are not the common property of the masses?

Let us now turn to another subject.

The Congress has passed a resolution about self-government, and I have no doubt that the All-India Congress Committee and the Muslim League will do their duty and come forward with some tangible suggestions. But I, for one, must frankly confess that I am not so much interested in what they will be able to produce as I am interested in anything that the student world is going to produce or the masses are going to produce. No paper contribution will ever give us self-government. No amount of speeches will ever make us fit for self-government. It is only our conduct that will fit for us it. And how are we trying to govern ourselves?

I want to think audibly this evening. I do not want to make a speech and if you find me this evening speaking without reserve, pray, consider that you are only sharing the thoughts of a man who allows himself to think audibly, and if you think that I seem to transgress the limits that courtesy imposes upon me, pardon me for the liberty I may be taking. I visited the Vishwanath temple last evening, and as I was walking through those lanes, these were the thoughts that touched me. If a stranger dropped from above on to this great temple, and he had to consider what we as Hindus were, would he not be justified in condemning us? Is not this great temple a reflection of our own character? I speak feelingly, as a Hindu. Is it right that the lanes of our sacred temple should be as dirty as they are? The houses round about are built anyhow. The lanes are tortuous and narrow. If even our temples are not models of roominess and cleanliness, what can our self-government be? Shall our temples be abodes of holiness, cleanliness and peace as soon as the English have retired from India, either of their own pleasure or by compulsion, bag and baggage? I entirely agree with the President of the Congress that before we think of self-government, we shall have to do the necessary plodding. In every city there are two divisions, the cantonment and the city proper. The city mostly is a stinking den. But we are a people unused to city life. But if we want city life, we cannot reproduce the easy-going hamlet life. It is not comforting to think that people walk about the streets of Indian Bombay under the perpetual fear of dwellers in the storeyed building spitting upon them. I do a great deal of railway traveling. I observe the difficulty of third-class passengers. But the railway administration is by no means to blame for all their hard lot. We do not know the elementary

laws of cleanliness. We spit anywhere on the carriage floor, irrespective of the thoughts that it is often used as sleeping space. We do not trouble ourselves as to how we use it; the result is indescribable filth in the compartment. The so-called better class passengers overawe their less fortunate brethren. Among them I have seen the student world also; sometimes they behave no better. They can speak English and they have worn Norfolk jackets and, therefore, claim the right to force their way in and command seating accommodation. I have turned the searchlight all over, and as you have given me the privilege of speaking to you, I am laying my heart bare.

Surely we must set these things right in our progress towards self-government. I now introduce you to another scene. His Highness the Maharaja who presided yesterday over our deliberations spoke about the poverty of India. Other speakers laid great stress upon it. But what did we witness in the great pandal in which the foundation ceremony was performed by the Viceroy?

Certainly a most gorgeous show, an exhibition of jewellery, which made a splendid feast for the eyes of the greatest jeweler who chose to come from Paris. I compare with the richly bedecked noble men the millions of the poor. And I feel like saying to these noble men, "There is no salvation for India unless you strip yourselves of this jewellery and hold it in trust for your countrymen in India." I am sure it is not the desire of the King-Emperor or Lord Hardinge that in order to show the truest loyalty to our King-Emperor, it is necessary for us to ransack our jewellery boxes and to appear bedecked from top to toe. I would undertake, at the peril of my life, to bring to you a message from King George himself that he except nothing of the kind.

Sir, whenever I hear of a great palace rising in any great city of India, be it in British India or be it in India which is ruled by our great chiefs, I become jealous at once, and say, "Oh, it is the money that has come from the agriculturists." Over seventy-five per cent of the population are agriculturists and Mr. Higginbotham told us last night in his own felicitous language, that they are the men who grow two blades of grass in the place of one. But there cannot be much spirit of self-government about us, if we take away or allow others to take away from them almost the whole of the results of their labour. Our salvation can only come through the farmer. Neither the lawyers, nor the doctors, nor the rich landlords are going to secure it.

Now, last but not the least, it is my bounden duty to refer to what agitated our minds during these two or three days. All of us have had many anxious moments while the Viceroy was going through the streets of Banaras. There were detectives stationed in many places. We were horrified. We asked ourselves, "Why this distrust?" Is it not better that even Lord Hardinge should die than live a living death? But a representative of a mighty sovereign may not. He might find it necessary to impose these detectives on us? We may foam, we may fret, we may resent, but let us not forget that India of today in her impatience has produced an army of anarchists. I myself am an anarchist, but of another type. But there is a class of anarchists amongst us, and if I was able to reach this class, I would say to them that their anarchism has no room in India, if India is to conquer. It is a sign of fear. If we trust and fear God, we shall have to fear no one, not the Maharajas, not the Viceroys, not the detectives, not even King George.

I honour the anarchist for his love of the country. I honour him for his bravery in being willing to die for his country; but I ask him-is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit

precursor of an honourable death? I deny it. There is no warrant for such methods in any scriptures. If I found it necessary for the salvation of India that the English should retire, that they should be driven out, I would not hesitate to declare that they would have to go, and I hope I would be prepared to die in defense of that belief. That would, in my opinion, be an honourable death. The bomb-thrower creates secret plots, is afraid to come out into the open, and when caught pays the penalty of misdirected zeal. I have been told, "Had we not done this, had some people not thrown bombs, we should never have gained what we have got with reference to the partition movement." (Mrs. Besant : 'Please stop it.') This was what I said in Bengal when Mr. Lyon presided at the meeting. I think what I am saying is necessary. If I am told to stop I shall obey. (Turning to the Chairman) I await your orders. If you consider that by my speaking as I am, I am not serving the country and the empire I shall certainly stop. (Cries of 'Go on.') (The Chairman: 'Please, explain your object.') I am simply. . . (another interruption). My friends, please do not resent this interruption. If Mrs. Besant this evening suggests that I should stop, she does so because she loves India so well, and she considers that I am erring in thinking audibly before you young men. But even so, I simply say this, that I want to purge India of this atmosphere of suspicion on either side, if we are to reach our goal; we should have an empire which is to be based upon mutual love and mutual trust. Is it not better that we talk under the shadow of this college than that we should be talking irresponsibly in our homes? I consider that it is much better that we talk these things openly. I have done so with excellent results before now. I know that there is nothing that the students do not know. I am, therefore, turning the searchlight towards ourselves. I hold the name of my country so dear to me that I exchange these thoughts with you, and submit to you that there is no room for anarchism in India. Let us frankly and openly say whatever we want to say our rulers, and face the consequences if what we have to say does not please them. But let us not abuse.

I was talking the other day to a member of the much-abused Civil Service. I have not very much in common with the members of that Service, but I could not help admiring the manner in which he was speaking to me. He said : "Mr. Gandhi, do you for one moment suppose that all we, Civil Servants, are a bad lot, that we want to oppress the people whom we have come to govern?" "No,," I said. "Then if you get an opportunity put in a word for the much-abused Civil Service." And I am here to put in that word. Yes, many members of the Indian Civil Service are most decidedly overbearing; they are tyrannical, at times thoughtless. Many other adjectives may be used. I grant all these things and I grant also that after having lived in India for a certain number of years some of them become somewhat degraded. But what does that signify? They were gentlemen before they came here, and if they have lost some of the moral fiber, it is a reflection upon ourselves. Just think out for yourselves, if a man who was good yesterday has become bad after having come in contact with me, is he responsible that he has deteriorated or am I? The atmosphere of sycophancy and falsity that surrounds them on their coming to India demoralizes them, as it would many of us. It is well to take the blame sometimes. If we are to receive self-government, we shall have to take it. We shall never be granted self-government.

