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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Genesis of the Study

To students of rhetoric Gandhi's life should be interesting as well as significant for many reasons. Gandhi won honor and admiration second to none as a great world leader for peace. He devoted his energies strenuously all his life to the welfare and progress of his own people. The concept of non-violence which he used throughout his life as a means of persuasion has come to be seen, for example, as "the only realistic alternative to nuclear warfare and global annihilation."¹

It was this very concept and practice which tremendously influenced a Martin Luther King in his ten years leadership of American Negroes calling for what was later contained in the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965.

Albeit Gandhi's concept of non-violence could be perceived as derived from many sources which include the Hindu and Buddhist ideals as well as the Christian teaching, especially Jesus's Sermon on the Mount, and many modern writings of Thoreau, Ruskin, and Tolstoy, the actual application of the doctrine was truly his own. Martin Luther King tersely emphasizes it when he says: "Gandhi was probably the first person in history to lift the ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and social force on a large scale."\(^2\)

Gandhi was a man who lived in public throughout the greater part of his life. It was indeed an extraordinarily intriguing life. Ram Vepa in his review of seven recent books about Gandhi, entitled "Gandhiana Thesaurus," aptly says: "Gandhi was many lives rolled into one: preacher and politician, thinker and philosopher, educationist and organizer."\(^3\) I feel it should

---


be added: and also rhetor and orator—rhetor, in a sense that he had the faculty of observing in a given case what are the available means of persuasion; and orator, in a sense that he was a good man skilled in speaking.

Surprisingly enough, while Gandhi's life and work has tremendous appeal to students of Political Science, Sociology, Philosophy, and History, it has been largely neglected by students of Rhetoric. Hopefully this study will partially fulfill this need.

Survey of Literature

Gandhian literature, works by and about M. K. Gandhi, are surprisingly numerous. Jagdish Saran Sharma in *Mahatma Gandhi: A Descriptive Bibliography* \(^4\) (1968) lists seventy-two collected works of Gandhi himself and two hundred and ninety-eight general biographies of Gandhi. Moreover, the conmemoration in 1969 of Mahatma Gandhi's birthday was a world-wide occasion that engendered a great number of publications on various aspects about Gandhi. Many of these publications emerged from different scholarly symposia devoted to an elaborate

---

re-examination of the thought and career of the Mahatma—the best known among them are: *Truth and Non-violence*⁵ (a UNESCO Symposium on Gandhi); *The Meaning of Gandhi*⁶ (a symposium organized by the Association for Asian Studies); *Gandhi and America's Educational Future*⁷ (an inquiry at Southern Illinois University). Now, books on the man and his teaching appear every year.

Out of a wealth of primary sources, hundreds of speeches that Gandhi gave, I selected some that seemed to furnish useful materials for the investigation of Gandhi's rhetoric of non-violence. The chief sources are, of course, works by M. K. Gandhi himself. They are: *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments With Truth; Satyagraha in South Africa; Non-violence*

---


in Peace and War; and Collected Works, in progress commencing 1956. The Collected Works, published by the Publication Division of the Government of India, is obviously an invaluable primary source for Gandhi's writings and speeches. It is estimated that this series will eventually run to sixty volumes. At this time, forty-six volumes, which cover Gandhi's writings and speeches and related documents from 1884 to 1931, have already been published.

Among the important works about Gandhi, which I have consulted as a means to grasping his biographical, philosophical, and political facets, I found that the following books prove useful: Mahatma, eight volumes by D. G. Tendulkar; The Life of Mahatma Gandhi by Louis Fischer; The Life and Death of Mahatma by Robert Payne; Gandhi's Truth: On the Orgins of Militant Non-violence; Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict by Joan Bondurant; and The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi by Dhirendra Mohan Datta.

The symposia reports already mentioned are also useful in providing insights into Gandhi's concept of non-violence.
While Gandhi as a charismatic figure attracts the interest of students in varied fields, he is almost totally neglected by American rhetoricians. Franklin Knower's *Index of Graduate Work in the Field of Speech* published in the *Speech Monographs 1935-1969* and *Dissertation Abstracts* show only two theses in the area of Rhetoric and Public Address which deal with M. K. Gandhi. The first was an M.A. thesis entitled "Gandhi--The Voice of India," by Helen Gillespie at Wayne University in 1956. The second was a doctoral dissertation entitled "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Gandhi-Jinnah Debate over the Partition of India," completed by Allen Hayes Merriam in 1972 at Ohio University. However, on checking indexes in other academic fields, it is found that many doctoral dissertations bearing Gandhi's philosophy have been undertaken: for example: "The Emergence and Making of a Mass Movement Leader: Potrait of Mahatma Gandhi in Southern Africa 1893-1914," by Banphot Virasai, University of California, Berkeley 1968 (Political Science); "International Relations in the Thought of Mohandas K. Gandhi," by Paul Power, New York University, 1960 (Political Science); "Gandhian


---


or articles deal with Gandhi's rhetoric. This study is undertaken in the hope of partially narrowing this gap.

**Research Goal**

The research goals of this dissertation are three-fold: (1) to describe and evaluate the kind and quality of Gandhi's methods of persuasion inherent in his major speeches involving the theme of non-violence; (2) to identify key rhetorical principles and techniques drawn from those speeches under investigation; and (3) to test the workability of the Western tenets of rhetorical criticism when undertaken within the Eastern contexts.

**Research Methodology**

Two chief methodological viewpoints regarding rhetorical criticism, prevalent in America during the past fifty years, are concerned with (1) the effect of the speech and (2) the effectiveness of the speech.\(^{10}\)

---

The "effect" viewpoint described by Herbert Wichelns emphasizes the importance of studying the result of a person's speaking. In his essay entitled "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," Wichelns concludes that rhetorical criticism "is concerned with effect. It regards a speech as a communication to a specific audience, and holds its business to be the analysis and appreciation of the orator's method of imparting his ideas to his hearers."¹¹ Thonssen and Baird's Speech Criticism: The Development of Standard for Rhetorical Appraisal, published in 1948, presents standards developed from rhetorical theory, particularly from the works of Aristotle; these authors concur with Wichelns' approach. In his preface to the History and Criticism of American Public Address, Brigance points out that "final judgment is here based on effect instead of beauty, on influence instead of appeal to the imagination."¹²


According to the "effect" viewpoint, the "effectiveness" approach to rhetorical criticism advocated by Wayland Maxfield Parrish largely ignores the actual effect of the speech. Parrish maintains that "the critic's concern is not with the literal results of the speech, but with the speaker's use of a correct method; not with the speech's effect, but with its effectiveness."\(^{13}\) If the audience variable is to be taken into account, Parrish would recommend that the critics "interpret and evaluate a speech in terms of its effect upon an audience of qualified listeners."\(^{14}\) Thus, according to the "effectiveness" viewpoint, a speech designed for a qualified audience, although not delivered, can be criticized rhetorically because it contains the essence of rhetoric. The meaning of a qualified audience in this context is similar to what Aristotle referred to more than two thousand years ago as "the audience of the judges," or what Perelman conceptualized recently as "universal audience."


\(^{14}\) Ibid.
Turning to the concern of this research, a casual glimpse of Gandhi's speeches on different occasions over a long period of his public career would suggest that his speeches were for the most part designed not to affect his audience for its own sake but to render his truth and his conviction more prevalent. This is also reflected in his own instructional words: "In my opinion . . . one should speak the truth in gentle language. One had better not to speak it, if one cannot do so in a gentle way, meaning thereby there is no truth in a man who cannot control his tongue." 15

Thus, it seems unrealistic to undertake from the "effect" viewpoint a rhetorical criticism of Gandhi's speeches. Moreover, it will be unfruitful to trace the fairly immediate social consequences of his speeches simply because one may easily succumb to the casual-for-casual fallacy. My logical choice of the method of criticism to be undertaken in this dissertation is, therefore, inclined to be effectiveness-oriented.

However, it will not be limited to a traditional pattern of rhetorical criticism. A pluralistic approach seems to be called for. As Bormann recommends it:

The pluralistic approach to criticism has virtue of a rhetorical and practical nature. Pluralism in critical viewpoint enables a critic to adopt a method for a given project in criticism that is most appropriate to the subject matter. Emerson could be profitably criticized from the effectiveness or artistic point of view. A critical study of Huey Long's speaking from an artistic standpoint probably would give little insight into his rhetoric, whereas, a study that placed his speaking in its historical context and examined the effect of his speeches might well explain his speechmaking.16

The major speeches by Gandhi, that have been selected for analysis in this dissertation, occurred at different times and places; and each presumably represented the major episode of Gandhi's public career. Chronologically, they are not cognate for they spread over the years 1906-1931. Sociologically, they represent vastly different rhetorical responses to vastly different rhetorical situations. Because of the nature of the speeches as such the pluralistic approach adopted for the critical examination seems more justified.

16Bormann, Theory and Research in Communicative Arts, p. 437.
Moreover, the arguments in the speeches are considered as the focal concern of this study. Therefore, it may be suitable to employ freely Burke's Pentadic analysis, Weaver's concept of arguments, and Toulmin's model of argument during the course of this study, depending upon which one of these will prove the most helpful.

The speeches selected for analysis are identified as follows: (1) Speech at the Mass Meeting, Johannesburg, September 11, 1906 (about 1,500 words); (2) Speech at Benaras Hindu University, February 6, 1916 (about 3,900 words); (3) "The Great Trial" Speech, March 18, 1922 (about 2,100 words); (4) Speech on the Eve of Historic Salt March, March 11, 1930 (about 900 words); (5) Speech at Dandi, April 5, 1930 (about 1,700 words); (6) Broadcast to America, September 13, 1930 (about 1,200 words).

In order to accomplish this study, the following themes are utilized as chapter divisions: The Rhetorical Milieu, Dramatistic Analysis, Analysis of Arguments, Gandhi and His Universal Audience, and Conclusions.
CHAPTER II
THE RHETORICAL MILIEU

The Concept of Non-Violence

The present chapter proposes to explore the Gandhian concept of non-violence. Presumably, an understanding of this important concept should help to shed light upon the rhetorical discourse under investigation.

For Gandhi, non-violence was the only means leading to Truth. "We have no means," said Gandhi, "of realizing Truth in human relations except through the practice of ahimsa (non-violence)." The following frequently-quoted passage will give us a clear idea of the relationship between ahimsa (non-violence) and Truth as conceived by Gandhi:

____________________

Without ahimsa it is not possible to seek and find Truth. Ahimsa and Truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. They are like the two sides of a coin, or rather of a smooth, unstamped, metalic disc. Who can say which is the obverse and which is the reverse? Nevertheless, ahimsa is the means; Truth is the end.18

What is the meaning of the term "Truth" as it appears in the quotation offered above? Gandhi explained it in many ways. On one occasion he stated: "When then is Truth? A difficult question; but I have solved it myself by saying that it is what the voice within tells you."19

In the preface of his best seller An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments With Truth, Gandhi says:

But for me, truth is the sovereign principle, which includes numerous other principles. This truth is not only truthfulness in word, but truthfulness in thought also, and not only the relative truth of our conception, but the Absolute Truth, the Eternal Principle, that is God.20

Frequently, Gandhi explicitly equated Truth with God. In his editorial in Young India December 31, 1931, he said: "If it is possible for the human tongue to give the fullest description of God, I have come to the conclusion that God is Truth. Two years ago I went a step further and said that Truth is God." Indeed his worldwide famous "Satyagraha" (civil-disobedience campaign) which literally means holding onto Truth was essentially grounded upon the doctrine of non-violence; and Gandhi always referred to it as doing in the name of God.

Though non-violence as conceived and advocated by Gandhi seemed to be inclined toward the Absolute, Gandhi never insisted on it as a rigid doctrine. He testified

to this when he wrote imaginatively:

If I wish to be an agriculturalist and stay in a jungle, I will have to use the minimum unavoidable violence, in order to protect my fields. I will have to kill monkeys, birds, and insects, which eat up my crops... To allow crops to be eaten up by animals, in the name of ahimsa, while there is a famine in the land, is certainly a sin. Evil and good are relative terms. What is good under certain conditions can become an evil or sin, under a different set of conditions... At every step, man has to use his discrimination as to what is ahimsa (non-violence) and what is himsa (violence).  

Gandhi believed that non-violence was necessary to life to sustain the soul as much as food to sustain the body. The crucial difference between non-violence (as a spiritual food) and the physical food lay in the matter of limitation and continuation. As he pointed out, "The body food we can only take in a measured qualities and at stated intervals; non-violence, which is the spiritual food, we have to take continually. There is no such

\[1\] Quoted in Leys and Rao, Gandhi and America's Educational Future, p. 11.
thing as satiation." Therefore, "non-violence," expounded Gandhi, "is a power which can be wielded equally by all children, young men and women or grown-up people, provided they have a living faith in the God of love and have therefore love for all mankind. This is why Gandhi always taught that "the very first step in non-violence is that we cultivate in our daily life, as between ourselves, truthfulness, humility, tolerance, loving kindness." One way to draw a distinction between violence and non-violence is the following: "Non-violence does not work the same as violence. It works in the opposite way. An armed man relies upon his arms. A man intentionally unarmed relies upon the unseen Force called God." Violence as defined by Gandhi meant


23 Ibid., p. 113.

24 Ibid., p. 114.

25 Ibid., p. 115.
"causing pain or killing any life out of anger, or from selfish purpose, or with the intention of injuring it."\textsuperscript{26} Therefore, the essence of violence, which was of course opposite to that of non-violence, was that "there must be a violent intention behind a thought, word, or act, i.e., an intention to do harm to the opponent so called."\textsuperscript{27}

It is necessary to note that the non-violence that Gandhi meant, preached, and practiced throughout his life was not a matter of passivity to avoid different forms of violent act for the sake of one's own physical safety and peace of mind. On the contrary, Gandhi over and over again reiterated his favorite theme that non-violence was an active force exclusively for the brave. It was moreover for Gandhi "an active force of highest order."\textsuperscript{28}

So, it rejected all kinds of cowardly outlooks.


\textsuperscript{27}Quoted in Leys & Rao, Gandhi and America's, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{28}Prabhu & Rao, The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 115.
In 1924, Gandhi wrote in the *Young India* stressing the active nature of his doctrine of non-violence this way:

My non-violence does not admit of running away from danger and leaving dear ones unprotected. Between violence and cowardly flight, I can only prefer violence to cowardice.\(^{29}\)

Also in 1926 he wrote:

Non-violence is not a cover for cowardice, but it is the supreme virtue to the brave. Exercise of non-violence requires for greater bravery than that of swordsmanship. Cowardice is wholly inconsistent with non-violence.\(^{30}\)

Again in 1927 he said:

My creed of non-violence is an extremely active force. It has no room for cowardice or even weakness. There is hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a coward.\(^{31}\)

Even in 1947, six months before he died, in the *Harijan*, a weekly journal he founded, he still emphasized


\(^{30}\)Ibid.

\(^{31}\)The *Message*, p. 16.
the same theme:

Inculcation of cowardice is against my nature. Ever since my return from South Africa, where a few thousand had stood up not successfully against heavy odds, I have made it my mission to preach true bravery which ahimsa means.\textsuperscript{32}

The first quotation in a series offered above suggests that Gandhi did not exclusively deny violence. In fact, he made an explicit statement regarding it earlier in 1920 in the \textit{Young India}.

I do believe that, where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence . . . I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should, in cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.\textsuperscript{33}

However, he added that "But I believe that non-violence is infinitely superior to violence. . . . But I do not believe India to be helpless."\textsuperscript{34} Yet, finally

\textsuperscript{32}Prabhu and Rao, \textit{The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi}, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 142.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}
he admitted that "life itself involves some kind of violence and we have to choose the path of least violence."\textsuperscript{35} Because of the fact that non-violence in the Gandhian sense was to be pursued by the brave who had committed themselves to the right cause, Truth, or God, it was unaccounted or untenable unless it was undertaken as a response to a violent situation. "Non-violence with a non-violent man," stated Gandhi, "is no merit." He went on to say in clear terms that "In fact it becomes difficult to say whether it is non-violence at all. But when it is pitted against violence, then one realizes the difference between the two."\textsuperscript{36} Therefore, it followed that agony operating in many ways upon the agent of non-violence was inevitable. But Gandhi always taught that the non-violence had to be prepared to sacrifice. "Non-violence in its dynamic condition," said Gandhi, "means concious suffering."\textsuperscript{37} Elsewhere, he said, "the gospel

\textsuperscript{35}Prabhu and Rao, \textit{The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi}, p. 143.

\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 114.

\textsuperscript{37}\textit{The Message of Mahatma Gandhi}, p. 11.
of ahimsa can be spread only through the believers dying for the cause.  

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, non-violence was regarded as a means. It may also prove useful to explore how Gandhi conceived the relationship between a means and its end. From his voluminous writings, we may draw a conclusion that Gandhi wholly disapproved the doctrine that the end justified the means for Gandhi never drew any distinction between means and end. On one occasion he boldly said, "Means and end are convertible terms in my philosophy of life." On another occasion he argued vehemently about the means-end issue:

They say 'means are after all means'. I would say 'Means are after all everything'. As the means so the end. There is no wall of separation between means and end. Indeed the Creator has given us control (and that too very limited) over means, none over the end. Realization of the goal is in exact proportion to that of the means. This is a proposition that admits of no exception.  

39 The Message of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 25.
40 Ibid., p. 25-26.
Late in his life in the Harijan, English weekly journal founded by Gandhi, dedicated to the cause of anti-untouchability, he told his reader:

For over fifty years, I have trained myself never to be concerned about the result. What I should be concerned about is the means; and when I am sure of the purity of the means, faith is enough to lead me on. All fear and trembling melt away before that faith.41

Throughout his public career, he always taught his people to believe the way he himself actually did. An inquiry into his own rhetoric in the following pages will perhaps reveal to us more clearly to what degree his concern for the non-violent means was emphasized as the controlling element in his message.

Non-Violence, Civil Disobedience, and Non-Cooperation

Except for the Benares Speech of September 11, 1906, all of the speeches selected for analysis in this paper are related to Gandhi's ideas about civil-disobedience and/or non-cooperation. Therefore, it is felt that this topic is relevant to provide an insight into those

particular speeches to a certain extent.

Gandhi gave credit for the term "civil disobedience" to Henry David Thoreau, the New England poet, essayist, and practitioner of resistance. "The expression [civil disobedience]," Gandhi wrote in 1921, "was, so far as I am aware, coined by Thoreau to signify his own resistance to the laws of a slave State."\(^42\) However, as time elapsed it had been often said that Gandhi took the idea of Civil Disobedience from Thoreau. Gandhi denied this in 1935 when he wrote: "The statement that I had derived my idea of Civil Disobedience from the writing of Thoreau [was] wrong. The resistance to authority in South Africa was well advanced before I got the essay of Thoreau on Civil Disobedience."\(^43\) Of course the basic assumption of Thoreau's concept on civil disobedience was vastly different from that of Gandhi's. As Professor Paul Power remarks: "Contrary to some interpretation, Thoreau was


not a believer in non-violence in the Gandhian sense. After writing his famous essay on civil disobedience, Thoreau later supported the cause of John Brown who wished to liberate the slaves through political violence."  

In his own Young India editorial, March 23, 1921, Gandhi defined civil disobedience as "the civil breach of unmoral statutory enactments."  

In the same article he emphasized that "it signified the resister's outlawry in a civil i.e. non-violent manner." Elsewhere, Gandhi warned his people to "give its full and therefore greater value to the adjective 'civil' than to 'disobedience';"  

because he realized that "disobedience without civility, discipline, discrimination, and non-violence is certain destruction." Moreover, "disobedience to be

---


45 Gandhi, Non-Violent Resistance, p. 3.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.
civil must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well-understood principle, must not be capricious, and above all, must have no ill will or hatred behind it."⁴⁸ Without these requirements civil disobedience would become "criminal." Criminal disobedience, according to Gandhi, could lead to anarchy but civil disobedience only to strength and purity. Gandhi further argued that whereas his civil disobedience being grounded upon the doctrine of non-violence was harmless to a state that was willing to listen to the voice of public opinion, it was dangerous for an autocratic state, for it brought about the fall of the state through the tremendous strength of public opinion. However, civil disobedience in the Gandhian sense was "a sacred duty when the State [had] become lawless, or which [was] the same thing, corrupt." Moreover, "a citizen that barter[ed] with such a state share[d] its corruption and lawlessness."⁴⁹

⁴⁸M. K. Gandhi, All Men are Brothers (New York, 1958), p. 56.
Civil disobedience might be undertaken either individually or collectively. When collectively, as testified by several episodes of Gandhi's public career, it meant mass resistance based upon non-violent thoughts and deeds against the unjust government when negotiations and the uses of constitutional means had proven unsuccessful. It had to be mass resistance to the immoral and harmful laws, by the people who were ordinarily law-abiding citizens. The Gandhian theory and practice of mass civil disobedience included several requirements. Significantly among them, first, mass civil disobedience could "only be tried in a calm atmosphere."\(^5\) This calm atmosphere was meant by Gandhi to be "the calmness of strength not weakness, of knowledge not ignorance."\(^6\) Second, the practitioners of civil disobedience had to be well-disciplined, sticking to their own pledge and strictly to their appropriate leaders. They were as


\(^6\) *Ibid.*
well-disciplined as the soldiers but "all the better for being unarmed."\(^5^2\) Third, civil disobedience presupposed on the part of the resisters veritable preparedness to face all kinds of sufferings and hardships without retaliation.\(^5^3\) Fourth, the persons who committed civil disobedience had to be willing to submit to the consequence of their intentional rule-breaking. "As a soldier who goes to battle seeks death," compared Gandhi to make his point more vivid, "we [the civil disobedience resisters] must seek arrest and imprisonment."\(^5^4\) In other words, they were required to consider arrest as "the normal condition of life."\(^5^5\) Needless to say, non-violence was the core and character of civil disobedience through and through.

Whereas civil disobedience referred to non-violent resistance by the mass who chose to disobey the unjust


\(^5^4\)*Ibid.*

\(^5^5\)*Ibid.*
laws of the land, non-cooperation referred to the withdrawal of cooperation of all kinds from the unjust government. Non-cooperation as launched under the leadership of Gandhi in 1920-22, 1930-34, and 1940-44 in India expressed itself in giving up titles and honours bestowed by the government, resignation from government service, boycott of the governmental institutions, and so forth. It also included the famous hartal which meant cessation of work; i.e., closing of shops, and other business activities, picketing, and so on. Interestingly enough, in 1920 Gandhi disclosed his scheme of non-cooperation to the public in Young India as follows:

Should non-cooperation become necessary, the Committee has decided upon the following as part of the first stage:

(1) Surrender of all titles of honour and honorary offices.
(2) Non-participation in Government loans.
(3) Suspension by lawyers of practice of civil disputes by private arbitration.
(4) Boycott of Government schools by parents.
(5) Boycott of Reformed Councils.
(6) Non-participation in Government parties, and such other functions.
(7) Refusal to accept any civil or military post.
(8) Vigorous prosecution of Swadeshi,\textsuperscript{56} inducing the people, at the time of this national and religious awakening, to appreciate their primary duty to their country by being satisfied with its own productions and manufacturers.\textsuperscript{57}

Contentwise, non-cooperation and civil disobedience were vastly different; functionally both of them were means to the same end, i.e., to make the particular government just whereas it had become unjust; and basically they were grounded upon the assumptions of non-violence. For Gandhi, "cooperation with a just government is a duty; non cooperation with an unjust government is equally a duty."\textsuperscript{58}

Throughout his public career, Gandhi seemed to base his rhetoric of non-violence significantly on this fundamental principle.

\textsuperscript{56}Swadeshi: the principle of using goods made locally or in one's own country.
\textsuperscript{58}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 159.
CHAPTER III
DRAMATISTIC ANALYSIS

"Kenneth Burke's dramatistic approach to rhetoric," observes Bernard L. Brock, "provides the critic with a language and theoretical structure that allows him to describe man as he responds to his world and understands man's basic rhetorical tendencies." He goes on to say that "with such a system the critic is able to make descriptive, interpretative judgments regarding the effectiveness of rhetoric."\(^{59}\)

Burke's dramatistic Pentad will be used as a tool to keep track of the rhetorical choices that Gandhi made either consciously or unconsciously in his speeches on different occasions. Burke sets up five elements which he says are present to some degree in any human action or interaction. In Burke's own words, these

---

elements are:

Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, Purpose. In
rounded statement about motives, you must
have some word that names the act (names
what took place, in thought or deed), and
another that names the scene (the background
of the act, the situation in which it occurred);
also, you must indicate what person or kind
of person (agent) performed the acts, and
what means or instruments he used (agency),
and the purpose.60

Burke further argues that whenever a man describes
a situation he "will offer some kind of answer to these
five questions: What was done (act), when or where it
was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it
(agency), and why (purpose).61 In connection with
this concept, David Ling, in his essay entitled "A
Pentadic Analysis of Senator Edward Kennedy's Address
to the people of Massachusetts, July 25, 1968," points
out that "As man speaks he indicates how he perceives
the world around him . . . . As man describes the

60Kenneth Burke, "A Grammar of Motives and
a Rhetoric of Motives," in Contemporary Theories of
Rhetoric: Selected Readings, ed. by Richard L. Johan-

61Ibid.
situation around him, he orders these five elements to reflect his view of that situation . . . . As one describes a situation his ordering of the five elements will suggest which of the several different views of that situation he has, depending on which element he describes as controlling.\(^{62}\)

Having grasped a methodology, each of Gandhi's speeches on different (five) occasions will now be considered in turn. First of all the total content of the speech will be described and identified in terms of the pentad, and then an analysis will be attempted with an eye to the controlling element of the pentad. In other words, it is an attempt to identify a key term, which was featured in Gandhi's substantive discourse.

Gandhi's Address to the Mass Meeting
Johannesburg, September 11, 1906

It was on September 11, 1906 when the Indian people who lived in Transvaal, South Africa, were meeting at the Empire Theatre in Johannesburg which was "packed from floor to ceiling." They were to decide what to do about pending discriminatory enactments against Indians. It was a time of crisis for every Indian who lived in Transvaal. Louis Fischer summed up the situation in these terms:

The proposed ordinance required all Indian men and women, and children over eight, to register with the authorities, submit to fingerprinting, and accept a certificate which they were to carry with them at all times. A person who failed to register and leave his fingerprints lost his right of residence and could be imprisoned, fined, or deported from Transvaal. An Indian apprehended on the street or anywhere without certificate could likewise be imprisoned, fined, or deported even though he owned valuable property or engaged in important commercial transactions.

---

65 Louis Fischer, The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 81.
Before the mass of nearly three thousand persons, after many angry speeches stirred the emotions of the audience, Sheth Haji Habib read a resolution demanding non-compliance with the registration. He appealed to the assembly to vote "with God as their witness." At that moment, Gandhi sensitively felt that the rhetorical situation called for his special response so he requested the floor. Obviously this special address by Gandhi is quite significant in terms of the rhetorical situation. It was an impromptu speech, but it clearly reflected Gandhi's level of philosophical maturity. The speech will be described in terms of the pentad as follows:

The scene comprised the three thousand Indians that filled the Imperial theatre, the main address delivered prior to Gandhi's utterance, the resolution read by Sheth Haji Habib, opposing the draft ordinance and calling for non-compliance in case it became law. The three thousand people assembled in the theatre

can be identified as the agent. The manner in which these three thousand people were about to pass the proposed resolution, voting with "God as their witness," to recognize the religious vow which could not be broken, may be seen as the act. Gandhi himself who was trying to convince the assembly of the superlative importance of what they were doing was in this situation an agency. The purpose was concerned with the motivation for the act, i.e., the responsibility to vote with utmost determination.