Look at the history of the British Empire and the British nation; freedom loving as it is, it will not

be a party to give freedom to a people who will not take it themselves. Learn your lesson if you wish to from the Boer War. Those who were enemies of that empire only a few years ago have now become friends. ”

(At this point there was an interruption and a movement on the platform to leave. The speech, therefore, ended here abruptly.)⁷

It is to be noted that Gandhi's speech comes rather at the early stage of the anti colonial movement when he was growing his name but was yet to establish himself as a cult figure. In this speech, Gandhi's language is essentially persuasive with very few metaphors being employed. In fact, contrary to most political ideologues, Gandhi's speech almost lacks the symbolic quality that has been associated with classical and modern ideas of public outreach. Gandhi's understanding of education in this speech reflects a stronger thrust on Indian languages and value system. He refers to educative understanding to reach "the poorest of the poor" and he uses pronouns like "we" to refer to people without literacy. There is a sense of identity construction where he transfixes his identity amongst those that lack formal education and positions himself as a metonymic representation of the illiterate Indians (despite himself being educated) and in that combines differences within Indian education and its access. Here it is to be noted that the audience had been essentially a literate audience. However, his insistence on appealing to uneducated Indians is definitely some symptom of a consciousness that regards the possibilities of this speech's afterlife on Gandhi's part. He breaks down the institutions of elite walled knowledge systems towards a more free, levelling ground. This rhetorical usage of language with an intention that dissolves its own agency (intention-intended model) is a function of unity. He brings in parxis directly to the institution through the reference of streets and cleanliness. A futuristic posture in being more concerned with what the students would produce. In that not only Gandhi looks into an underprivileged identity through illiteracy but imbues conditions with an optimistic identity already in construct

Gandhi brings in the idea of mass culture to display his interest in what "masses would produce" and refers that "no speeches" nor "papers" would provide self governance. This is a deliberate strategy to make the anti colonial movement more of and for the underprivileged . In fact, he brings in the notion of agency to change human environment that is less a function of theoretical study but more of collective responsibility that is more "common" in public conscience.

Besides, he questions radical and armed retaliation, rebukes "anarchists" but calls himself "an anarchist of different type". This is definitely a political conception around the good anarchist and the bad anarchist. He talks about an anarchy of politics where a particular head is not unduly accepted but is against what he calls the "anarchy of senses". Gandhi speaks against mutual sense of suspicion and relates anarchic politics to fear. Through this method, he constructs bravery and cowardice in negotiable terms. Interestingly, he brings in God to refuse all

⁷ See: M K Gandhi, *Speeches and Writings*, edited by and with an introduction from CF Andrews , third edition (Madras: GA Nateson and Co.), 1958, pg 45.

allegiance to colonisers. His oratory lies in negatively shaping his argument to keep negotiable measures open in presence of a foreign authority that includes imploding of power structures through personal politics than direct combat. Here, he distances religion from the notion of sovereignty. His words are not deliberately incendiary; it has a more “realist than utopian” presence. His appeal (to the Civil Servants) is on their “conscience”; an act of subjective and inclusionary measure. He talks about thinking audibly and his stress is on cognition than sense responses. Again, during the inaugural part of speech, he calls him an “animal managed by others”; thus he deliberately offers to relinquish his leader’s identity and attempts to portray a sense of oneness with the masses.

Gandhi is intelligently dealing with social objectives and methods to realize them. Here, he is using a logo-centric approach to invite Indians to join in the national movement and in turn accept his leadership. The ethos of the cult is yet to come alive; pathos negligible in his speech. Hence, Gandhi’s attempt to rationalize socialize becomes central to his emergence as a mass leader.

But now let us have look at his second speech. This speech was delivered by Gandhi at the Round table Conference of 1931.

“It will be after all and at best a paper solution. But immediately you withdraw that wedge, the domestic ties, the domestic affection, the knowledge of common birth – do you suppose that all these will count for nothing?”

Were Hindus and Mussalmans and Sikhs always at war with one another when there was no British rule, when there was no English face seen there? We have chapter and verse given to us by Hindu historians and by Mussalman historians to say that we were living in comparative peace even then. And Hindus and Mussalmans in the villages are not even today quarrelling. In those days they were not known to quarrel at all. The late Maulana Muhammad Ali often used to tell me, and he was himself a bit of an historian. He said : ‘If God’ – ‘Allah’ as he called out – gives me life, I propose to write the history of Mussalman rule in India; and then I will show , through that documents that British people have preserved, that was not so vile as he has been painted by the British historian; that the Mogul rule was not so bad as it has been shown to us in British history; and so on. And so have Hindu historians written. This quarrel is not old; this quarrel is coeval with this acute shame. I dare to say, it is coeval with the British Advent, and immediately this relationship, the unfortunate, artificial, unnatural relationship between Great Britain and India is transformed into a natural relationship, when it becomes, if it dose become, a voluntary partnership to be given up, to be dissolved at the will of either party, when it becomes that you will find that Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Christians, Untouchable, will all live together as one man I do not intend to say much tonight about the Princes, but I should be wronging them and should be wronging the Congress if I did not register my claim, not with the Round Table Conference but with the Princes. It is open to the Princes to give their terms on which they will join the Federation. I have appealed to them to make the path easy for those who inhabit the other part of India, and therefore, I can only make

these suggestions for their favourable consideration, for their earnest consideration. I think that if they accepted, no matter what they are, but some fundamental rights as the common property of all India, and if they accepted that position and allowed those rights to be tested by the Court, which will be again of their own creation, and if they introduced elements – only elements – of representation on behalf of their subject, I think that they would have gone a long way to conciliate their subjects. They would have gone a long way to show to the world and to show to the whole of India that they are also fired with a democratic spirit, that they do not want to remain undiluted autocrats, but that they want to become constitutional monarch even as King George of Great Britain is an Autonomous Frontier Province : Let India get what she is entitled to and what she can really take, but whatever she gets, and whenever she gets it, let the Frontier Province get complete autonomy today. That Frontier will then be a standing demonstration to the whole of India, and therefore, the whole vote of the Congress will be given in favour of the Frontier Province getting provincial Autonomy tomorrow. Prime Minister, If you can possibly get your Cabinet to endorse the proposition that from tomorrow the Frontier Province becomes a full-fledged autonomous province, I shall then have a proper footing amongst the Frontier tribes and convince them to my assistance when those over the border cast an evil eye on India. Thanks: Last of all, my last is pleasant task for me. This is perhaps the last time that I shall be sitting with you at negotiations. It is not that I want that. I want to sit at the same table with you in your closets and to negotiate and to plead with you and to go down on bended knees before I take the final lead and final plunge.

But whether I have the good fortune to continue to tender my co-operation or not does not depend upon me. It largely depends upon you. It depends upon so many circumstances over which neither you nor we may have any control whatsoever. Then, let me perform this pleasant task of giving my thanks to all form Their Majesties down to the poorest men in the East End where I have taken up my habitation

In that settlement, which represent the poor people of the East End of London, I have become one of them. They have accepted me as a member, and as a favoured member of their family. It will be one of the richest treasures that I shall carry with me. Here, too, I have found nothing but courtesy and nothing but a genuine affection from all with whom I have come in touch. I have come in touch with so many Englishmen. It has been a priceless privilege to me, They have listened to what must have often appeared to them to be unpleasant, although it was true.

Although I have often been obliged to say these things to them they have never shown the slightest impatience or irritation. It is impossible for me to forget these things. No matter what befalls me, no matter what the fortunes may be of this Round Table Conference, one thing I shall certainly carry with me, that is, that from high to low I have found nothing but the utmost courtesy and that utmost affection. I consider that it was well worth my paying this visit to England in order to find this human affection.

It has enhanced it has deepened my irrepressible faith in human nature that although English men and English women have been fed upon lies that I see so often disfiguring your Press, that although in Lancashire, the Lancashire people had perhaps some reason for becoming irritated

against me, I found no irritation and no resentment even in the operatives. The operatives, men and women, hugged me. They treated me as one of their own. I shall never forget that.

I am carrying with me thousands upon thousands of English friendship. I do not know them but I read that affection in their eyes as early in the morning I walk through your streets. All this hospitality, all this kindness will never be effaced from my memory, no matter what befalls my unhappy land. I thank you for your forbearance. (Concluded).⁸

Gandhi in this particular speech, enunciates words of confrontation though adhering to processes of negotiation. While he monopolizes on the Indian National Congress as the only major representation of India, he also promotes ahimsa as the only totalizing instrument of operation within the Congress. Congress, to him, serves as the medium of rebellion and he is apologetic about an old, radical way of protest. He endorses the new way as “true India” wheret he idea of “we” is mainly Gandhi’s own idea; though in fact INC had its own share of leaders who doubted Gandhi’s mode of resistance but were made quiet by the “mass” character of the movement.

A new identity of India, the only credible identity that mattered was one which Gandhi envisioned , the old historicising process on the radicals and the moderates were delegitimized with a violence that installed nothing but non violence while dismissing all other modes of anti-colonial struggle. What is significant in this speech is Gandhi’s slight decentring of his ‘we’ towards a space where his ‘we’ was being recognized and admitted only through what thee “I” thought. The collective praxis that remains dominant in this speech is slight undercut by the emphasis on the ‘I’ ness of the approval that came from Gandhi.

Hence, what Gandhi does here is to violently impose a new ethos on the masses as the only method to political liberation. This desperate attempt to weave a new ethical stance has to do more with the objectivities of reason and social praxis than personal invitation. However, Gandhi has taken a step away from complete rationalizing impulse to a sense of contingent ethos creation.

Now let us have a look at the famous speech by Gandhi on the eve of the inauguration of the Quit India Movement in 1940.

“Before you discuss the resolution, let me place before you one or two things, I want you to understand two things very clearly and to consider them from the same point of view from which I am placing them before you. I ask you to consider it from my point of view, because if you approve of it, you will be enjoined to carry out all I say. It will be a great responsibility. There are people who ask me whether I am the same man that I was in 1920, or whether there has been any change in me. You are right in asking that question. Let me, however, hasten to assure that I am the same Gandhi as I was in 1920. I have not changed in any fundamental respect. I attach the same importance to non-violence that I did then. If at all, my emphasis on it has grown

⁸ See: M K Gandhi, *Speeches and Writings*, edited by and with an introduction from CF Andrews , third edition (Madras: GA Nateson and Co.), 1958, pg 64.

stronger. There is no real contradiction between the present resolution and my previous writings and utterances. Occasions like the present do not occur in everybody's and but rarely in anybody's life. I want you to know and feel that there is nothing but purest Ahimsa in all that I am saying and doing today. The draft resolution of the Working Committee is based on Ahimsa, the contemplated struggle similarly has its roots in Ahimsa. If, therefore, there is any among you who has lost faith in Ahimsa or is wearied of it, let him not vote for this resolution. Let me explain my position clearly. God has vouchsafed to me a priceless gift in the weapon of Ahimsa. I and my Ahimsa are on our trail today. If in the present crisis, when the earth is being scorched by the flames of Himsa and crying for deliverance, I failed to make use of the God given talent, God will not forgive me and I shall be judged unworthy of the great gift. I must act now. I may not hesitate and merely look on, when Russia and China are threatened. ...

and to set up a dictatorship. But under the Congress scheme of things, essentially non-violent as it is, there can be no room for dictatorship. A non-violent soldier of freedom will covet nothing for himself, he fights only for the freedom of his country. The Congress is unconcerned as to who will rule, when freedom is attained. The power, when it comes, will belong to the people of India, and it will be for them to decide to whom it placed in the entrusted. May be that the reins will be placed in the hands of the Parsis, for instance-as I would love to see happen-or they may be handed to some others whose names are not heard in the Congress today. It will not be for you then to object saying, "This community is microscopic. That party did not play its due part in the freedom's struggle; why should it have all the power?" Ever since its inception the Congress has kept itself meticulously free of the communal taint. It has thought always in terms of the whole nation and has acted accordingly. . . I know how imperfect our Ahimsa is and how far away we are still from the ideal, but in Ahimsa there is no final failure or defeat. I have faith, therefore, that if, in spite of our shortcomings, the big thing does happen, it will be because God wanted to help us by crowning with success our silent, unremitting Sadhana for the last twenty-two years.

I believe that in the history of the world, there has not been a more genuinely democratic struggle for freedom than ours. I read Carlyle's French Revolution while I was in prison, and Pandit Jawaharlal has told me something about the Russian revolution. But it is my conviction that inasmuch as these struggles were fought with the weapon of violence they failed to realize the democratic ideal. In the democracy which I have envisaged, a democracy established by non-violence, there will be equal freedom for all. Everybody will be his own master. It is to join a struggle for such democracy that I invite you today. Once you realize this you will forget the differences between the Hindus and Muslims, and think of yourselves as Indians only, engaged in the common struggle for independence. Then, there is the question of your attitude towards the British. I have noticed that there is hatred towards the British among the people. The people say they are disgusted with their behaviour. The people make no distinction between British imperialism and the British people. To them, the two are one. This hatred would even make them welcome the Japanese. It is most dangerous. It means that they will exchange one slavery for another. We must get rid of this feeling. Our quarrel is not with the British people, we fight their

imperialism. The proposal for the withdrawal of British power did not come out of anger. It came to enable India to play its due part at the present critical juncture It is not a happy position for a big country like India to be merely helping with money and material obtained willy-nilly from her while the United Nations are conducting the war. We cannot evoke the true spirit of sacrifice and valour, so long as we are not free. I know the British Government will not be able to withhold freedom from us, when we have made enough self-sacrifice. We must, therefore, purge ourselves of hatred. Speaking for myself, I can say that I have never felt any hatred. As a matter of fact, I feel myself to be a greater friend of the British now than ever before. One reason is that they are today in distress. My very friendship, therefore, demands that I should try to save them from their mistakes. As I view the situation, they are on the brink of an abyss. It, therefore, becomes my duty to warn them of their danger even though it may, for the time being, anger them to the point of cutting off the friendly hand that is stretched out to help them. People may laugh, nevertheless that is my claim. At a time when I may have to launch the biggest struggle of my life, I may not harbor hatred against anybody.⁹

In this speech, Gandhi seeks approval of masses in an almost epideictic manner. He puts his identity as the leader on a negligible platform. However, significantly Gandhi finds the need to re-legitimize his own stance on non violence by quoting his role in the 1940s as the “same Gandhi as I was in 1920s..I attach the same importance to non-violence that I did then. If at all my emphasis has grown stronger.” Gandhi provides an apparent “public space” to opt out of ahimsa though he uses persuasion in rhetoric. His method in appealing to the masses does not rely in intelligent politics alone but centres more on God and dharma where the term dharma in itself serves as a far greater spiritual cement to rationalize all that he had been enunciating.

Again in his “ours is not a drive for power but a non-violent fight”, Gandhi re-creates ideological “justness” in the face of massive people discontent. In fact, during the 1940s with several factors within the Congress, the unnaturally patient attitude of the organization and the historical circumstances across the world had started interrogating the legitimacy of ahimsa as a political tool of confrontation, Gandhi’s violent imposition of non-violence could no longer be justified only on rational or ethical lines but demanded emotive invocations. More instance, “ I believe that in the history of mankind, there has not been a more genuine democratic struggle” over he almost exercises authority over historical narratives. To Gandhi, at this point of the Indian independence struggle, it turned into both a battle of ideas and individual struggle over oneself before confronting the antagonists. Gandhi also mentions his stance against ‘hatred’; and against slavery by the Japanese. In his tacit message to the Bose camp, he plays the ethical messiah that his much criticized policy over the British seems to look contrarian against. Thus, though Gandhi refrains from absolute use of pathos, his speech shows reduced talk on reason while reservation of his ethos takes the dominant appeal. There are glimpses of pathos visible in his speech like seldom before.

⁹ See: M K Gandhi, *Speeches and Writings*, edited by and with an introduction from CF Andrews , third edition (Madras: GA Nateson and Co.), 1958, 78.

In another speech called as “My Fast for Protest”, Gandhi utilizes similar pathos in his voice. This speech that comes almost at the end of 1946 lacks the rational element completely that the Gandhi of the 1920s frequently made use of. His speech is provided below.

One fasts for health's sake under laws governing health, fasts as a penance for a wrong done and felt as such. In these fasts, the fasting one need not believe in Ahimsa. here is, however, a fast which a votary of non-violence sometimes feels impelled to undertake by way of protest against some wrong done by society, and this he does when as a votary of Ahimsa has no other remedy left. Such an occasion has come my way.

When on September 9th, I returned to Delhi from Calcutta, it was to proceed to the West Punjab. But that was not to be. Gay Delhi looked a city of the dead. As I alighted from the train I observed gloom on every face I saw. Even the Sardar, whom humour and the joy that humour gives never desert, was no exception this time. The cause of it I did not know. He was on the platform to receive me. He lost no time in giving me the sad news of the disturbances that had taken place in the Metropolis of the Union. At once I saw that I had to be in Delhi and ‘do or die’. There is a apparent calm brought about by prompt military and police action. But there is storm within the breast. It may burst forth any day. This I count as no fulfillment of the vow to ‘do’ which alone can keep me from death, the incomparable friend. I yearn for heart friendship between the Hindus, the Sikhs and the Muslims. It subsisted between them the other day. Today it is non-existent. It is a state that no Indian patriot worthy of the name can contemplate with equanimity. Though the Voice within has been beckoning for a long time, I have been shutting my ears to it, lest it may be the voice of Satan otherwise called my weakness. I never like to feel resourceless, a Satyagrahi never should. Fasting is his last resort in the place of the sword—his or other’s. I have no answer to return to the Muslim friends who see me from day to day as to what they should do. My impotence has been gnawing at me of late. It will go immediately the fast is undertaken. I have been brooding over it for the last three days. The final conclusion has flashed upon me and it makes me happy. No man, if he is pure has anything more precious to give than his life. I hope and pray that I have that purity in me to justify the step.¹⁰

Almost similar pathetic elements, and even more intensely subjective compulsions plague one of his last speeches that he delivers a year later in May, 1947.