Although it was the scene that gave rise to Gandhi's decision to speak at that moment, he did not order it as a controlling element. Beginning his speech by pointing out that "there is a vast difference between this resolution and every other resolution we have passed up to date," he briefly gave credit to Haji Habib and congratulated him for his new idea of suggesting that the resolution be passed in the name of God. Gandhi then went on to feature the act of the assembly as the controlling element in the dramatistic process. He equated the
act of voting with the religious vow, which could not
be broken. "To pledge ourselves or to take an oath
in the name of God or with Him as witness is not some-
thing to be trifled with. If having taken such an
oath we violate our pledge, we are guilty before God
and man." He further emphasized that "a man who
lightly pledges his word and then breaks it becomes
a man of straw and fits himself for punishment here
as well as hereafter." He urged that his audience
were obliged to pledge with utmost responsibility
and full understanding. He argued that, "There is
no one in this meeting who can be classed as an
infant or as wanting in understanding. You are well
advanced in age and have seen the world... . No one
present, therefore, can ever hope to excuse himself
by saying that he did not know what he was about
when he took the oath." Perhaps for fear of a pos-
sible feeling of hesitation and caution in the minds
of his fellow-Indians, which might reduce their defini-
tive action, Gandhi warned them that even though
hesitation and caution might imply wisdom, they had
their limits. Under that exigency, Gandhi saw that
the limits had then passed. He stirred them to act
determinatively and individually.

The Government has taken leave of all
sense of decency. We would only be betraying
our unworthiness and cowardice, if we cannot
stake our all in the face of the conflagra-
tion which envelopes us and sit watching it
with folded hands. There is no doubt,
therefore, that the present is a proper
occasion for taking pledges.

Recognizing the importance of the individual's
value, Gandhi affirmed that "But every one of us must
think out for himself if he has the will and the
ability to pledge himself. Resolution of this nature
cannot be passed by a majority vote. Only those who
take a pledge can be bound by it." These statements
functioned rhetorically to increase responsibility
on the part of the audience as agent in their act of
passing the resolution which had already become a
religious vow.

After asking his fellow-Indian people who assembled
in that Empire Theatre to search their own hearts,
Gandhi described in the second part of his speaking
a scene that he anticipated to take place. He asked
them to be prepared for the worst. The injurious scene that he described included insults, starvation, hard labour, attachment of property, deportation, imprisonment, flogging, illness, and even death. However, the scene that Gandhi so described was not intended to function as the featuring element. A careful examination of this part of the speech reveals that the scene was so described to accentuate the speaker's concern for the act about to be undertaken. It was the act of the struggling hopeful, a pledge in the name of God. This is what Gandhi stressed:

In short, therefore, it is not at all impossible that we might have to endure every hardship that we can imagine, and wisdom lies in pledging ourselves on the understanding that we shall have to suffer all that and worse. If someone asks me when and how the struggle may end, I may say that, if the entire community manfully stands the test, the end will be near. If many of us fall back under storm and stress, the struggle will be prolonged. But I can boldly declare, and with certainty, that so long as there is even a handful of men true to their pledge, there can only be one end to struggle, and that is victory.

At the end of the speech Gandhi explicitly identified himself with his fellow-men. To them he spoke
out fearlessly not as agency but as an agent. "There is only one course open to [those] like me, to die but not to submit to the law. It is quite unlikely, but even if everyone else flinched leaving me alone to face the music, I am confident that I would not violate my pledge." His identification with the audience also showed that he wanted to place more emphasis on their act of the struggling to maintain their religious and justifiable pledge. So far we may rightly conclude that Gandhi saw in the act alone the underlying motive or means of wiping off the problem, i.e., only by adhering to the pledge and enduring every possible suffering to come might the India people in South Africa be delivered from the evil they envisioned.

The foregoing pentadic analysis helps establish three conclusions: First, Gandhi's speech of September 11, 1906, functioned to intensify the moral and religious consciousness of the three thousand Indian people not as a body but as individuals, in their action of passing the resolution. Second, the speech was intended to warn the audience of the risks possible in their continuing resistance to the
Government. Third, the speaker unmistakably identified himself with the cause he recommended to others. By this action, he revealed his good will toward them as well as his own deep commitment to opposition. These three conclusions emerging from the speech as a whole suggest that out of the pentad, the act was featured as the controlling element.

According to Burke, when the act is featured in discourse, the philosophy that dominates within the speech is realism.\(^{65}\)

It may be noted, at least temporarily, that Gandhi's view of the world was accordingly associated with the realism. This statement may be confirmed or modified after several of his speeches have been examined by a similar perspective.

\(^{65}\) Scott and Brock, *Rhetorical Criticism*, p. 320.
Gandhi's Speech at Benares Hindu University
February 6, 1916

In February, 1916, Benaras Hindu University was solemnly opened by Lord Hardinge, the Viceroy in the presence of great dignitaries of state, maharajahs and educators from all over India. Many eminent persons delivered speeches. On February 4, 1916, it was Gandhi's turn to address the audience, most of whom were impressionable youths. A galaxy of princes, bedecked and bejewelled, had occupied the dais. The Maharajah of Darbhanga, Sir Rameshwar, was in the chair. Like the other princes, he wore a resplendent uniform bedecked with jewels. Gandhi was clad in a white cloak and a short, coarse white dhoti (a long piece of cloth worn as a lower garment by men in India).  67

---

66 The text of the speech is from The Collected Works, Vol. XIII, pp. 210-211.

Gandhi spoke extemporaneously. He said that he wanted to think aloud—speak without reserve.

Because the 1916 speech is quite lengthy and pretty involved, it can best be examined in three parts. The first is the narrative in which Gandhi described several undesirable domestic conditions of India at that time, which in his view were necessary to be annihilated in order to pave the way to Indian self-government. The second part of the speech involved Gandhi's concern over the way to fight a revolution. The third part of the speech began after he was interrupted by Mrs. Besant until he had to stop abruptly because many dignitaries including the Chairman left the platform. It was the final stage which Gandhi used to emphasize his demand that the Indians should scrutinize their own action patterns.

Each of these three parts will be considered in turn.

---

Mrs. Annie Besant, a remarkable English woman, was an accepted and respected leader of modern India. She started a school at Benares in 1892, and in 1916 this institution was expanded into Hindu University Central College.
Domestic Conditions of India: Barriers to Self-Government

In Gandhi's utterance concerning the undesirable conditions of India as he viewed them, we can identify these elements:

The Scene. There are three aspects of the scene: the unlimited use of the English language throughout India; the filth and squalor of Benaras, Bombay and even the sacred temples; and the maharajahs' sumptuous ways of living.

The Act. The desired acts may be identified as the adoption of the Indian vernacular as the medium of public communication; the removal of the corrupt habits of the multitudes, and the subsequent implantation of desirable ones, especially with regard to community cleanliness and hygiene; and the termination of the Maharajahs' pretentious mode of life.

The Agent. All the educated men and the advantaged people, especially those who presented themselves in that assembly, could be considered in terms of the pentad as the agent.
The Agency. What Gandhi emphatically called for in this particular speech were the actual practices to be undertaken. These, therefore, are the agency in the pentad.

The Purpose. Throughout the speech it was self-government which described the motivation for the act. Therefore it can be identified as the purpose in the pentad.

Once the key terms of the dramatic pentad have been identified another attempt will be made to investigate which element Gandhi described as controlling. In determining the key terms, because of a complex nature of the speech content, the "ratio" procedure suggested by Burke will be used. The pentad would allow ten possible ratios or comparisons: scene-act, scene-agent, scene-agency, scene-purpose, agent-agency, and agency-purpose. These ratios are "principles of determination."69

However, in this particular case of Gandhi's speech only three key terms (scene, act, and agency) appear prevalent; therefore, there remain only three ratios to be considered. They are scene-act, scene-agency, and act-agency.

**Scene-Act.** Gandhi cited the nearest illustration when he condemned the Indians' unwillingness to speak in their own vernaculars. "It is a matter of deep humiliation and shame for us," Gandhi frankly declared, "that I am compelled this evening under the shadow of this great college, and in this sacred city, to address my countrymen in a language that is foreign to me." What is the wrong with the use of the English language instead of the native one? "I know if I were appointed an examiner to examine all those who have been attending during these two days this series of lectures [in English]," avowed Gandhi, "most of those who might be examined upon these lectures would fail. And why? Because they have not been touched." He then cited the second illustration, the scene of the Indian Congress
sessions in Bombay. He told his audience that "the only speeches that touched the huge audience in Bombay were the speeches that were delivered in Hindustani."

Having shown how disadvantageous the use of a foreign language would be, Gandhi abruptly exacted an act from his listeners by saying: "I am hoping that this university will see to it that the youths who came to it will receive their instruction through the medium of their vernaculars." He then went on to expand his ideas: "Our language is the reflection of ourselves, and if you tell me that our languages are too poor to express the best thought, then I say that the sooner we are wiped out of existence, the better for us." Once he posed a forthright rhetorical question: "Is there a man who dreams that English can ever become the national language of India?", which provoked scattered cries of "never" from the mass of the audience.

To strengthen his point, Gandhi referred to the charge against the Indians that they had no initiatives, which he attributed to the waste of time when the Indian youths had to reach their knowledge through the English
language. "How can we have any," Gandhi asked his audience to ponder, "if we are to devote the precious years of our life to the mastery of a foreign tongue?"

To emphasize the urgency of adopting the Indian vernacular, Gandhi awakened his listeners' imaginations by saying:

Suppose that we had been receiving during the past fifty years education through our vernaculars, what should we have had 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 the past fifty years would be a heritage for the nation.

The next aspect of the scene that Gandhi introduced was concerned with the filthy scene of the cities and their temples. This he criticized bitterly: "I visited the Viswanath Temple last evening and as I was walking through those lanes, these were the thoughts that touched me . . . . 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."
Leaving the scene of the lane in Benares, Gandhi went
on to talk about the squalor of the streets in Bombay
and even in a railway train. "It is not comforting
to think," he said, "that people walk about the streets
of Indian Bombay under the perpetual fear of dwellers
in the storeyed buildings spitting upon them." Referr-
ing to his extensive experience as a railway traveller,
Gandhi complained: "We do not know the elementary laws
of cleanliness. We spit anywhere on the carriage
floor . . . the result is indescribable filth in the
compartment."

Even though Gandhi spent much time dealing with
this particular aspect of the scene, he did not do it in
such a way that the scene became controlling. He wanted
to show that the unfavorable scene really called for
appropriate action. No implication was made that the
scene was hopelessly out of control. This is discern-
ible from what he said in the following statements:
I entirely agree with the President of the Congress that before we think of self-government, we shall have to do the necessary plodding . . . 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. (emphasis mine).

The last aspect of the scene that Gandhi introduced into his speech was concerned with the maharajahs. In fact, the speech seemed to reach the climax immediately after his transitional sentence: "I now introduce you another scene." He discussed the bejewelled maharajahs, admonishing them for their wealth. He insisted that they had stolen their wealth from the poor. The following paragraph deserves quotation because it constitutes not only the speech climax, but also the perspicuous interplay of the scene and the act as described by the speaker.

What did we witness in the great pendal in which the foundation ceremony was performed by the Viceroy? Certainly a most gorgeous show, an exhibition of jewelry which made a splendid feast for the eyes of the greatest jeweller who chose to come from Paris. I compare with the richly bedecked
noblemen the millions of the poor. And I feel like saying to these noblemen: "There is no salvation for India unless you strip yourselves of this jewelry and hold it in trust for your countrymen in India." ... Sir, whenever I hear of a great palace rising in any great city of India ... I become jealous at once and I say: "Oh, it is the money that has come from the agriculturists." (emphasis mine).

Though Gandhi's demand (as underlined) seemed impracticable, it shows his intent to feature the act. Indeed, he did say later that "There cannot be much spirit of self-government about us if we take away or allow others to take away from them [the agriculturists] almost the whole of the results of their labour." This statement indicated that Gandhi wanted the Maharajahs to discontinue taking advantage of the disadvantaged farmers.

Our comparison of the scene-act ratio so far reveals that it is the act which supersedes the scene. In this case, the scene did not seem to be seen by Gandhi as the chief cause or motivation for the problem. In other words, he visualized the scene as less controlling than the act. Therefore, the ratio
scene-agent does not need any analysis, for as Charles Larson suggests, "Once a term has been superseded by another, the term superseded is clearly not a key term and need not be played off against any others." The remaining ratio to be examined is the act-agency.

**Act-Agency.** As already identified, the agency in Gandhi's speech embraced his idea of the actual practice or the "by-doing." At the beginning of the speech, the key term "agency" was already revealed figuratively in the following statements: "You will never be able merely through the lip to give the message [of the spiritual life] that India, I hope, will one day deliver to the world . . . . 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." Throughout the first part of the speech, the agency as such was always implicit whenever the act was discussed. However, when comparing these two terms with each other as they were so ordered in the speech, the act seemed to be more prominent.

If this analysis is correct, we may conclude, from the first part of the speech, that the agent concern was dominant, i.e., Gandhi's concern was the removal of Indian domestic problems which needed to be done as promptly as possible.

Non-Violence versus Violence: The way to fight a revolution

Late in the speech Gandhi related his ideas and thoughts to the concept of non-violence which he wanted to implant in the minds of his audience, especially Indian youth. Though this part of the speech is fairly short, the pentadic elements do not seem inconspicuous. The scene: Indian terrorists existed at that time requiring the British authority to take stringent precautions; the act: to fight
a revolution for the betterment of India; the agent: the Indian patriots; the agency: non-violent method; and the purpose: the salvation of India—her self-government.

We will go on to consider how Gandhi featured these pentadic elements.