But whether it ends soon or late or never, let there be no softness in dealing with what may be termed as a crisis. Critics have regarded some of my previous fasts as coercive and held that on merits the verdict would have gone against my stand but for the pressure exercised by the fasts. What value can an adverse verdict have when the purpose is demonstrably sound? A pure fast, like duty, is its own reward. I do not embark upon it for the sake of the result it may bring. I do so because I must. Hence, I urge everybody dispassionately to examine the purpose and let me

¹⁰ See: M K Gandhi, *Speeches and Writings*, edited by and with an introduction from CF Andrews, third edition (Madras: GA Nateson and Co.), 1958, 103-04.

die, if I must, in peace which I hope is ensured. Death for me would be a glorious deliverance rather than that I should be a helpless witness of the destruction of India, Hinduism, Sikhism and Islam. That destruction is certain if Pakistan ensures no equality of status and security of life and property for all professing the various faiths of the world, and if India copies her. Only then Islam dies in the two India's, not in the world. But Hinduism and Sikhism have no world outside India. Those who differ from me will be honoured by me for their resistance however implacable. Let my fast quicken conscience, not deaden it. Just contemplate the rot that has set in beloved India and you will rejoice to think that there is a humble son of hers who is strong enough and possibly pure enough to take the happy step. If he is neither, he is a burden on earth. The sooner he disappears and clears the Indian atmosphere of the burden the better for him and all concerned. I would beg of all friends not to rush to Birla House nor try to dissuade me or be anxious for me. I am in God's hands. Rather, they should turn the searchlights inwards, for this is essentially a testing time for all of us. Those who remain at their post of duty and perform it diligently and well, now more so than hitherto, will help me and the cause in every way. The fast is a process of self-purification.¹¹

In both the last two speeches, there is a marked use of unnatural pathos in voice. Gandhi in his last speech even anticipates his own death. He remarkably takes recourse to almost prophetic language. Interestingly, although Gandhi's spiritual struggles were well known, Gandhi's early speeches does not overtly put these forward, at least those orations that had higher possibilities of being recorded and written about in the printed press at large. In the second last speech, Gandhi does refer to fasting as a means to shuddhi that will lead to religious harmony. This might well be read as an attempt to look into the last resort of the political. There lies a collective search for truth as Gandhi asks for 'blessing', an approach that still hovers around mass cultures rather than proclaiming his elevation as the leader. Gandhi, most importantly, paints himself a sacrificial figure; one whose penance takes on a role of an everlasting bond amongst India's conflicting cultural landscapes. He almost assumes himself on the foundation of a mediator and an essential fabric without whom India will lose its modern identity. In one way, Gandhi visualises himself as the totemic representation of India himself. He implores people not to go soft on him in a discourse that almost asks History to be his judge in his role for Indian resurgence. His model on Indian identity, draws on no 'enemy' figure, even colonizers are seen to be dealt with through restraint and rationality and his leadership is cemented with subjective appeal at every political crisis directed at him. His desire for self-destruction is projected to be more agreeable than admitting any change in values or in another other reading, Gandhi precludes other possibilities of variant hermeneutics in Indian history. His is an egoistic complex that shuns existence when the modes of praxis is delegitimized.

¹¹ See: M K Gandhi, *Speeches and Writings*, edited by and with an introduction from CF Andrews , third edition (Madras: GA Nateson and Co.), 1958, 117.

Now I intend to look at the cult of Hitler and study the pattern through which his oratory persuasion runs. To start with, I shall briefly mention Hitler's far right value systems to establish the plinth on which his political currency ran. Hitler had Volunteered in World War 1 after petitioning the Bavarian King and had won two decorations of bravery, including the rare Iron Cross First Class. He had survived injuries in the eye and on the leg during the war. Hitler believed that it was not only the Allied Power who crushed Germany in World War 1 but

“traitors” at home. Interestingly, he inducted himself as a part of the German Workers' Party, 1918 which aimed at securing the working class interests. However, later he formed the NAZI Party which came to known as the National Socialist Workers' Party. The NAZI's adopted the hooked cross or the Swastika as a symbol for ethnic dominance and they campaigned mostly the against 'soft measures' of Weimar Republic .

Of course, his prominent moments include the 1923 Beer Hall incident where Hitler engaged in a gun battle with police and invoked a 'revolution' that established himself as a national figure.

His strong anti-establishment character with his incisive choice of words gained him immense 'popularity'. He developed the Aryan race theory that propagated an anti Semitic stance. The Schutzstaffel (SS), in fact, swore on Hitler despite Weimar republic gaining a bit of support due to economic reforms. Hitler garnered more support with the onset of Great Depression that threatened German economic stability yet again. Hitler stood against communism primarily due to Jewish en masse participation in the Communist Party and asserted largely on the 'hypocrisy' of the communist movement that integrated Jews who were still capitalists themselves. Of most, the Jewish idea of 'double citizenship' and divided loyalty to nation was another potent factor that led him built his anti-Semitic stance. He ran against Paul von Hindenburg in 1933 and won elections. And he had been declared as chancellor within short span of time. Hitler capitalized on the Reichstag fire event (where Nazis themselves might have been involved) to control absolute authority. On March 23, 1933, Hitler seized absolute power. His diplomatic decisions include his initial appeasement policy towards other nations, and brutal oppression at home (often genocides). Germany has had witnessed events like the Night of Long Knives (1934) and the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws (1935). He had played a major role in World War 2 banking on an expansionist policy while forging alliances with Italy and Japan and other pacts. These include the Pact of Steel with Italy and the non aggressive pact with Soviet Russia. His erection of concentration camps and the lethal gas chambers that narrate the most terrible tales of the 20th century are historical periods that stain human civilization.

However, Hitler did enjoy enormous popularity in Germany for almost a decade. His autobiographical narrative that has its own logo-centric rationalizing approach might include a different dimension of generating Habermasian consensus. For that let us look into a few important speeches of Hitler across his tenure as a German statesman.

The first speech that we consider was delivered by Hitler at the German Munich, on April 12th 1922.

“Some one may say 'Well, there is the eight-hour day!' And was a collapse necessary to gain that? And will the eight-hour day be rendered any more secure through our becoming practically the bailiff and the drudge of the other peoples? One of these days France will say: You cannot meet your obligations, you must work more. So this achievement of the Revolution is put in question first of all by the Revolution Then some one has said: 'Since the Revolution the people has gained Rights. The people governs!' Strange! The people has now been ruling three years and no one has in practice once asked its opinion. Treaties were signed which will hold us down for centuries: and who has signed the treaties? The people? No! Governments which one fine day presented themselves as Governments. And at their election the people had nothing to do save to consider the question: there they are already, whether I elect them or not. If we elect them, then they are there through our election. But since we are a self governing people, we must elect the folk in order that they may be elected to govern us. Then it was said, 'Freedom has come to us through the Revolution.' Another of those things that one cannot see very easily! It is of course true that one can walk down the street, the individual can go into his workshop and he can go out again: here and there he can go to a meeting. In a word, the individual has liberties. But in general, if he is wise, he will keep his mouth shut. For if in former times extraordinary care was taken that no one should let slip anything which could be treated as lèse-majesté, now a man must take much greater care that he doesn't say anything which might represent an insult to the majesty of a member of Parliament. And if we ask who was responsible for our misfortune, then we must inquire who profited by our collapse. And the answer to that question is that 'Banks and Stock Exchanges are more flourishing than ever before.' We were told that capitalism would be destroyed, and when we ventured to remind one or other of these famous statesmen and said 'Don't forget hat Jews too have capital,' then the answer was: 'What are you worrying about?