Again Gandhi described another unpalatable scene which he emphasized that it was his "bounden duty to refer to." He first talked tauntingly about the British precautions taken for the security of the Viceroy in the city of Benares. "All of us have had many anxious moments while the Viceroy was going through the streets of Benares. There were detectives stationed in many places. We were horrified."

However, he referred to the precautions seemingly because he wanted to point out that it was the existing Indian terrorists that made them necessary. "But why was it necessary to impose these detectives on us?" Gandhi asked his audience the unpleasant question and then himself answered it: "We may foam, we may fret that India of today in her impatience has produced an army of anarchists."
Gandhi saw the existing situation as a kind of violence, which he would never endorse. "I myself am an anarchist," Gandhi said, "but of another type." Then he expressed his disapproval of any forms of violence by saying: "But there is a class of anarchist among us, and if I was able to reach this class, I would say to them that anarchism has no room in India if India is to conquer the conqueror. It is a sign of fear." He also commented: "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 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." These statements indicated that Gandhi accepted the act of fighting a revolution. He considered it as an honourable act; but he strongly opposed any methods of violence. Moreover, he expounded his view of the way to fight a revolution which was absolutely different from that of the
terrorists:

If I found it necessary for the salvation of India that the English should retire, that they should be drive out, I would not hesitate to declare that they would have to go, and I hope that 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 into the open, and when caught pays the penalty of misdirected zeal.

Up to this point, Gandhi had not said that the British should be gotten rid of. He was featuring the non-violent act of struggling for Indian self-government. He suggested that non-violence as a means to self-government required no secrecy, but it demanded supreme bravery, perhaps even to die "an honourable death." Now it is clear that Gandhi used the scene as a background against which he could bring into focus a kind of act and its means (agency) which he wanted to make prominent. Unfortunately, before Gandhi could finish his discussion of the matter, he was interrupted by Mrs. Besant, who abruptly said: "Please stop it" as he was alluding to the violent acts of throwing the bombs by some Indian terrorists that recently took place in India.
A Necessary Condition for Indian Self-governmen:
Frankness and Openness on the Part of the Indians

Gandhi was so adaptive to the unusual and unexpected situation that he could keep his temper when being interrupted by Mrs. Besant. Turning to the chairman he said, "If I am told to stop, I shall obey. I await your orders." When the chairman told him to explain his object amidst the cries of "go on" from the audience, he defended Mrs. Besant by saying: "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 your young men." However, Gandhi did not resume his point. He hammered for the second time, in a broader perspective, another responsible act that should or perhaps had to be performed by the Indians in order to receive self-government.

Here again we can identify the following elements: the scene—the events surrounding the students and the role of the Civil Service members;
the act—the students' obligation to scrutinize themselves; the agent—the students themselves; the agency—to do things in an open and frank manner; and the purpose—to pave the way to self-government.

Gandhi clarified himself to the audience that what he said was simply due to his wishes to purge India of the atmosphere of suspicion on either side. What he wanted was mutual love and mutual trust. He referred to the college as a scene where students should discuss any problems openly. "Let us frankly and openly say," urged Gandhi, "whatever we want to say to our rulers and face the consequence if what we have to say does not please them." He also warned that "But let us not abuse." In other words, he wanted his audience, especially the students, to act not only actively but also openly and fearlessly. "There is not reason for anarchism in India." Gandhi hammered once more his political view into the mind of the student. To urge his audience to scrutinize themselves more concretely, Gandhi alluded to his recent encounter with a British member of the Civil
Service who seemed to complain that all of the British Civil Servants were misunderstood by the Indians as always being the oppressors. And Gandhi answered that not all of them were so. He forthrightly told the audience that while he granted that many of the Civil Servants were tyrannical and at times thoughtless, he also granted that "After having lived in India for a certain number of years, some of them become somewhat degraded." He went on to say that "They were gentlemen before they came here, and if they have lost some of the moral fibre, it is a reflection upon ourselves." This statement, of course, did not directly affect the students, but it did vexingly affect many people, especially the princes who were actually sitting there; so they responded with cries of "no". But Gandhi did not spare anyone, and went on to criticize the situation in order to urge his hearers to scrutinize themselves frankly and openly:
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 demoralises 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.

After he went on to speak three more sentences, there was an interruption and there was a movement on the platform to leave. Suddenly, Maharajah of Darbhanga who presided rose and left the hall. There was no chairman; the speech, therefore, ended abruptly.

It is conspicuous that in this third part of the speech, though it was unfinished, Gandhi tried to feature the act of self-scrutinizing to be done by the Indians in a frank and fair manner as the controlling element within the scene of India at that time and with the purpose of readily achieving self-government. He forthrightly inculcate his ideas into the minds of his hearers no matter if what he said would be displeasing or not.
In line with the Burkeian concept, an analysis of these three parts of the speech should suggest to us that the philosophy that dominated within the speech is realism. And if "As man speaks, so is he." is true, we may conclude that Gandhi was indeed a realist.

The "Great Trial" Speech, March 18, 1922

The trial of Mahatma Gandhi and his colleague Shri Shankarlal Banker (newspaper editor, printer and publisher), on charge under Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code was held on March 18, 1922, before Mr. C. N. Broomfield, District Sessions Judge. The charges were of "Bringing or attempting to bring into hatred or contempt or exciting or attempting to excite disaffection towards His Majesty's Government established by law in British India, and thereby committing offences punishable under Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code"; the alleged offences occurred in three 'articles' published in Young India: "Tampering With Loyalty," September 29, 1921, "The Puzzle and Its Solution,"

December 15, 1921, and "Shaking the Manes," February 23, 1922.

Both Gandhi and Banker readily pleaded guilty to all the charges. The court, however, gave Gandhi a chance to make a statement. Gandhi spoke extemporaneously first and then read his prepared speech. He tried to explain why, from a staunch loyalist and cooperator, he had become an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-cooperator. It was mostly a description of his past role in connection with the British Empire. The Pentadic elements in the first part of the speech may be identified as follows:

The scene included the situations in South Africa around the eighteen-nineties, which was described by Gandhi as the "troubled weather", in London in 1914 when the War broke out, and in Delhi in 1918 when a special appeal was made by the British authority for recruits.

The act was concerned with Gandhi's leadership in raising Indian volunteers to offer services to the

Indian volunteers to offer services to the British Empire in time of need.

The agent in this case was Gandhi himself.

The agencies included several Indian volunteer corps raised by Gandhi.

The purpose was to give the government his "voluntary and hearty co-operation."

When Gandhi referred to his early experience in South Africa, he broadly stated that as an Indian, he could enjoy no human rights. But he was so optimistic as to think that the British treatment to the Indian there was "an excrescence upon a system that was intrinsically and mainly good." He therefore gave the government his "voluntary and hearty co-operation."

Gandhi cited two distinct illustrations that showed his acts of genuine cooperation with the British government.

When the existence of the Empire was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a volunteer ambulance corps, and served at several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906, at the time of the Zulu revolt, I raised a stretcher-bearer party and served till the end of the "rebellion."
These statements at once featured the act as 
the controlling element in the pentad. Moreover, 
Gandhi cited the fact that he received medals on both 
of these occasions and another gold medal for his 
work in South Africa. By so doing, he augmented 
the strength and significance of his cooperative 
services in the mind of the listeners.

Further, Gandhi referred to a similar kind of 
act in another setting when he said: "I raised a 
volunteer ambulance corps in London, chiefly students. 
Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be 
valuable."

These three examples illustrate non-violent 
acts in the genuine Gandhian sense because they 
embraced both the act of bravery and the avoidance 
of harm to others.

The final illustration of his act of cooperation 
with the British government, which Gandhi cited to 
carry the audience (the judges) with him, was when 
he responded to a special appeal made by the Viceroy 
of India for recruits for the British army in 1918.
"I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda," declared Gandhi, "and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted."

It was very likely that Gandhi described the three episodes to show that his acts were completed with a similar success notwithstanding that the scenes under which they took place were vastly different both in time and place.

In short, we may conclude that in describing his own past role in connection with the British Empire, Gandhi featured his act as the most prominent element in the pentad.

The second part of the speech dealt with the critical situations that took place in India resulting from the severe measures that had been taken by the British authority against the Indian people. Gandhi devoted considerable time developing his ideas for this portion; this consisted of over 15,000 words, more than three-fourths of the whole speech. In terms of the pentad:
The scene consisted of the Indian social settings under British rule; the act included Gandhi's own display of disaffection and his promotion of it toward the British government; Gandhi identified himself as the agent throughout the whole situation; the agency consisted of Gandhi's articles in the Young India combined with his numerous speeches and other writings that preached disaffection and non-cooperation toward the government; and the purpose was to submit to the penalty for non-cooperation with evil.

Gandhi's message in this second part of his discourse referred to the situations in the past, which took place over a long period of his public career and in a great variety of Indian contexts. More than half of the message was devoted to the scene. He first condemned the Rowlatt Act\textsuperscript{73} as "a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom." He then referred to the horror in Punjab, the crawling orders, and the public floggings, but without giving any other details about them. [The Panjab horror signified

\textsuperscript{73}The Rowlatt Act was initiated by Sir Sidney Rowlatt and became the law of the land on March 18, 1919. It gave great powers to the government and the police to arrest, keep in prison without trial, or to have a secret trial of, any person they disapproved of or suspected.
a tragedy of the massacre by the British authority of the defenseless Indian people who simply gathered in a public meeting; the infamous "crawling order" was the British order to add humiliation to hurt. Because a British headmistress of a girl's school in Amritsar, a city where the massacre took place, had been attacked by the mob, the British instruction was issued that anybody passing the street where the murder took place would have to go on all fours. The order applied even to the people whose homes could be reached through that street alone. The public flogging was a barbarian punishment devised by the British authority for the Indian who failed to salute the British officers as they passed them in some districts of Amritsar. He also mentioned very briefly some of the unfulfilled promises of the British Prime Minister. However, he spent considerable time describing the misery of the Indian villagers which in his view was due to the British rule and exploitation of India. This is, for example, the way he delineated how and why the Indian villagers lived in misery and want.
India has become so poor that she had little power of resisting famine. Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages just the supplement she needed for adding to her meager agricultural resources. This cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman process as described by English witnesses. Little do town dwellers know how the semistarved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realize that the government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eyes.

Gandhi further condemned the laws that had been strictly enforced in India by the British authority. "In my opinion," he told the judges, "the administration of the law is thus prostituted conciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiters."

Gandhi tried to describe the scene at great length apparently because he wanted to show that it was his justification for displaying and promoting disaffection against the British system. Late in the speech, in discussing his disaffection toward the British government, Gandhi stated that, "I have endeavored to give
in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection." Then he went on to feature his act of disaffection. "I have no personal ill-will against any administrator," Gandhi assured the judge, "much less have I disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it an honour to be disaffected towards a government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system." To feature his act more saliently, Gandhi vigorously said: "I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system. And it has been a precious privilege for me to be able to write what I have in the various articles, tendered in evidence against me."

Gandhi concluded his statement with the implication of his concept of non-violence, and with a plea not for mercy, but for the highest penalty.

Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-cooperation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen.

Finally, he told the judge, "The only course open to you, the judge, is either to resign your post ..."
if you feel that in reality I am innocent, or to
inflict on me the severest penalty . . . if you believe
that the system . . . is good for the people of this
country . . ."

Both of the analyses of the two sections of the
speech lead us to conclude that when Gandhi described
the situations in terms of the pentad, he either cons-
ciously or unconsciously ordered the situations in
such a way that the acts always were featured, not-
withstanding the act in the first situation was entirely
contrary to the act in the second situation (full co-
operation versus non-cooperation).

The content of this speech was also especially
remarkable for the fact that it embraced all the
essence of the doctrine of non-violence in the Gandhian
sense. To the best of my knowledge, albeit most the
speeches by Gandhi and especially all the ones selected
for this study were always concerned with some signif-
icant aspect or aspects of non-violence, none of them
seemed to bear the principles and assumptions of
non-violence as conceived by Gandhi so comprehensively
as this particular speech of March 23, 1922. It may
prove helpful to point out these aspects which appeared
here and there and at times repeatedly throughout the speech.

First, non-violence techniques, even being applied upon a large political scale, involved no secrecy. In the first sentence of his speech, Gandhi referred to himself like this: "I have become an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-cooperator." It implied that such disaffection and non-cooperation came into the picture only after negotiation through compromise had proven unsuccessful. Gandhi's non-violent scheme of disaffection and non-cooperation with the government was always made known beforehand to the government's officials as well as the public involved. Indeed, his preaching of disaffection through the three articles in his magazine, Young India, for which he was arrested and charged with sedition, were acts done publicly without the least bit of secrecy. "It has been a precious privilege for me," he light-heartedly said, "to be able to write what I have in the various articles." All of these revealed that Gandhi's principles of non-violence were completely divorced from all kinds of covert undertakings.
Second, the method of non-violence was not devised for cowards; in other words, cowardice was wholly inconsistent with non-violence. This principle was abundantly clear when Gandhi referred to his many wartime services. Gandhi set himself as an example of the brave who was at the same time an adherent of non-violence. Far from making a plea for mercy, he told the court that "non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-cooperation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me."

Third, non-violent disaffection and resistance was directed not against the persons in the system but the system itself which was viewed as the source of evil. Concerning this, Gandhi said: "I have no personal ill will against any single administrator, much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected toward a government." Elsewhere in the speech he also said, "I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system" (emphasis mine).
Fourth, the Gandhian theory and practice of non-violence required that the practitioner be willing to accept suffering. In this case it was a suffering from legal consequences. Gandhi's willingness to accept the consequence of his law breaking was obvious when he pleaded guilty, and told the judge: "I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act."