Capitalism as a whole will now be destroyed, the whole people will now be free. We are not fighting Jewish or Christian capitalism, we are fighting very capitalism:

No, assuredly the Jew has suffered no privations! . While now in Soviet Russia the millions are ruined and are dying, Chicherin - and with him a staff of over 200 Soviet Jews - travels by express train through Europe, visits the cabarets, watches naked dancers perform for his pleasure, lives in the finest hotels, and does himself better than the millions whom once you thought you must fight as 'bourgeois.' The 400 Soviet Commissars of Jewish nationality they do not suffer; the thousands upon thousands of sub-Commissars -they do not suffer. No! all the treasures which the 'proletarian' in his madness took from the 'bourgeoisie' in order to fight so-called capitalism - they have all gone into their hands. Once the worker appropriated the purse of the landed proprietor who gave him work, he took the rings, the diamonds and rejoiced that he had now got the treasures which before only the 'bourgeoisie' possessed. But in his hands they are dead things - they are veritable death-gold. They are no profit to him. He is banished into his wilderness and one cannot feedoneself on diamonds. For a morsel of bread he gives millions in

objects of value. But the bread is in the hands of the State Central Organization and this is in the hands of the Jews: so everything, everything that the common man thought that he was winning for himself, flows back again to his seducers. And now, my dear fellow-countrymen, do you believe that these men, who with us are going the same way, will end the Revolution? They do not wish the end of the Revolution, for they do not need it. For them the Revolution is milk and honey. And further they cannot end the Revolution. For if one or another amongst the leaders were really not seducer but seduced, and today, driven by the inner voice of horror at his crime, were to step before the masses and make his declaration... ”¹²

In this speech, Hitler constructs his words with an over-detailed interpretation of historical events. His exposition is based on factual history, a sort of logocentric exposition of the Treaty of Versailles and other treaties that left Germans in debt and without colonies. Hitler has been remarkably analytical in his approach. For instance, he analyses the conditions of the Weimer Republic : “And in the political sphere we lost first our military prerogatives, and with that loss went the real sovereignty of our State, and then our financial independence, for there remained always the Reparations Commission so that 'practically we have no longer a politically independent German Reich, we are already a colony of the outside world. We have contributed to this because so far as possible we humiliated ourselves morally, we positively destroyed our own honor and helped to befool, to besmirch, and to deny everything which we previously held as sacred.”

His retrospective, almost mythical concern for German history that elucidates on the German race as “mighty, militant” is symbolic of the power of associating oneself with the logos, the mythically put rational. Now, this is an interesting problem. Mythical and rational are two contradictory strands of re-visiting history. But even in Greek classical terms, the rationalizing project has always been linked to divine sanctions and have taken on exemplary legendary imagination. In a sense with the advent of Chistianity, the conception of religious history has been linear in away but nevertheless interspersed with the supernatural. Secular history again has scarcely been away from a documentation of cultic groups and movements and in that way Hitler plays a prominent part. He goes back to Prussian and Hapsburg empires to cite rulers with German blood, their military prowess. There is an unmistakable attempt in re-construction of history that expands beyond German unification (1870s).

Hitler shows a tendency to conceptualise identity in terms of history and the bloodline of rulers. He imposes ‘gallantry’ of German rulers on all German race. He furthers the military agenda vis a vis international politics and focuses on “German blood that retaliates , thus in short allowing hyper-nationalism to dwell on brilliantly on economically privileged German race. Two pronged rhetorical strategy also involved the doctrine of the underprivileged and the working class. The

¹² See: *A Collection of Speeches by Adolph Hitler*, Vol. 1, edited by Raoul de Sales, introduction by Raymond Gram Swing, New York: My New Order.2020, 44-45.

hard reality of economic exploitation was pitted against “communist sham” that sheltered even capitalist classes. With that the ambition of economic freedom through diplomatic occupations sought to aid Hitler’s analytical project on history. Hitler couples this with an ardent focus on both expansion and colonization as part of the rational programme. He often called armaments as speeches themselves, a symbol of identity and expression, thus equating language to both thought, identity and action. In the Schmittian analysis, Hitler’s overt friend-enemy distinction plays a vital role in both his messianic project and German social identity. He posits himself as the messiah of both the brave and the oppressed. His language has free speech, multiple levels of historical allusions, metaphors and comparisons, trope of inversions but all structurally focussed on the logo-centric rational aspect of it.

The second speech that we locate for our study is the one he delivered on the 26th of February, 1924 before the Munich Court.

He said, *“It Seems strange to me that a man who, as a soldier, was for six years accustomed to blind obedience, should suddenly come into conflict with the State and its Constitution. The reasons for this stem from the days of my youth. When I was seventeen I came to Vienna, and there I learned to study and observe three important problems: the social question, the race problem, and, finally, the Marxist movement. I left Vienna a confirmed anti-Semite, a deadly foe of the whole Marxist world outlook, and pan-German in my political principles. And since I knew that the German destiny of German-Austria would not be fought out in the Austrian Army alone, but in the German and Austrian Army, I enlisted in the German Army.... When, on November 7, [1918] it was announced that the Revolution had broken out in Munich, I at first could not believe it. At that time there arose in me the determination to devote myself to politics. I went through the period of the Soviets, and as a result of my opposition to them I came in contact with the National Socialist German Workers Movement, which at that time numbered six members. I was the seventh. I attached myself to this party, and not to one of the great political parties where my prospects would have been better, because none of the other parties understood or even recognized the fundamental problem. By Marxism I understand a doctrine which in principle rejects the idea of the worth of personality, which replaces individual energy by the masses and thereby works the destruction of our whole cultural life. This movement has utilized monstrously effective methods and exercised tremendous influence on the masses, which in the course of three or four decades could have no other result than that the individual has become his own brother's foe, while at the same time calling a Frenchman, an Englishman, or a Zulu his brother. This movement is distinguished by incredible terror, which is based on a knowledge of mass psychology. ..The German Revolution is a revolution, and therefore successful high treason; it is well known that such treason is never punished....”*¹³

¹³ See: *A Collection of Speeches by Adolph Hitler*, Vol. 1, edited by Raoul de Sales, introduction by Raymond Gram Swing, New York: My New Order.2020, 48.

Here, Hitler's nationalist rhetoric reaches its peak, his method of identification is only through military conscription. He establishes his military past to project his rightful position as the leader. Ironically, Culture takes secondary seat after a tepid response by public intellectuals. The idea of his economic logos is subsumed by logic of a figure that can lead to salvation. Hitler, more prominently than most other state figures, gives into full identification with his own charisma and in creating the 'cult-messiah figure'. He embarks on self conscious speech and is projected through language as the leader of the metonymic whole for the masses, creates organic association. Interestingly, Hitler, for the first prominent time, breaks away with Marxist mimicry, revises ideology to talk about the brain-body monistic labour. There is a marked rhetoric of allegation citing personality traits which are in the process of being wiped out. He re-defines history as those of the leaders chosen by the masses. Strikingly, there is a defined hint of fascist rhetoric reaching its peak through this speech. However, persuasion again is through logo centric vindication with a visible shift towards his own figure as the leader. Thus the indulgence in the pathetic is visible though not dominant.

The third speech that I look at read is one that was enunciated in the Berlin Reichstag on March 23, 1933. This was on the eve of Hitler's rise to power in Germany.

"In November 1918, Marxist organizations seized the executive power by means of a revolution. The monarchs were dethroned, the authorities of the Reich and of the States removed from office, and thereby a breach of the Constitution was committed. The success of the revolution in a material sense protected the guilty parties from the hands of the law. They sought to justify it morally by asserting that Germany or its Government bore the guilt for the outbreak of the War. This assertion was deliberately and actually untrue. In consequence, however, these untrue accusations in the interest of our former enemies led to the severest oppression of the entire German nation and to the breach of the assurances given to us in Wilson's fourteen points, and so for Germany, that is to say the working classes of the German people, to a time of infinite misfortuneThe splitting up of the nation into groups with irreconcilable views, systematically brought about by the false doctrines of Marxism, means the destruction of the basis of a possible communal life.... It is only the creation of a real national community, rising above the interests and differences of rank and class, that can permanently remove the source of nourishment of these aberrations of the human mind..."¹⁴

Here, certain traits of Hitler's language needs to be studied. First, Hitler indulges in a rhetoric of negation. His focus is neither on the rationalist-mythic dream of the German legendary state nor the race of the warriors. His prime focus is against the Marxist doctrine of redemption. Hitler

¹⁴ See: *A Collection of Speeches by Adolph Hitler*, Vol. 1, edited by Raoul de Sales, introduction by Raymond Gram Swing, New York: My New Order.2020, 53.

stresses more on the perpetuation of the ‘authentic’/ ‘inauthentic’ saviour. However, he retains the logocentric project of rationality through economic fact seeking. He looks at the economy as a project as the end by the means of military occupation. Hitler talks about aggression and unity while developing on the Aryan race theory. Strikingly the components of the anti-Semitic identity is collimated with the psychotic paranoia in extermination of the enemies outside and inside the national frame. He does this through the rhetoric of sanitisation and fixing space time through a mythical appropriation. So he strikes a balance between cultic identification with masses and confuses statistics to deal with an eccentric dialectics of both logo-centric persuasion and pathetic reminiscence for German identity.

Interestingly, Hitler’s speech at the Reichstage on 30th January, 1937 moves towards another pathetic notion of both individual and collective identity.