**Speech on the Eve of Historic Salt March**
**March 11, 1930**

After the Indian National Congress passed a resolution demanding full independence within a year, all members were called to resign from legislatures and official positions and Gandhi was deputed to lead the nationwide civil disobedience campaign that would

74 The text of the speech is from The Collected Works, Vol. , pp.
implement the resolution. On March 2, 1930, Gandhi sent a long letter to the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, informing him of his civil disobedience campaign soon to begin. This rhetorical document is in all probability the best available primary source that gives us an abundantly clear idea concerning the background of this world-wide famous "Salt March." Therefore, it is relevant enough for quotation here, prior to our analyses of the two speeches emerging from this dramatic campaign:

Dear Friend,

Before embarking on Civil Disobedience and taking the risk I have dreaded to take all these years, I would fain approach you and find a way out.

My personal faith is absolutely clear, I cannot intentionally hurt anything that lives, much less human beings, even though they may do the greatest wrong to me and

---


The full text of the letter is given in The Collected Works, Vol. 43, pp. 2-8.
mine. Whilst, therefore, I hold the British rule to be a curse, I do not intend harm to a single Englishman or to any legitimate interest he may have in India . . .

And why do I regard the British rule as a curse?

It has impoverished the dumb millions by a system of progressive exploitation and by a ruinous expensive military and civil administration which the country can never afford.

It has reduced us politically to serfdom. It has sapped the foundations of our culture. And by the policy of cruel disarmament, it has degraded us spiritually . . .

It seems as clear as daylight that responsible British statesmen do not contemplate any alteration in British policy that might adversely affect Britain's commerce with India... If nothing is done to end the process of exploitation, India must be bled with an ever increasing speed. . .

Let me put before you some of the salient points. The terrific pressure of land revenue, which furnishes a large part of the total, must undergo considerable modification in an Independent India . . . the whole revenue system has to be so revised as to make the peasant's good its primary concern. But the British system seems to be designed to crush the very life out of him. Even the salt he must use to live is so taxed as to make the burden fall heaviest on him, if only because of the heartless impartiality of its incidence. The tax shows itself more burdensome on the poor man when it is remembered that salt is the one thing he must eat more than the rich man (emphasis mine) . . . . .
Nothing but organized non-violence can check the organized violence of the British government.

This non-violence will be expressed through civil disobedience, for the moment confined to the inmates of Satyagraha [Sabarmati] Ashram, but ultimately designed to cover all those who choose to join the movement.

My ambition is no less than to convert the British people through non-violence, and thus make them see the wrong way they have done to India. I do not seek to harm your people. I want to serve them even as I want to serve my own.

The plan through Civil Disobedience will be to combat such evil as I have sampled out. I respectfully invite you to pave the way for the immediate removal of those evils, and thus open a way for the real conference between equals. But if you cannot see your way to deal with these evils and if my letter makes no appeal to your heart, on the eleventh day of this month I shall proceed with such co-workers of the Ashram as I can take, to disregard the provisions of the Salt Laws. (emphasis mine).

If you care to discuss matters with me, and if to that end you would like me to postpone publication of this letter, I shall gladly refrain on receipt of a telegram.

This letter is not in any way intended as a threat but is a simple and sacred duty peremptory on a civil resister.

I remain

Your sincere friend

M. K. Gandhi
Lord Irwin chose not to reply but his secretary sent a short acknowledgement saying: "His Excellency . . . regrets to learn that you contemplate a course of action which is clearly bound to involve violation of the law and danger to public peace."\textsuperscript{77}

Therefore, on the eleventh of March before the crowd that swelled to 10,000 at the evening prayer held on the Sabarmati sands at Ahmedabad, Gandhi delivered a memorable speech on the eve of his historic march.\textsuperscript{78}

The message in this speech was concerned with Gandhi's anticipation of the immediate future situation. We can analyze his message in terms of the dramatistic pentad in order to see how he proposed to deal with the situation he anticipated in the immediate future. Here we can identify the following elements:

The scene would be the situation after Gandhi and his companions are arrested and imprisoned by the

\textsuperscript{77}Fischer, \textit{The Life of Mahatma Gandhi}, p. 272.

\textsuperscript{78}Narayan, \textit{The Selected Works of Mahatma Gandhi}, p. 25.
British authority.

The act would embrace numerous details of actions to be taken by the civil resisters after Gandhi and their other leaders had been arrested.

The agents would refer to the civil resisters.

The agency would be the dual non-violent resistance campaign: civil disobedience and non-cooperation (Satyagraha).

The purpose would be to remove evils emerging from the British system especially the Salt laws in effect at the time.

Before Gandhi made this speech he had a distinct inclination that he would, more certainly than not, be arrested by the British authority. In the same day that he made this speech he wrote a short letter to Jawaharlal Nehru saying: "The air is thick with the rumor that I shall be arrested during the night. . . . The column will proceed with the march even though I may be arrested."79 Also to another friend, Satis, he began his letter by saying: "This may be my last letter before my arrest . . . Tomorrow I feel

they are bound to arrest me."\textsuperscript{80} Throughout the speech Gandhi actually used the word "arrest" six times and many more times he implicitly referred to that possibility. Again, in describing this situation, Gandhi ordered the pentadic elements in such a way that the act became dominant. He divided his narration into two different but related parts. The first part was concerned with the act of starting civil disobedience to break the salt laws while the second part highlighted the acts of non-cooperation. Both of the acts were presumed, by Gandhi's own words, to be "in the pursuit of an exclusive non-violent struggle."

Because the twenty-four day march was intended by Gandhi to be a monumental and historic signal to the nation, Gandhi emphasized at the beginning of his speech that after he himself and his companions were arrested, "the program of the march . . . must be fulfilled as originally settled." He urged the potential marchers and resisters to complete their

\textsuperscript{80}Ibid.
commitments even without his leadership with the following striking and act-oriented statement: "No one who believes in non-violence, as a creed, need therefore sit still."

He suggested clearly and concretely the acts of violating the salt laws to be performed by the civil resisters after he was arrested and the leadership had fallen into the responsibility of the Working Committee of the Congress; and the audience would naturally feel that Gandhi was concentrating on the main issue when they heard him say,

Wherever possible, civil disobedience of salt laws should be started. These laws can be violated in three ways. It is an offence to manufacture salt wherever there are facilities for doing so. The possession and sale of contraband salt (which includes natural salt or salt earth) is also an offence. The purchasers of such salt will be equally guilty. To carry away the natural salt deposits on the seashore is likewise a violation of law. So is the hawking of such salt. In short, you may choose any one or all of these devices to break the salt monopoly.

Gandhi was aware that the acts of civil disobedience, to be effective, required perfect discipline collectively observed by the resisters as well as wise leadership. Therefore he stressed: "Let nobody assume
that after I am arrested there will be no one left
to guide them. It is not I but Pandit Jawaharlal
who is your guide. He has the capacity to lead."
Even at the local level, leadership was essential:

Whenever there are Congress Committees,
where there is no ban by the Congress and
wherever the local workers have self-confidence,
other suitable measures may be adopted . . . .

Wherever there are local leaders, their
orders should be obeyed by the people. Where
there are no leaders and only a handful of
men have faith in the programme; they may do
what they can, if they have enough self-
confidence.

In summary, we may say that this first part of
the speech functioned on the one hand to minimize any
possible anticipative anxiety that might occur in the
mind of civil disobedience resisters and marchers. On
the other hand, it did function to maximize their de-
termination to fulfill the requirements of the civil
disobedience campaign.

In the second part of the speech, Gandhi focused
on the act of non-cooperation which he urged his people
to commit with confidence in the righteousness of their
cause, in the purity of their weapons (non-violent
techniques), and therefore in the blessings of God. He listed many different ways in which the acts of non-cooperation might be expressed; among them what he emphasized more strongly than the others was the resignation from the Government service. "Let us," he urged, "bid good-bye to the Government employment, no matter if it is the post of a judge or a peon." However, he reiterated the statement which called for his followers' commitment to non-cooperation proper; and then supplemented this with statements that affirmed his confidence in them.

Let all who are cooperating with the Government in one way or another, be it by paying taxes, keeping titles, or sending children to official schools, etc., withdraw their cooperation in all or as many ways as possible. One can devise other methods, too, of non-cooperation with the Government. And then there are women who can stand shoulder to shoulder with men in this struggle.

In concluding the speech, Gandhi still featured the act as the controlling element in the pentad by restating his sensible anticipation that nothing could shake the assurance that the march of protest would definitely start the next morning even though he would be arrested. "I shall eagerly await the news," declared
Gandhi, "that then batches are ready as soon as my batch is arrested." Nevertheless, in the final part of the speech, Gandhi did not entirely neglect to relate to the agents which were in this case the marchers. Both encouragingly and warningly, he said, "A satyagrahi (civil resister), whether free or incarcerated, is ever victorious. He is vanquished only when he forsakes truth and non-violence and turns a deaf ear to the Inner Voice (God). If, therefore, there is such a thing as defeat for even a satyagrahi, he alone is the cause of it" (parenthesized words mine).

Throughout the speech, it was noticeable that the act was distinctively featured. Even in the closing statement Gandhi said, "God bless you all and keep off all obstacles from the path in the struggle that begins tomorrow," which was the leader-speaker's oath; the overtone of the already featured act was still discernible.
Speech at Dandhi, April 5, 1930

After Gandhi and his seventy-eight disciples walked for two-hundred miles in twenty-four days, they reached the seashore at Dandhi on April 5, 1930. His small band of non-violent marchers had grown into a non-violent army consisting of several thousand members. On that day, April 5, Gandhi made one of the most memorable speeches before thousands of the audience who came from different places and gathered together at the small seaside hamlet of Dandi. In his speech introduction, Gandhi recited his inclination to believe that he might have been arrested at the time the march was being commenced. He solicited his hearers to join him in congratulating the government. "The Government," remarked Gandhi, "deserves to be congratulated on not arresting us, even if it desisted only from fear of world opinion." Then he turned abruptly to the main issue by saying: "Tomorrow we shall break the salt tax law." And hereupon we could see how the five elements in the pentad were ordered to

81 The text of the speech is from The Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 181-183.
function dramatically in the discourse.

The *scene* embraced the events that might take place after the salt law had been broken. Gandhi anticipated two possibilities with regard to the immediate future scene. One, the government might tolerate the impending civil disobedience in the same manner that it did during the past twenty-four days, and the other, Gandhi himself and all the eminent leaders in India might be arrested. No matter which alternative what was incontrovertible according to Gandhi was that the government officers in India would throw away the true English laws and treat the Indian people barbarously.

The *act* demanded by Gandhi from his civil resisters who might contextually be considered as the *agents* in this dramatistic process was concerned with the violation of the salt law in effect at that time; and the means or the *agency* through which the act of violation would be committed was, of course, the non-violent technique of civil disobedience. The *purpose* which described the motivation for the above *act* was to bring about the abolition of the salt law in the first place and then ultimately to lead to self-government.
In the early morning of the following day (April 6th—the anniversary of the massacre of Jallianwala, Amaritsar), in order to inaugurate a violation of the salt law, Gandhi went to the sea to bathe ceremonially in the ocean and then returning to the seashore, picked up some salt left by the wave. Therefore, the speech that he gave just one day before was fulfilled. Indeed, after the abrupt key statement: "Tomorrow we shall break the salt tax law," Gandhi prominently and continuously featured the act of breaking the British law. He urged his audience, which included thousands of the civil disobedience resisters, to take no account of the possible phenomenon that he as well as all the other eminent leaders might have to be arrested. "If they arrest me or my companions tomorrow," Gandhi declared, "I shall not be surprised, I shall certainly not be pained. It would be absurd to be pained if we get something that we have invited on ourselves." He wanted them to take into account only the act of violating the law. He wanted them and perhaps the whole nation to be unanimous in their support of what he called the "battle of right against might."
We are now resolved to make salt freely in every home, as our ancestors used to, and sell it from place to place, and we will continue doing so wherever possible till the Government yields, so much so that the salt in Government stocks will become superfluous. If the awakening of the people in the country is true and real, the salt law is as good as abolished.

Gandhi tried to assure his audience that their act of non-violence in breaking the law would entail immediate suffering, but they should decidedly face it unyieldingly even at great cost of life. Here he used a figurative expression which at the same time strikingly emphasized the need of the act of breaking the salt law.

Every man's house is his castle. Our body also is a fort of a kind. And once salt has entered that fort, it should not be allowed to be forced out of it even if horses are made to trample on your heads. From today we should begin cultivating the strength of will to see that a fist holding salt does not open even if the wrist should be cut off.

Late in the speech after having expressed his unconcern about any possible measure to be taken by the British authority, Gandhi emphasized his only concern:
If you have not yet gone out to remove salt, let the whole village get together and go. Hold the salt in your fist and think that you are carrying in your hand salt worth Rs. 6 crores. Every year the Government has been taking from us 6 crores through its monopoly of salt.

This was, of course, another way that he emphatically featured the act.

There is one more point to consider. Within his speech at Dandi, April 5, 1930, Gandhi included another minor dramatic description with regard to emerging significance of the hamlet of Dandi. Gandhi pointed out the fact that even though Dandi was a barren and out-of-the-way place, thousands of people still came to assemble with enthusiastic approval. He also identified Dandi as the "battlefield of satyagraha" which was "chosen not by a man but by God." He further stressed that "Dandi should be a sacred ground for us, where we should utter no untruth, commit no sin. Everyone coming here should come with devout feeling in his heart." Due to the emerging significance of Dandi, Gandhi demanded that anyone coming to Dandi could wear no foreign cloth but he should be dressed exclusively in khadi, the Indian
hand-woven cloth. He told his audience the way he intended to enforce his moral discipline within the scene of Dandi by saying:

If, ignoring my suggestion, any of you come to Dandi wearing foreign cloth, I shall have to place at the points of approach to Dandi, volunteers who will kneel before you and request you to wear Khadi. If you feel offended by their doing so and slap them in the face, those satyagrahis will let themselves be slapped.

This particular episode of the speech functioned to emphasize the two primary requirements for the civil disobedience resisters; i.e., first, they needed to conform to a set of disciplinary rules set up by their leaders and second, they need to be willing to accept agony arising out of the anger of their opponents whom they were attempting to change.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF ARGUMENTS

Stephen Toulmin in his book entitled *The Uses of Argument*, especially Chapter III "The Layout of Argument," provides a new insight into the nature of argument. He also provides us with a language and theoretical structure that may actually be used to analyze arguments in a rhetorical discourse.