“MEN! Deputies of the German Reichstag! The Reichstag has met today on a day momentous for the German people. Four years have passed since the greatest national revolution and reformation that Germany has ever experienced began. These were the four years which I asked for as a trial period.... I do not know whether there has ever been such a thorough revolution as ours, which nevertheless left unmolested numerous former political functionaries and allowed them to work in peace and paid pensions to its bitterest enemies. But our policy has not been of much use to us as far as other countries are concerned. Only a few months ago honorable British citizens felt they must make a protest to us for detaining in a concentration camp one of the most criminal subjects of Moscow. [Presumably Herr von Ossietzky, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize.] I do not know whether these honorable men have also protested against the slaying and burning of tens of thousands of men, women, and children in Spain. We are assured that the number of people slain in Spain is 170,000. On this basis we would have had the right to murder 400,000 to 500,000 people in the Nazi Revolution! The National Socialist program replaces the liberalistic conception of the individual by the conception of a people bound by their blood to the soil. Of all the tasks with which we are confronted, it is the grandest and most sacred task of man to preserve his race. This will not lead to an estrangement of the nations; on the contrary, it will lead for the first time to a mutual understanding. It will also prevent the Jewish people from trying to disintegrate and dominate other people under the mask of an innocent bourgeoisie.

Within a few weeks the social prejudices of a thousand years were swept away. So great was the Revolution that its spiritual foundations have not been understood even today by a superficial world. They speak of democracies and dictatorships, and have not realized that in this country a Revolution has taken place that can be described as democratic in the highest sense of the word. Does a more glorious socialism or a truer democracy exist than that which enables any German boy to find his way to the head of the nation? The purpose of the Revolution was not to deprive a privileged class of its rights, but to raise a class without rights to equality.... There is now only one representative of German sovereignty - the people itself. The will of the people finds its expression in the Party as its political organization. Therefore there is only one legislative body. There is only one executive authority. Therefore the people is the basis, and Party, State, Army,

industry, justice, etc., are only the means of maintaining the people. In a new penal code, justice will be put for all time into the service of maintaining the German race. When I took over power there were more than 6,000,000 unemployed and the farmers seemed doomed to decay. Today you-must admit that I have fulfilled my promises. . .The Four-Year Plan will give permanent employment to those workmen who are now being released from the armament industry. It is significant for the gigantic economic development of our people that there is today a lack of trained workmen in many industries. There will be no strikes or lockouts in Germany, because every one has to serve the interests of the entire nation. Education of the people will never come to an end, and this education includes the Hitler Youth, the Labor Service, the Party, and the Army,, as well as books, newspapers, theaters, and films. The restoration of Germany's equality of status was an event which exclusively concerns Germany herself. We have never taken anything from any people or harmed any people. In this sense I will deprive the German railways and the Reichsbank of their former character and place both without reservation under the sovereignty of the Government. The time of so-called surprises has thus been ended. I solemnly withdraw the German signature from the declaration, extracted by force from a weak Government against its better judgment, that Germany was responsible for the War. The restoration of the honor of the German people was the most difficult and the most audacious task and work of my life. As an equal State, Germany is conscious of its European task to co-operate loyally in removing the problems which affect us and other nations. My views concerning these problems can perhaps be most suitably stated by referring to the statements recently made by Mr. Eden in the House of Commons. I should like to express my sincere thanks for the opportunity of making a reply offered me by the frank and notable statement of the British Foreign Minister. I shall first try to correct what seems to me a most regrettable error - namely, that Germany never had any intention of isolating herself, of passing by the events of the rest of the world without sharing them, or that she does not want to pay any consideration to general necessities. I should like to assure Mr. Eden that we Germans do not in the least want to be isolated and that we do not feel at all that we are isolated . ”¹⁵

Hitler’s speech becomes largely epideitic and highly narrative that looks for re-establishment of cultural ideology. His perpetuating agenda cites statistics and foreign victories as measures of reaffirmation. But importantly, the idea of the cult is projected more into common -sensual ethos of Germans. Lesser logo-centric discourse is given space and greater stress is laid upon German ethos relying on the new temperament as the original exploration of the gilded German-Aryan trait. Aggression is reduced in its tenor but none the less perpetuated through the continuous narrative of the enemy at home. There remained an appeasement strategy with allied powers but aggressive rhetoric was still given greater space in Germany. The idea of objective logos dwells

¹⁵See: *A Collection of Speeches by Adolph Hitler*, Vol. 1, edited by Raoul de Sales, introduction by Raymond Gram Swing, New York: My New Order.2020, 92.

less into the mythic past or the promised future (like his initial speeches) but mainly is retained to inform the present. He addresses the Nuremberg laws and the Jewish purge and intends to garner 'legitimacy' through a curious combination of the 'rational' (the friend/enemy distinction) as much as the emotive (the layers of pure German identity). Interestingly, the concept of sovereignty that was not given a dominant place in his previous spaces is poignantly re-introduced (it had been more in line with the German monarchy), and Hitler himself shuns democracy (for the most significant manner since his elevation as a statesman) and replaced by cult dictatorship. This method in interpellative attempts processed itself through his embodying himself as the only 'will of the people'. This qualification of "will power" is largely through the suspension of the spirit of enquiry.

The final speech of Hitler that I look into perhaps marks the last important speech of Hitler and was delivered by him on May 4, 1941.

Deputies. Men of the German Reichstag: At a time when only deeds count and words are of little importance, it is not my intention to appear before you, the elected representatives of the German people, more often than absolutely necessary. The first time I spoke to you was at the outbreak of the war when, thanks to the Anglo-French conspiracy against peace, every attempt at an understanding with Poland, which otherwise would have been possible, had been frustrated. The most unscrupulous men of the present time had, as they admit today, decided as early as 1936 to involve the Reich, which in its peaceful work of reconstruction was becoming too powerful for them, in a new and bloody war and, if possible, to destroy it. They had finally succeeded in finding a State that was prepared for their interests and aims, and that State was Poland. All my endeavors to come to an understanding with Britain were wrecked by the determination of a small clique which, whether from motives of hate or for the sake of material gain, rejected every German proposal for an understanding due to their resolve, which they never concealed, to resort to war, whatever happened. The man behind this fanatical and diabolical plan to bring about war at whatever cost was Mr. Churchill. His associates were the men who now form the British Government. These endeavors received most powerful support, both openly and secretly, from the so-called great democracies on both sides of the Atlantic. At a time when the people were more and more dissatisfied with their deficient statesmanship, the responsible men over there believed that a successful war would be the most likely means of solving problems that otherwise would be beyond their power to solve. Behind these men there stood the great international Jewish financial interests that control the banks and the Stock Exchange as well as the armament industry. And now, just as before, they scented the opportunity of doing their unsavory business. And so, just as before, there was no scruple about sacrificing the blood of the peoples. That was the beginning of this war. A few weeks later the State that was the third country in Europe, Poland, but had been reckless enough to allow herself to be used for the financial interests of these warmongers, was annihilated and destroyed. In these circumstances I considered that I owed it to our German people and countless men and

*women in the opposite camps, who as individuals were as decent as they were innocent of blame, to make yet another appeal to the common sense and the conscience of these statesmen.*¹⁶

This speech, like the last speeches of Gandhi, combines all the elements of classical rhetoric though there is a radical shift towards pathos. Hitler, at this point of history, steers away from rational or fictional statistical delineation of politics for a more persuasive attempt to reach out to the masses and that through keeping his own figure and his own emotions at the centre. This speech can safely be called pathetic in more than one way. The idea of the messiah is made possible through the same mythic system of thought but with a poignant appeal to re-assert his role as the savior of the German people who were wronged after the First World War. This portrayal of a sacrificial figure is a marked gesture in all failing political milieu and with an urgency to re-centre politics from the ‘common sense’ or ‘common knowledge’ of the public to the personal charisma and sympathy towards the leader and his dreams/myths of the past, present and the future. For instance, Hitler’s own identity is deemed to be “broken” into millions of Germans whose “honour” is to be “redeemed”. Thus, the ‘messiah is always right’ becomes a new discourse of the political. In that his persuasion is more by personal outreach than logo-mediated conceptualization and his cultural ethos dominates over materialist analysis.

Finally, in this paper, I take up Fidel Castro, the left wing revolutionary, anti-colonial figure and a staunch autocrat who ruthlessly sabotaged all counter-revolutionary movements. Castro’s legacy has a glorious chronology of his own before stepping into controversies that marred his claims about both democracy and left wing liberal ethos. In July 1916, he led an uprising against the Batista govt. Interestingly, Castro used to believe in liberal democracy before Batista usurped power. In July 1955, during the apotheosis of that movement, he delivered his famous “History will absolve me” speech before the court that made him the unmistakable newer star within the anti-colonial political horizon. In Jan, 1959, he led the triumphant procession into Havana and assumed prime ministerial post in February, 1959. In 1961, he declared himself as a revolutionary socialist and braved through the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. In 1965, he found the New Cuban Communist party and in 1975, he sent troops to South Africa in defense of their government against colonial rule, thus sparking international ambitions. Cuba went through severe economic crisis under Castro in 1980s till the middle of the 1990s. In 1994, there were wide spread protests against Castro. He confronted the US and its jets in 1996 and emerged victorious in quelling the ‘counter-revolutionaries’. In 2002, he declared socialism to be “irrevocable” in the Cuban constitution and in 2003, followed it up with widespread crackdown on Cuban protestors. Castro throughout his tenure as a leader have been accused of severe cases of human rights violation, autocratic approach to the constitution amendment acts and even erecting labour camps to “straighten” Cuban youth. Despite the despotic semblances that have

¹⁶ See: *A Collection of Speeches by Adolph Hitler*, Vol. 1, edited by Raoul de Sales, introduction by Raymond Gram Swing, New York: My New Order.2020, 98.

been associated with Castro, he remains a very pertinent figure in the political history of the 20th century.

I read through Castro's speeches with effective analysis on the logos/pathos/ethos components and try to look into the pattern that emerges out of them. The first speech that I consider here is entitled "What is Democracy" that he delivers in 1959 on the victory against the American troops as he promised to usher in a new age for the Cuban citizens.

"Distinguished revolutionary leaders of Latin America, who are honoring us with a visit; heroic peasants of Cuba; fellow countrymen, all: On a day like this so full of memories for all of us it would be hard not to feel overcome by the deepest emotion. As I speak to you now, the first question which came to my mind was why a

man who is just a citizen like you all should have such a great debt of gratitude to the people, for all the signs of affection given. All we did was try to do our duty. All the credit is due the people, not one man. I also wondered why there was such rejoicing at the announcement that I was obeying the people's will and resuming my post. The only explanation possible is that the people know I am not interested in public office and that I will not sacrifice one iota of the national interests of my sense of duty for all the premierships in the world. The people would never demand the return of a man who was ambitious only for his post, for if our country is tired of anything it is tired of ambitious men, men incapable of sacrificing themselves for the national interests. A people never supports a government without reason; a people never supports leaders without a reason. For those abroad who defame us, to those who speak of democracy and slander us, we could offer no better argument than the million and more Cubans who have gathered here today. To those who speak in the name of democracy or who hypocritically invoke the word democracy to slander us we can say that this is democracy. Democracy is the fulfillment of the will of the people. Those who wish to find out what a real democracy is should come to Cuba. Those who wish to find out what a ruling people are like should come to

Cuba. Those who wish to find out what a ruling people are like should come to Cuba. Those who want to find out what the real word democracy means should come to Cuba. Our democracy is so pure that we can compare it to the first that existed in the world, such as the Greek democracy, where the people discussed and decided their fate in the public square. However, there is a difference: In Greece everything was discussed democratically by the owners of slaves; in Cuba the people in general discuss everything freely. The pilots of our country are the farmers, while the people who ruled in Greece were well-to-do. Our leaders come from among the farmers, who have been mistreated for such a long time.

The peasant was not only denied land; he was denied education; the peasant was even denied a chance to learn to read and write. The peasant was denied even the right to live, for it should be

known that the peasants' children often died from lack of medical care. The peasant's wife died, because he often had no medicine or doctor for her. There are cases in which the peasants' children have died of starvation. In redeeming the peasantry, the revolution is taking the first step toward establishing a real democracy, a democracy without slaves, without helots, and which today presents the rare case of a non-representative democracy, one that is pure, a democracy that lives through the direct participation of the people in its public problems. In our country only the will and interests of the people are effective. If the people had willed otherwise, I would not have returned to the post of premier. The decision was up to the people. The people could have said not to come back, or they could, and did, say that I should come back. And so it was not the will of one man or a group of men but the will of the people which was done. Now let our enemies say and write what they will.

When we speak about the power of our revolution, we do not do so to make anyone afraid of it because no one has reason--unless it be egotistical and base reasons--to fear our revolution.

When we say we are strong we do not say so because we want to attack anyone. We only aspire to live on our wealth and not on that of other people. We only want to live on the sweat and toil of our people and not on the sweat and toil of other people. When I say that our revolution is strong, I do not do so to frighten other people because our revolution is aimed against no one and no people of the world have anything to fear from our revolution. Those who lie to the people; those who unashamedly and cynically wish to deceive other people awakening fears of our revolution in them; those vested and egotistic interests that wish to deceive other people--these people are only watching out for their base and egotistic interests. No one has anything to fear from our revolution. So when I say that our revolution is strong, we do not display an aggressive fortress against anyone.”¹⁷

Castro's speech "This is Democracy," provides an excellent example of the leader using the phonic system to promulgate a message of national mobilization. To him, identity construction is not through the history of Cuban past but through the present force of development and potential for a new identity. His attempt at 'identity' creation, unlike Hitler, does not transpire by citing past identities nor from relying from a mythic or legendary racial system of thought. In fact, it works on quite a contrarian position, there is only one linear rhetoric that talks about a single collective identity. This is possible only through breaking way from the past and not romanticizing it. However, Castro does use myth to a limited extent, though not on racial or stringently ethnic lines. He uses history in its most grandiose form and in the rhetoric of the victors against the vanquished. There is invocation of classical history and the allusion to Greek city-states. He speaks about the battle of the Greek and the Persian. He mentions how Leonidas and his Spartans would stay behind to hold off the attackers led by Xerxes while the rest of the Greek army escaped. It is necessary to point out a prophecy that Leonidas had received from an oracle right before the battle that said that Sparta would either lose its city, or lose a king. So

¹⁷ See: <https://lanic.utexas.edu/la/cb/cuba/castro.html> Section 1959.

what Castro here attempts to perform is to use the tropes of inversion and malleability in a rather deliberate manner.

But how is it a case of inversion? There is an element of irony attached to it. By history, the Spartans, in their own city-state, were the exact people to which Castro referred. They were not a group of citizens who became militarized in order to secure power for the majority of workers.

The Spartans endured severe military training in order to keep their slaves in check. The Helots, or Spartan slaves, were the true workers of Sparta, farming the land. The Helots outnumbered the Spartans, so the Spartans had to establish a militaristic order that could crush any attempted uprising by these slaves. When Castro stated, "You, the farmers, the workers, the youth, were the majority of the people. You who produce, you who made sacrifices, you who work, you were always and you are today and will be tomorrow, the majority of the people. But you did not govern. You were the majority, but others governed in your stead and governed against you," he was basically speaking to the Helot slaves, not the Spartan oppressors. Such tropes, however, went unnoticed by the larger Cuban population and in historical imagination, the 'falsification' of historical implications were the new attempts in inventing a new logos, an act of generating false consciousness. However, it is to be noted that Castro uses this mythic history not to generate a cultural identity but to aggrandize military prowess.

The second speech that we look at is commonly called as the 'Speech on Savagery' (1978).

"I am going to ask the people to do something for me, and that is that they help me. There are a million persons here and the loudspeakers cannot be heard. Absolute silence is necessary. It is very difficult to speak when (words indistinct) perfectly well, and today I should like to tell the people what I feel; I would like to tell the reporters what the people of Cuba feel, I want to tell the diplomatic representatives of the entire world the way our people think. To hear us, it is not enough to have been here; to have attended is not enough alone. It is necessary to be silent. It is necessary to show the people's discipline by being quiet. Let us see if a million people can be silent. (He waits to let the crowd calm down--Ed.) Fellow citizens, it is possible that our fighters trembled more today before this crowd than they ever did before enemy bullets. For us, who have extraordinary faith in our people, this assembly has exceeded all estimates. It is said that with those who have just arrived the crowd extends from the Malecon to the Park of Fraternity. We can say one thing here today, and that is that there is no place in Havana to bring together all the people who support the revolution. (Applause) Before a small park was enough and there was room left. This time all the parks together around the presidential palace are insufficient. I am going to tell you an anecdote so that you can understand the full moral value of this meeting for us.