"All the canons for the criticism and assessment," concludes Toulmin, "are in practice field-dependent, while all our terms of assessment are field-invariant in their force."  

Field-invariant refers to anything which remains the same regardless of a field of arguments.

---


84 Ibid., p. 38.
it applies to while field-dependent refers to anything which varies as we move from argument in one field to any argument in another. 85

An argument, as described by Toulmin, is the defending of a claim. When a claim is asserted, it may be challenged; if challenged, the claim needs to be supported with a suitable set of data; and if still challenged, it needs to be justified by providing a warrant to indicate the bearing of those data upon that claim. Toulmin indicates that it may not be sufficient simply to specify our data, warrant, and claim; three more components—a qualifier, a rebuttal, and a backing may be also needed to satisfy the challenger. It may prove useful to describe these six features of argument in turn.

(1) **Claim** is an assertion, the conclusion of an argument which presumably the communicator wishes his audience to accept.

(2) **Data** is the factual and circumstantial information stated by the communicator to establish his claim so that the claim may be accepted by his audience.

(3) **Warrant** is a general proposition stated by the communicator to authorize the bearing relationship between the data and the claim.

(4) **Qualifier** is a field-invariant which specifies the degree of force the communicator means his claim to possess by virtue of his warrant.

(5) **Rebuttal** is a statement which indicates circumstances in which the general authority of the warrant does not work. It is an exception.

(6) **Backing** is an assurance or assurances that confirm the authority or currency of the warrant. It is the "grounds for regarding a warrant as generally accepted."

Having grasped Toulmin's pattern of analysis, one may now understand Brockriede and Ehninger when they note that:

> Toulmin's analysis and terminology are important to the rhetorician for two different but related reasons. First, they provide an appropriate structural model by means of which rhetorical arguments may be laid out for analysis and criticism; and, second, they

---

suggest a system for classifying artistic proofs which employs argument as a central and unifying construct.\textsuperscript{87}

An analysis and criticism of arguments from Gandhi's selected speeches will be then undertaken by using Toulmin's pattern as the frame of reference. Each of the major arguments in the speech will be identified in terms of the six components. Then an evaluation will be made as to the appropriateness and adequacy of each step of the argumentative process. Moreover, having located and singled out the warrants and backings, it should throw light upon the kind of philosophical position that Gandhi leaned upon. In this way a study of arguments in his discourse will give insights into the mind of the man. As Richard Weaver states:

\begin{quote}
\ldots The reasoner reveals his philosophical position by the source of argument which appears most often in his major premise because the major premise tells us how he is thinking about the world. In other words, the rhetorical content of the major premise which the speaker habitually uses is the key to his primary view of existence.\textsuperscript{88}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{87}Wayne E. Brockriede and Douglas Ehninger, Toulmin on Argument: An Interpretation and Application,\textit{"} Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVI (February 1960), p. 44.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
The "Great Trial" Speech, March 18, 1922

Structure of the Arguments

Argument #1

Claim: The people of India should "gain a status of full equality in the British Empire" (11. 42-45).

Qualifier: Gandhi qualified his claim with a phrase that reflected his humble state of mind: "It was possible" which was in effect equivalent to "almost necessarily" (1. 42).

Data: Both in South Africa as well as in India the Indian people led by Gandhi volunteered to serve the Empire wholeheartedly on many significant occasions when the Empire was badly threatened to wage war (1.1. 17-42).

(1) In 1899, in the Boer War, Gandhi "raised a volunteer ambulance corps, and served at several actions" (1.1. 22-25).

(2) In 1906, at the time of the Zulu revolt, he "raised a stretcher-bearer party

The rhetorical setting in regard to this particular speech is already described prior to its dramatistic analysis in Chapter III, page 62.
and served till the end of the rebellion" (1.1. 26-28).

(3) In 1914, when World War I broke out between England and Germany, he "raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London, consisting of the Indian residents in London, chiefly students" (1.1. 31-34).

(4) In 1918, to answer a special appeal made at the War Conference in Delhi by the Viceroy for recruits, he strenuously raised a corps in Kheda (1.1. 37-38).

Warrant: To render "such services" was a sufficient condition for gaining equal status in returns (1. 44).

Backing: Gandhi believed in the general authority of such a warrant (1. 44).

The above claim became another substantial part of the data for the next argument when Gandhi asserted that equality would never become reality soon, perhaps for generations (1.1. 79-81). Other pieces of factual data were introduced into the speech; and they cohered readily to form a set of data for the argument as shown
Argument #2

Claim: Gandhi felt obliged to exercise and promote disaffection toward the system (1.45).

Qualifier: "Necessarily" is implied in the context.

Data: (1) The Rowlatt Act was "a law designed to rob the people of all freedom."
(2) The Punjab horrors which induced the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, the crawling order, public floggings, and other indescribable humiliations, were extremely inhumane (1.1. 49-52).
(3) "The plighted word of the Prime Minister to the Mussulmans of India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled" (1.1. 53-56).
(4) Gandhi made every possible effort to cooperate and work with the British Government, especially in the reforms. But he saw that "not only did the reforms mark a
change of heart" but they did more harm to India. (l.l. 58-64).

(5) "The British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before" (l.l. 75-76). All in all India was seriously deprived of her nationhood.

**Warrant:** Whenever one's legitimate rights and values are deprived by any system, and negotiation had proved unsuccessful, intensive agitation against the system is necessarily called upon (l.l. 48-49).

**Backing:** Gandhi believed that "the highest duty of a citizen" was to concede such a warrant (l. 176); and, also, "in his opinion, non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good" (l.l. 165-166).

Later in the speech Gandhi's argument was concerned with the evil of the particular law of the land enforced in India at that time.
Argument #3

Claim: Section 124-A designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen was perhaps the worst evil among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code (1.1. 131-135).

Qualifier: 'Perhaps' is explicit in the claim.

Data: (1) Under Section 124-A, mere promotion of disaffection is a crime (1. 142).
(2) Gandhi himself and Banker, his colleague, as well as "some of the most loved of India's patriots" had been convicted by Section 124-A (1.1. 140-147).

Warrant: "Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has an affection for a person or system, one should be free to give fullest expression to his disaffection so long as he does not contemplate, promote, or incite to violence" (1.1. 135-139). [Any contradictories to these statements can be taken as evils.]
Backing: Gandhi seemed to consider his above warrant as a maxim which is, as Aristotle defined it, "a statement about those things which concern human action, about what is to be chosen or avoided in human conduct." 90

It was a statement beyond challenge.

Having condemned the law of the land, Gandhi articulated the philosophical view which underlay his doctrines of non-violence and non-cooperation. He also constructed them in an argument quite feasible for analysis along the Toulmin pattern.

**Argument #4**

Claim: Gandhi claimed that it was a privilege for him to be charged under Section 124-A (1.1. 147-148).

Qualifier: 'Necessarily' was implied in the claim.

Data: Gandhi restated his data in Argument #2.

"The government . . . in its totality

has done more harm to India than any previous system" (l.l. 154-155); and "India is less manly under the British rule than she ever was before" (l.l. 155-156).

Warrant: It is "a virtue to be disaffected toward a [bad] government" (l.l. 153-154). It is "a sin to have affection for the system which was predominately bad" (l.l. 157-158).

Backing: This warrant is indeed Gandhi's unshaken principle. It is strongly implied by his actual words: "I hold it" and "I consider it" (l. 157).

Having identified the essential components of the argument, a further evaluation of their appropriateness and adequacy will continue.

**Evaluation of the Arguments**

**Argument #1**

We should consider whether or not the claim, "The people of India should gain a status of full equality in the British Empire," had been well-established. In
other words, we should evaluate how well the set of data as provided by Gandhi functioned to support his claim. Gandhi supported his claim by referring to five historical events arranged in chronological order. Four of them significantly marked a great service that the Indian people through the leadership of Gandhi himself rendered to the British Empire in time of need. They could be seen as a great service because they were given at great cost of life and they were loftily voluntary. To refer to the first event alone when Gandhi volunteered to serve with the British in the Boer War would probably be enough to justify the strength of his data. As Louis Fischer, one of America's most distinguished writers, described it:

The public and the army admired the endurance and courage of Gandhi's corps. In one sanguinary engagement at Spion Kop in January, 1900, the British were being forced to retire and General Buller, the commanding officer, sent through a message saying that although, by the terms of enlistment, the Indians were not to enter the firing line, he would be thankful if they came up to remove the wounded. Gandhi led his men on to the battlefield. For days they worked under the fire of enemy guns and carried moaning soldiers back to base hospital. The Indians
sometimes walked as much as twenty-five miles a day.91

Vere Stent, British editor of the Pretoria News, wrote:

I came across Gandhi in the early morning sitting by the roadside eating a regulation army biscuit. Every man in Buller's force was dull and depressed, and damnation was invoked on everything. But Gandhi was stoical in his bearing, cheerful, and confident in his conversations, and had a kindly eye. He did one good . . . I saw the man and his small undisciplined corps on many a battle-field during the Natal campaign. When succor was to be rendered, they were there. Their unassuming dauntlessness cost them many lives, and eventually an order was published forbidding them into the firing lane.92

In this group of data, Gandhi also included factual information about his receipt of the distinguished medals from the British authorities. This piece of evidence helped strengthen the significance of his cooperation with the British which he had already mentioned to establish his claim. It is legitimately


92 Quoted in Fischer, The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 63.
believable that the judge or in fact any rational audience would esteem such a deed highly. The fact that Gandhi cited these four different events when he led the Indians to serve the British Empire, each in time of need, can be counted as appropriate in terms of the claim he wanted to establish. They are also quite adequate to reinforce each other, to make the data themselves more forceful.

Turning to his major premise, the warrant and its backing, there are two related aspects to consider: first, how properly the warrant functioned to authorize the general relationship between his data and his claim, and second, what kind of philosophical position could be discernible in the premise. Gandhi's warrant in this particular argument was concerned with the concept of equity. He appealed for justice that extended beyond the written law. It was his strong conviction that when India had rendered such services to the British Empire she should gain the recognition of equal status in return. His conviction was, of course, grounded on the universal law of equity, which, to use Aristotle's
idiom, is a universal notion of right . . . that all men instinctively apprehend, even they have no mutual intercourse nor compact.\(^3\) Of course this kind of warrant may not always be valid in the field of international politics, but apparently Gandhi believed in another kind of politics which could never be divorced from ethics, morality, and religion, which of course embraced the universal law of equity among many others. Therefore it may be concluded that Gandhi's warrant in this particular argument was ethical and well-designed to establish his claim. It was humanely-oriented and appealed to the humanitarian rather than to the imperialist of the early Twentieth Century. As for the philosophical position which is revealed in this premise, it is concerned with right, i.e., the right to gain equal status from our counterpart is earned not indigenous or granted. To earn, here, implies sober acts repeatedly over a period of time. And all of the acts

\(^3\) Cooper, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, p. 73.
Gandhi clearly presented in his data can be deservedly taken into account as the earning as such. The conclusion concerning Gandhi's philosophical position derived from this particular speech is, therefore, not only incidentally but essentially concurrent with our previous conclusion derived from the pentadic analysis of some other speeches of his.

**Argument #2**

Somewhat similar to Argument #1, Argument #2 contains data dealing with factual information (data #2 and #3). Gandhi did not expand on his evidence simply because the material was already well-known to his audience, especially the British authorities who were hearing him. Perhaps he also saw it useless to inflame the minds of the mass which might engender unnecessary civil violence. However, the facts he alluded to were exceedingly useful in enhancing the strength of his claim. They also specified the British political weakness as well as wickedness. For instance, the massacre in April 3rd, 1919, at Jallianwala in the sacred city of Amritsar
that Gandhi very briefly referred to was notoriously brutal; when the British imperial power, represented by Brigadier General Dyer, fired on the defenseless Indian people, killing 379 of them and wounding four times as many. Even the mild report of the Committee appointed by the Government of India (Lord Hunter, Senator of the College of Justice of Scotland as Chairman) tells the story of the massacre of April 13 like this:

As soon as General Dyer entered the Bagh, he stationed twenty-five troops on one side of the higher ground at the entrance and twenty-five troops on the other side. Without giving the crowd any warning to disperse, which he considered unnecessary as they were in breach of his proclamation, he ordered his troops to fire and the firing continued for about ten minutes. There is no evidence as to the nature of the address to which the audience was listening. None of them were provided with firearms, although some of them have been carrying sticks.³⁴

The datum dealing with the Rowlatt Act was partially treated as a claim in Argument #3. Datum #4 was supported by the testimony of his own efforts. Data #5 was a conclusion of a lesser argument which might be called, according to Richard Weaver, the argument from circumstance. This is an argument from circumstance, 

that Gandhi developed to establish his claim: "The British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before."

She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages just the supplement she needed for adding to her meager agricultural resources. This cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhumane processes as described by English witnesses. Little do town dwellers know how the semistarved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realize that the government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. (1.1. 60-72).

The data for this argument was moreover combined with the claim from the first argument. They dovetailed completely so as to establish the claim about the Indian disaffection toward the British system.

In connection with the philosophical assumption that right is earned, as discerned in Argument #1, the warrant in Argument #2 generalized that whenever one's right was deprived and negotiation had proven a failure,
agitation was obligatory. It showed that non-violence as Gandhi meant it was indeed an active resistance not a passive one as often understood by many people. It also indicated another prerequisite to the actual practice of civil disobedience, i.e., a failure of sincere negotiations with the opponent to achieve mutual cooperation. The warrant philosophically reflected an assumption that rights which had been painstakingly earned, had to be protected. This warrant was supported by the postulational backing that it was the supreme duty of a citizen to refuse to cooperate with evil as earnestly as to agree to cooperate with the good. In short, Gandhi's warrant and backing as detected in his Argument #2 helped throw light upon his philosophical assumptions with regard to his theory of non-violence.