The Cuban people are not a savage people, or a criminal people. This is the noblest and most feeling people in the world. If an injustice were committed here, all the people would be against

it. Our intellectuals are not unfeeling; our newsmen are not unfeeling; our workers are not unfeeling; our peasants are not unfeeling; our priests are not unfeeling, and when everybody (few words indistinct) the punishment, it is because the punishment is a just one, it is because the punishment is deserved. The allied powers punished the war criminals after the second world war, and they have less right to do so than we have, because they meted out punishment under the ex post facto legislation, while we are punishing the war criminals under legislation passed before the crime, in public trials, in courts made up of honest men. To avoid mistakes we are trying only the most notorious criminals, those who (have 5, 10, 15, or 20 murders against them?), those known to all the people. But is it not possible to expatriate, and I am going to meet with newsmen from the whole hemisphere. We have also invited the President of Cuba to attend the interview, and we are going to invite the cabinet. And we are going to explain fully to the newsmen everything they want us to explain. We must not expatriate; there is just one thing more.”¹⁸

In this speech, Castro draws in his ideological and hence logo-centric concerns more strongly than his earlier speeches. It directly appeals to the newly formed anti-colonial ethos in the Cuban minds. There remains a careful perpetuation of the insider-outsider binary and Castro attempts to measure popularity now in terms of mass reflection. To Castro, this was the period where he attempts to play the messiah in a form of metonymic representation of the anti-colonial collective. His revolutionary ideology which had so forth been banking on both economic and colonial analysis was now promulgated to cultural sphere. There was an indictment of an enemy inside: counter-revolutionaries, the same Schmittian note that aided Hitler’s justification of genocidal discourse. There was skepticism towards international exchange, both economic and ideological and attempts to project self-consciousness through the collective. Castro’s language seems to explore the identity of the masses mostly through history and occasionally through his own figure. The same oscillation between objective logos and ego-driven pathos rise in conflict in Castro’s speeches henceforth with him assuming the dictatorial throne.

The third speech that might be significant here is the 1982 speech on economic crisis that immediately followed the Mariel incident.

“Socialism worked the miracle of eliminating many diseases and reducing the number of deaths...Socialism worked the miracle of bringing our country into first place in Latin America in the field of culture...Socialism worked the miracle of eradicating unemployment in our country...Socialism worked the miracle of undertaking the economic and social development... Castro must ensure that Cubans understand that socialism uses its godliness to inspire individuals, but it is the individuals who must perform the actual work in the physical world.

¹⁸ <https://lanic.utexas.edu/la/cb/cuba/castro.html> Section 1978.

Hence, Castro weaves his speech to create a more receptive, tangible understanding of socialism through metaphor. Linking socialism to a compass, he states, "...and our compass is socialism, our compass is Marxism-Leninism...so let them flee, their parents do not want them back too.

We didn't always act wisely, as we said during the Second Congress, we didn't always make the best decisions. But we were certainly always able, with all the honesty in the world, to detect in time any error, any wrong decision, recognize it, rectify it, and carry on; because even when you travel through the mountains with the help of a compass – and our compass is socialism, our compass is Marxism-Leninism – from time to time there can be some drifting away from the right path – just as ships sailing on the ocean occasionally drift off course a little – but you always keep going ahead. After Castro restores Cubans' faith in godly socialism in order to stabilize internal turmoil, he redirects Cubans toward a possible external invasion by the United States by invoking the living history of Giron, previously mentioned, so that Cubans may duplicate itsperceived grandeur. With a hardened faith in socialism, and a rallying cry of 'Remember Giron'."¹⁹

With this one may also look at his speech on "Wolves" that he delivered a decade later but by espousing similar thoughts.

"There are some who are embarrassed at having been communists, even of having been socialist... We are not embarrassed. We feel proud to call ourselves socialists and feel even more proud to be communists" or "We will not commit suicide with cowardly concessions and compromise. We will not destroy ourselves." "Society has thought of another form of organization now, ...a more just society, where man has put science, technology, and machines at the service of man, really. That horrifying inequality that existed between some human beings and others has disappeared

No one can promote science and technology more than socialism is doing, because no one else can seek the integration, the cooperation among all scientists, all the scientific research centers, all the professionals, all the hospitals". He backed up this claim by referencing numerous science movements that were currently taking place within Cuba that illustrated cooperation among professionals."²⁰

Both these speeches of Castro has been built on ideological reiteration: ideas beyond materialism with cultural binaries as the superstructure in Cuban politics. To this extent, both Logos and Ethos are working jointly to give effect to a mode of persuasion. However, contrary to Castro's earlier speeches, there is more legislative rhetoric than epideictic understanding in this piece. The idea of popularity is not generated from the masses themselves but is imposed onto masses by function of power at this stage of the Cuban establishment. However, collective praxis is still seen to be more dominant than the central figure of the messiah. Unlike Castro's

¹⁹ <https://lanic.utexas.edu/la/cb/cuba/castro.html> Section 1982.

²⁰ <https://lanic.utexas.edu/la/cb/cuba/castro.html> Section 1987

former speeches, invocation of ideology over self-consciousness or history and there is a complete break with centre/right politics on the part of Castro. Self-consciousness, though plays a secondary role in ideological interpretation here, is nevertheless present with a potential vigour that maintains the logo-centric balance from collapsing into pathetic, individual appeals.

Interestingly unlike both Hitler and Gandhi, there is perpetuation of the cultic and collective together after three decades of incumbency (both Gandhi and Hitler had exhausted notions of logocentrism and mass praxis in favour of frenetic appeals through their individual personas by this time span in their respective movements.

However, if we closely examine the second speech, the one called “Wolves”, the appeals are more exclusively personal and pathetic. The radical friend-enemy distinction is exploited to the verge of paranoia. Significantly, Castro’s mythical use of free speech is now redolent with explicit use of metaphors and allegories. There is an element of Pathos and Ethos over Logos. There is an integration of technology and labour: projection of ideology as the wholesome essence of existence. Castro uses deliberative rhetoric that contains lesser aggression but military affirmation where the latter becomes an important part of ideological sustenance.

However, I take up an extract from Castro’s last public speech called the “University” delivered in 2002. This is significant to note the complete change of Castro’s tone and rhetoric four years before his abdication from Cuba’s premier position.

“I avail myself of the experience or the authority which I have in order to wage this battle. There are millions of Cubans ready to wage this war which is a war of all the people” “We have reached military invulnerability, that this empire cannot afford the price of the lives that would be lost.” “This country can self destruct; the Revolution can destroy itself, but they can never destroy us; we can destroy ourselves, and it would be our fault.” “We possess a weapon as powerful as nuclear power and it is the immense justice for which we are struggling. Our nuclear weapon is the invincible power of moral weapons.” ““carry out criticism and self-criticism in the school room, in the party cells and then outside the party cells, in the municipality and finally in the entire country.”²¹

This speech is not symptomatic just of transition but marked inversion in rather radical ways. The entire outreach completely deals with the use of Pathos over Logos where the cult culture edges out notions of collective praxis. There is a complete shift to ideational perpetuation. Here, military affirmation is not through ammunition and the warfields alone but in academic and cultural spaces which Castro now believes to be the battle sites of the future. This is in fact a case of developing another new ethos in formation in Cuban identity. There is a mention of a ‘Closed

²¹ <https://lanic.utexas.edu/la/cb/cuba/castro.html> Section 2002.

identity' that celebrates plurality within a prescribed circle, often used as a measure to safeguard other ideological advancements. This speech is epideictic in a major sense. The idea of popularity permeates through power and keeps any potential for mass cultures eclipsed.

To conclude, all the three political figures show exceptional similarity of pattern in handling their modes of oratory persuasion despite belonging to disparate, almost radically contrarian ideologies. In my study, such patterns posit further opportunities to enquire more about political behavior in fluidly positioned ideologies. It remains inconclusive, with the fear of generalization, that variant ideologies feed power in different notions though power trumps them back on similar lines, as power's own function and construct rhetoric that seek truth in curious ways.

WORKS CITED

Aristotle. *Ethics*. Translated by J & K Thomson. Penguin Classics, 1976.
 Aristotle *Rhetoric*. Translated by J & K Thomson. Penguin Classics, 1981.
 Castro, Fidel. *Speeches*.

<https://lanic.utexas.edu/la/cb/cuba/castro.html>

Gandhi, M K. *Speeches and Writing.*, Edited by and with an introduction from CF Andrews . Third edition (Madras: GA Nateson and Co.), 1958.

Hadot, Pierre. *What is Ancient Philosophy?*. Harvard University Press: 2004.

Henry, Michel. *The Essence of Manifestation*. Translated by Christina Gschwandtner. New York: Wm. B. Eardsman Publishing Co, 2002.

Hitler, Adolf. *A Collection of Speeches by Adolph Hitler*. Vol. 1. Edited by Raoul de Sales, introduction by Raymond Gram Swing. New York: My New Order.2020.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Translated by George Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Scholem Gersholm. "On Jonah and the Concept of Justice" in *Critical Enquiry*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, Winter 1999, Vol. 25. No. 2.