Argument #3

In comparison with the others, this is a minor argument, through which Gandhi wanted to condemn the law that suppressed the liberty of the citizen. However, the warrant in this argument was interesting. It showed another angle from which Gandhi looked at
the concept of freedom. Gandhi distinguished a true affection from what he considered the fake one. To him, true affection was preoccupied with freedom, even freedom to express disaffection so long as it did not involve violence. The claim in this argument was to confirm Datum #1 in the preceding argument.

Argument #4

The claim in Argument #4 could be construed that Gandhi saw the Government's charge against him, to which he pleaded guilty, as an official acknowledgement of his intentional disaffection for the government. Here the concept of non-violent resistance in the Gandhian sense was clearly implied, in addition to the fact that he could follow the virtue of a responsible citizen as he defined it. Non-violence in the Gandhian sense always presupposed a certain kind of suffering; and in this case it was suffering from imprisonment entailed by the authoritarian opponents. The warrant and its backing also specified one of the roots of Gandhi's own political/philosophical assumptions: it was a virtue to be disaffected to a bad government and also a sin to have affect for it.
Speech on the Eve of Historic Salt March
March 11, 1930

Structure of the Arguments

Argument #1

Claim: The non-violent program of the march to Dandi, Gandhi assured his hearers, would have to be fulfilled as originally settled (1.1. 8-10).

Data: (1) From what he had seen and heard, Gandhi strongly believed that the stream of the civil resisters from Gujarat would flow unbroken (1.1. 12-14).

(2) Gandhi felt positively that his followers would know what they should do to fulfill their task after he himself and his companies were arrested (1.1. 7-8).

Warrant: Everyone who joined the Satyagraha (civil disobedience campaign) had "resolved to utilize all his resources in the pursuit of an
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exclusively non-violent struggle" (1.l. 17-18).

Backing: It was Gandhi's hope and prayer that his statement would be confirmed (1.l. 19-20).

Datum #2 above was treated as a claim generally established in Argument #2 and elaborately re-established in Argument #3, as follows:

**Argument #2**

Claim: His task would have to be done even if he perished (1.l. 21-22).

Data: (1) Once Gandhi was arrested, the Working Committee of the Congress would show the way to the resisters (1. 23).

(2) Pandit Jawaharlal would be the able guide to lead the non-violent resistance campaign (1.l. 73-75).

Warrant: The reins of the movement would still remain in the hands of those of Gandhi's associates who believe in non-violence as an article of faith (1.l. 26-28).
Argument #3

Claim: Even if he would be arrested Gandhi saw no problem of starting the civil disobedience of salt laws, to be undertaken by the non-violent resisters (1.1. 38-39).

Data: (1) The Congress would take the whole general responsibility (1.1. 33-34).
(2) Salt laws could be violated in three ways:
   (a) manufacturing of salt even to carry away the natural salt deposits on the seashore,
   (b) possession and sale of contraband salt, which included natural salt or salt earth, and
   (c) purchasing of such salt (1.1. 39-47).
(3) Different other ways of non-violent civil disobedient practices could also be done:
   (a) liquor and foreign-cloth shops could be picketed;
   (b) citizens could refuse to pay their taxes;
   (c) the lawyer could give up his practice;
   (d) the public could boycott the courts by refraining from litigation;
   (e) government servants could resign their posts (1.1. 80-85).
Warrant: Non-violent resisters could easily choose any one or all of those methods to break the unjust laws or to withdraw their cooperation with the government (l.l. 34-35 and 109-110).

Backing: "No one who believed in non-violence, as a creed, needed sit still" (l.l. 34-35).

Rebuttal: Unless they lacked the two virtues: fearlessness and self-effacement (l.l. 76-78).

**Evaluation of the Arguments**

The purpose of Gandhi's speech of March 11, 1930, may be classified as a speech to actuate because it was intended to persuade listeners to perform a particular task, in this case the civil disobedience program of the Salt March. Now the arguments within the speech as identified above will be evaluated in turn.

---

Argument #1

Concerning the first claim that Gandhi made, it was vitally necessary to confirm it to the audience since once they had believed in it, their enthusiasm for the task ahead would have been aroused. However, had such a claim been barely mentioned without adequate support, its credibility, in general, could not be guaranteed except on the basis of the speaker's own ethos. In Gandhi's case, though his ethos was unusually powerful with this audience, he still did not rely upon that alone; he supported his claim with two fitting pieces of data. The first datum was concerned with the testimony from his direct experience, while the second one lay upon his confidence in his own disciples that they would be able to fulfill the task even in the absence of his leadership. To make his second datum stronger, so as to leave no room for any possible uncertainty which might occur in the mind of his audience, Gandhi supported it by constructing two separate arguments, as already identified above as Arguments #2 and #3. On that account, we may say that had the statements in each of the two supporting arguments been strongly and logically tied in, the first argument would certainly be well-established.
Hence, our final step of evaluation is to examine the strength of these two arguments (#2 and #3). However, before going on to do so, an appraisal of the warrant for Argument #1 should be made with an eye to its function to establish the data-claim bearing as well as its philosophical implications. The warrant—everybody who joined the satyagraha had resolved to utilize all his resources in the pursuit of an exclusive non-violent struggle—was a general statement which declared the definitive intent of the satyagrahi in regard to the affairs of non-violent struggling. It was therefore functional legitimately as an inference-license which confirmed the bearing of those data upon the asserted claim. Contentwise, this warrant could be considered as an attribute of the satyagrahi (the civil resister) which was defined in terms of its task and responsibility characterized by the non-violent commitment. In other words, Gandhi's warrant for this particular argument was based upon his definition of the satya-grahi. Here again, the definition itself was implicitly act-oriented when we noted the key phrase "to utilize
all his resources" in the definiens. And also because he probably felt that this particular warrant needed to be hammered more strongly into the minds of his hearers, he confirmed it with a backing which was literally an oath in the best sense of the term.

Turning to the next two arguments and firstly noting the claims, Gandhi did not say them in so many words but that was what he meant as he talked about Data #2 in the first argument. Now we are readily going to consider the two arguments in turn.

**Argument #2**

Both of the data in this argument emphasized the importance and indispensability of the leader for the civil disobedience campaign. Gandhi told his audience that many more able leaders still existed to show the way to the resisters; and, of course, when he cited Jawaharlal Nehru and the Working Committee of the Congress, he assumed their charisma would in all probability help to strengthen his audience's morale. As for the warrant in this argument, albeit it did not reveal any critical philosophical base of the speaker himself, it did confirm the assumption
that the civil disobedience in the Gandhian sense required very necessarily a charismatic leader whose qualification, among many others, was unswerving commitment to the doctrine of non-violence.

**Argument #3**

The data in this argument was vastly different from those in the preceding one. At this time Gandhi elaborated the very many possibilities that the salt laws might be violated and the very many different ways that the acts of non-cooperation might be maneuvered, practically, by those devout non-violent resisters. Once more his warrant; as well as his backing and rebuttal, which might be collectively intelligible as a major premise, revealed serious assumptions that the principles of non-violence in the Gandhian sense were grounded upon. There were (a) unjust laws of the land had to be violated; (b) co-operation with the unjust government had to be withdrawn; and (c) while being dynamic and active, the non-violent resister had to possess the double virtues of fearlessness and self-effacement.
Speech at Dandhi, April 5, 1930

Structure of the Arguments

Argument #1

Claim: The mass civil disobedience movement would be definitely kept alive (1. 49).

Qualifier: Even if Gandhi himself and all the eminent leaders were arrested) (i.1. 42-43).

Data: (1) Gandhi and his party had completed his twenty-four day march from Sabarmati Ashram to the seaside hamlet of Dandi without being arrested by the government (i.1. 1-19).

(2) As Gandhi conceived it, a whole nation was practically roused and also on the march in the figurative sense of the word (1. 45).

(3) Of the hundreds of thousands that supported the movement during the march and listened to Gandhi's speeches, there would be many who were sure "to take up this battle" (1. 46-48).
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(4) All of them were then determinedly resolved to break the salt law and would continue doing so "till the government yielded" (1.1. 50-53).

Argument #2

Claim: "In this struggle for swaraj (self-government) millions should offer themselves for sacrifice and win such swaraj as would benefit the masses of the country" (1.1.158-160).

Data:
(1) All Headmen had to resign their post and should prove themselves true to their word and should regard it as a sin to serve this government till freedom was won (1.1.64-67).
(2) The notorious drink habit of all Indian villagers had to be eradicated (1.1. 71-73).
(3) The Indian people should use no foreign cloth; they should be dressed exclusively in khadi (home-spun and hand-woven cloth) (1.1. 86-87).

Warrant: Self-government, the goal that the Indian people wished to reach was yet very far (1.57).
Backing: "If three or four men [could] fight and win swaraj, they will rule the country afterward" (l. 156).

Argument #3

Claim: Dandhi should be a sacred ground for India (l. 112).

Data: (1) Dandi, as stipulated for by Gandhi, had to be preconceived as a place where everyone coming should be dressed exclusively in khadi (l.1. 83-84).
(2) Everyone coming to Dandi should come with the devout feeling to utter no untruth, to commit no sin (l. 86).
(3) Dandi was chosen not by man, but by God (l. 96).

Warrant: none

Evaluation of the Arguments

Unlike the speech on the eve of the Salt March, the series of arguments within the speech at Dandi, April 5, 1930, consisted of three conglomerations of ideas which did not happen to overlap each other.
However, the first claim that Gandhi made in this particular speech still remained intact, (namely it was concerned with the survival of the civil disobedience movement). Characteristically, Gandhi provided a set of data to support his claim—the mass civil disobedience movement would be definitely kept alive—drawing from the circumstantial events which evolved during the twenty-four days of his two hundred and forty-one mile march.

Datum #1 in the first argument itself manifested his feeling of amazement combined with a sense of gratification. Data #2 through #4 described the circumstances with regard to the unexampled multitude of the civil disobedience resisters and sympathizers. In consideration of the fact that at the time Gandhi started his march from Sabarmati Ashram on March 12th, he led only seventy-eight male and female followers, but when reaching the sea at Dandi on April 5th, his small band had grown into a non-violent army of several thousands strong, the circumstantial impact was, of course, phenomenal. Therefore, Gandhi's argument from circumstance as such could be considered as fairly sound. More significantly, if we considered in terms of
the immediate audience response; this particular argument should also function persuasively. Interestingly enough, of all the major arguments we had examined in line with the Toulmin model in this study, this was the first one out of which the warrant was truncated. Consequently, no philosophical aspect could be detected from it, as Richard Weaver applicably stated: "The argument from circumstance is the least philosophical of all the sources of argument; since theoretically it stops at the level of perception of fact."⁹⁸

In his second argument Gandhi departed from the civil disobedience issue to the business of non-cooperation and the principle of using goods made locally or in one's own country, plus the eradication of the drink habit of the Indian villagers. All of these problems, as already listed in the above data, were so ardently demanding that they appeared to justify the claim: The goal of self-government that

---

⁹⁸ Wea. The Ethic of Rhetoric, p. 57.
the Indian people wished to reach was yet very far. Even so, Gandhi provided a warrant together with its backing in order to establish his claim more fervently. Both the warrant and the backing reflected Gandhi's political philosophy; a political achievement of self-government for India had to be earned out of the struggle and sacrifice by the masses for the benefit of the masses themselves because had such an achievement grown out of the essay of the few alone, it was going to be they who afterward would rule the country in line with the authoritarian principle. The idea here, of course, was not to deprecate those who were leaders of the struggle; rather it implied that those leaders had to identify themselves completely with millions of the masses which constituted the great majority of the country. Gandhi himself no doubt worked hard and set a good example to other leaders.

The last argument that Gandhi developed in this inspirational speech was structurally similar to the first argument; i.e., the warrants were truncated and so consisted of only two major components—data and claim; also the sets of data shared the same type of
circumstantial information. However, the data which featured this particular argument seemed to be carefully selected with an eye to inspire the audience to a greater awareness of the significance of this historic march to the hamlet of Dandhi where the symbolic gesture of breaking the law was going to be done the following day. So they were well designed to establish the claim that abruptly changed the status of Dandhi from a paltry hamlet into "a sacred ground" for India.

In short, an examination of this particular speech with special focus on its three rhetorical arguments taken as a whole might lead us to a new conclusion that the Gandhian principle of satyagraha even when predominately taking the form of civil disobedience was by no means neglectful of the emphasis of self-sacrifice and also the motivation of self-esteem.
CHAPTER V
GANDHI AND HIS UNIVERSAL AUDIENCE

When Arnold J. Toynbee described the world crisis from 1931 to 1932 in his monumental work *Survey of International Affairs*, he referred to Mahatma Gandhi as follows:

In India, at the turn of the years 1930 and 1931, Mr. Gandhi was in prison, as a result of his salt-making march to the sea, and for the moment the centre of action and interest had shifted from Gujarat to London, where the India Round Table Conference had been in session since the 12th of November.

What's more interesting was when Toynbee annotated the phrase 'salt-making march' this way:

Mr. Gandhi's march to the sea had begun on the 12th of March, 1930. He had been arrested on the 5th of May, 1930. The Mahatma—part Hindu saint and part Western politician—was recognized to be one of the most remarkable characters on the public stage of the world at this time.\(^9\)

Professor Paul Power recently expressed his opinion in agreement with Erik Erikson, that Gandhi was a universal man. Paul Power was one of the leading American scholars and experts on Gandhi while Erik Erikson was one of the leading figures in the field of psycho-analysis and human development, and the winner of both Pulitzer Prize and National Book Award.

That Gandhi was a universal man makes it indispensable for this rhetorical study to embody some focus on his universal message. This chapter, therefore, will first deal with the rhetorical concept of the universal audience and then evaluate the Gandhi rhetorical impacts upon this type of audience.

Perelman's Philosophical Concept of the Audience

The term 'universal audience' is provided by Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca when they developed the concept of the rhetorical audience in their recent work, _The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation_. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca see the audience as the central concern with regard to the framework of

---

rhetorical argumentation. "For this reason," they say, "we consider it preferable to define an audience, for the purpose of rhetoric, as the ensemble of those whom the speaker wishes to influence by his argumentation."\textsuperscript{101} (emphasis the authors)

This definition seems to be simple and clear, but its implications are not. There are a number of complicating features of such a concept.

First, the audience refers to not all of those who just happen to hear the message, but all those whom the speaker is sending his message to, with the intent or aspiration to influence.

Second, it is the speaker who selects the audience. Once the type of audience he is going to address has been selected, his rhetorical substance and arguments will be definitively determined. As stated in the The New Rhetoric, "the audience, as visualized by one undertaking to argue, is always a more or less systematized construction."\textsuperscript{102}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
Third, while admitting that "audiences are almost infinite in their variety," Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca develop the idea of two significant types of audience, namely, the universal audience and the particular audience [is] dependent upon the type of appeals selected by the speaker."104

The particular audience, as developed in the New Rhetoric, is composed of the listeners whose views the speaker has adapted his argumentation to.105 Hence, when argumentation is "aimed exclusively at a particular audience," it may be "foreign or even directly opposed to what is acceptable to persons other than those he is presently addressing."106


106 Ibid.
In contrast with the particular audience, the universal audience is composed of the listeners whom the speaker is about to address with a kind of argumentation whose reasons adduced are of a compelling character, absolutely and timelessly valid.\textsuperscript{107} It is a type of audience that "philosophers always claim to be addressing."\textsuperscript{108}

Fourth, the most complicating feature of the above definition of the audience lies in the phrase "to influence by argumentation." Within this context, influencing apparently embraces both persuading and convincing. In their philosophic construct, as they develop the idea of the two types of audience, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca try to show the distinction between persuasion and conviction. Although they accept the notion that "the difference between the term convincing and persuading is always unprecise and in practice must remain so,"\textsuperscript{109} they are purposefully emphatic about it.

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., p. 32.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., p. 31.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., p. 29.
We are going to apply the term persuasive to argumentation that only claims validity for a particular audience, and the term convincing to argumentation that presumes to gain the adherence of every rational being [a universal audience].

Accordingly, argumentation designed for and directed toward the particular audience is persuasion, and argumentation designed for and directed toward the universal audience is conviction. Within this philosophic frame of reference, therefore, the following quotations illustrate the type of message by a number of speakers evidently directed toward the universal audience.

Edmund Burke (1729-1797)
On Conciliation With America:

First, sir, permit me to observe that the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered.

My next objection is its uncertainty. Terror is not always the effect of force, and an armament is not a victory. If you do not succeed, you are without resource: for conciliation failing, force remains; but, force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left. Power and authority are sometime

bought by kindness; but they can never be begged as alms by an impoverished and defeated violence.\textsuperscript{111}

Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865)
\textbf{First Inaugural Address:}

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other, but the different parts of our country cannot do this.\textsuperscript{112}

John F. Kennedy (1917-1963)
\textbf{Inaugural Address:}

To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best effort to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{111} Goodwin F. Berquist, Jr., \textit{Speeches for Illustration and Example} (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965), p. 50.
\item \textsuperscript{112} Ibid., p. 138.
\end{itemize}
Evaluation of the Message

Having grasped the concept of the universal audience, we will continue to consider Gandhi's message from those speeches that have been referred to in the preceding sections.

The Gandhi speech before the Mass Meeting, Johannesburg, September 11, 1906, was given before the audience which, as we already know, consisted of nearly three-thousand Indians who lived in South Africa at that time; among them were rich merchants, miners, lawyers, indentured labourers, waiters, and poor shop keepers. But, if we consider these listeners in terms of the Perelman concept, Gandhi seemed to consider them as the universal audience.

The main purpose of this particular address, as we know, was to convince the immediate audience to vote with utmost determination in support of the resolution demanding non-compliance with registration provisions. However, Gandhi's selection of the appeals, showed that it was the universal audience his appeals were directed to. For instance, when he emphasized the importance of the oath, he made the universal appeal this way:
We all believe in one and the same God, the differences of nomenclature in Hinduism and Islam notwithstanding. To pledge ourselves or to take an oath in the name of that God or with Him as witness is not something to be trifled with. If having taken such an oath we violate our pledge, we are guilty before God and man. Personally, I hold that a man, who deliberately and intelligently takes a pledge and then breaks it, forfeits his manhood. And just as a copper coin treated with mercury not only becomes valueless when found out, but also makes its owner liable to punishment, in the same way a man who lightly pledge his word and then break it become a man of straw and fits himself for punishment here as well as hereafter.

The argumentation inherent in the quotation offered above was a manifest universal appeal, which fitted the rhetorical situation in Johannesburg in 1906, and should as well fit even today's rhetorical situations, provided the speaker wishes to direct his message to an audience of a universal type. Gandhi's reserved restatement of the same theme was also manifest as a universal appeal; namely, "I know that pledges and vows are, and should be, taken on rare occasions. A man who takes a vow every now and then is sure to stumble."

In his speech at Benares' Hindu University, February 6, 1916, Gandhi chose to direct his argumentation
to only some of the members of the audience and yet made it a kind of the universal appeal. He condemned the maharajahs' sumptuous ways of living in spite of the fact that these maharajahs had made large donations to the university. He condemned the unlimited use of the English language, especially when he was compelled to give an address in English on that particular occasion in spite of the presence of the notables including Mrs. Annie Besant, a remarkable English woman who was also one of the founders of the university. His major premises which appeared elsewhere in the speech, and at times in the forms of rhetorical question, manifested his selection of the universal appeals:

"Our language is the reflection of ourselves."

"No paper contribution will ever give us self-government. No amount of speeches will ever make us fit for self-government. It is our own conduct that will fit us for it."

"Is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit precursor of an honourable death?"

"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 Gandhi speech of March 23, 1922, in which he propounded his faith before an English judge was even more vivid an example of appeals addressed to a universal audience. He did not consider the judge who was supposed to respond to his argumentation as the judge per se, but as a rational being who was there to decide whether or not the laws enacted by the British India Government were evil. His intent crystallized when he ended his speech with the following words:

The only course open to you, the judge, is either to resign your post, and thus dissociate yourself from evil if you feel that the law you are called upon to administer is an evil and that in reality I am innocent, or to inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country and that my activity is therefore injurious to the public weal.

Interestingly enough, when Gandhi sat down, Mr. Justice Broomfield bowed to the prisoner before pronouncing sentence. Passing sentence on Gandhi, the judge declared, "is no respecter of persons." And he went on to say:
Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that, in the eyes of millions of your countrymen, you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and even saintly life."

A critical examination of the Gandhi "salt march" speeches would also reveal that the message was basically designed to possess universal appeals. This may sound unusual when we consider that his immediate audience in each of the speaking situations for the most part consisted of his disciples, the villagers, and the civil resisters at the grass-roots; but it will be clearer after a consideration of two different but related rhetorical aspects.

First, Gandhi as a rhetor, at that time wanted to receive both nation-wide and world-wide sympathy and support regarding his non-violent fighting in the cause of justice. He was aware of the fact that his message would flow very rapidly all over the world.

through different channels which had been readily on the alert surrounding him. As Louis Fischer described it:

As March 11th neared, India bubbled with excitement and curiosity. Scores of foreign and domestic correspondents dogged Gandhi's footsteps in the ashram; what exactly would he do? Thousands surrounded the village and waited. The excitement spread abroad. Cables kept the Ahmedabad post office humming. "God guard you," the Reverend Dr. John Haynes Holmes wired from New York.115

When the historic March was completed at Dandi on April 5, he was asked what he hoped to accomplish by breaking the salt laws; and he answered: "I want world sympathy in this battle of right against might." Then he wrote out the words vigorously in his own hand-writing as shown on the next page.

Second, Gandhi built his message in such a way that it was essentially grounded upon his assumptions of non-violence. From village to village he constantly maintained and emphasized the ideas of bravery, willingness to face all kinds of sufferings, self-discipline, and disengagement of all kinds of physical coercion—sacrifices non-violent advocates must make the world

I want world sympathy in this matter. Right against Right.

Gandhi

5-4-30
over. Gandhi, because of his unusually powerful charisma, could direct his universal appeals toward his immediate audience and transform them to a universal level.

The following excerpts from the "salt march" speeches illustrate how Gandhi used the universal appeals when he was addressing the audience of the civil resisters:

From the speech on the eve of the salt march:

My task shall be done if I perish and so do my comrades. It will then be for the Working Committee of the Congress to show you the way and it will be up to you to follow its lead. That is the only meaning of the Working Committee's resolution. The reins of the movement will still remain in the hands of those of my associates who believe in non-violence as an article of faith.

-----------------------------

The history of the world is full of instances of men who rose to leadership by sheer force of self-confidence, bravery and tenacity. We too, if we sincerely aspire to swaraj and are impatient to attain it, should have similar self-confidence.
From the Dandi speech:

Time was when I was infatuated with British rule, as British law taught that the person of every individual is sacred. According to that law, the police cannot kill or manhandle a man even though he might be guilty of murder. It is the duty of the police to produce the man alive before the court. Nor has the police any authority outside the jail to seize from a person even goods alleged to have been stolen. But here the very opposite is true. How otherwise can the police have the authority to decide whether I hold a handful of salt or pebbles?

-----------------------------------

Unauthorized entry into a house is a barbarous act. It is for a judge to decide whether I hold in my hand salt or dust. The English law holds the human person to be sacred. If every official assumes the authority of a judge and enters our homes, he would be acting as a robber.

Having seen from several speeches that even when speaking to the immediate audience the Gandhi message was still oriented to the universal appeals, we now turn to one particular speech which was obviously addressed to the remote audience alone; and that was his broadcast to America on September 13, 1931, the day after his arrival in England to attend the Round
Table Conference as the sole representative of the Indian National Congress. The Columbia Broadcasting System arranged for a radio address to New York and other stations on the North American continent; according to Louis Fischer, Gandhi refused to prepare a script and spoke extemporaneously.\textsuperscript{116} Gandhi began his speech by identifying himself with the world audience by saying that in his opinion the Indian struggle in its consequence affected not merely India, but the whole world. It was noticeable that throughout the speech, not once did he mention the word 'America' or 'the American people', or any other word implying that he was addressing this country in particular. This fact suggests that Gandhi, consciously or unconsciously, selected universal appeals to convince his listeners. In other words, he designed his message for the universal audience, not a particular one.

The thematic statement that Gandhi made earlier in the address was: "If India is to perpetuate the glory of her ancient past, it can do so only when it

\textsuperscript{116} Fischer, \textit{The Life of Mahatma Gandhi}, p. 287.
attains freedom." He did not prove it until late in the speech when he elaborated on the destruction, by the East India Company, of village industry for the benefit of British manufacturers. He insinuated that millions of villagers who were the productive constituent of the Indian ancient civilization had become idle for nearly six months of the year, because their supplementary village industry was destroyed; consequently they had become the "semi-starved millions, who could no more supplement or even restore the glory of Indian ancient past." This is the way Gandhi crystallized his ideas:

The time was not very long ago when every village was self-sufficient in regard to the two primary human wants: food and clothing. Unfortunately for us, the East India Company, by means I would prefer not to describe, destroyed that supplementary village industry, and the millions of spinners who had become famous through the cunning of their deft fingers for drawing the finest thread, such as has never yet been drawn by any modern machinery. These village spinners found themselves one fine morning with their noble occupation gone. From that day forward India has become progressively poor.

This kind of argumentation could be construed as
a universal appeal in line with the Perelman concepts that first, it had not been adapted to the views of the listener in accordance with their experiential and group affiliation bias; and second, it was based upon pure reason.

Immediately after Gandhi made his thematic statement, he put forth his favorite theme of non-violence by stating that India's struggle had drawn the attention of the world, not because the Indians are fighting for their liberty, but because "the means adopted by us for attaining that liberty are unique, and as far as history shows us, have not been adopted by any other people." He went on to emphasize that:

The means adopted are not violence, not bloodshed, not diplomacy as one understands it nowadays, but they are purely and simply truth and non-violence. No wonder that the attention of the world is directed towards this attempt to lead a successful bloodless revolution.

These appeals seemed to gain universal acceptance as attested to, for example, by the writings of Albert Einstein in 1949 and by Martin Luther King in 1958 as follows:
Gandhi is unique in political history. He has invented an entirely new and humane technique for the liberation struggle of an oppressed people and carried it out with the greatest energy and devotion. The moral influence which he has exercised upon thinking people throughout the civilized world may be far more durable than would appear likely in our present age, with its exaggeration of brute force.117

----------------------------------

Gandhi was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale.118

Gandhi spent well over two-thirds of his broadcast time pointing out the essence of his concept of non-violence. He first established his stance that "I, personally, would wait, if need be, for ages rather than seek to attain freedom of my country through bloody means." Then he went on to emphasize the two fundamental principles of non-violence, namely, suffering without retaliation and self-discipline on the


part of the true non-violent practitioners. And he tried to convince his audience that perhaps his non-violent means could show the way out to the "hungering world," which was "sick unto death of blood-spilling." Gandhi's effort to convince the audience of the rationale of non-violence apparently was widely spread as attested by the article which appeared on page nine of the *New York Times*, September 21, 1931, entitled: "Gandhi Urges World to Try Non-Violence." The article contains Gandhi's own writing on the importance of the act of non-violence, which restated and elaborated what he had said in his broadcast. And also in this very same page on the same day in the *New York Times* gave the coverage of Gandhi's activities in London, which showed that he had received widest attention in the United States. Actually, during the time associated with Gandhi's attendance at the Round Table Conference, there appeared well over a hundred items of coverage by the *New York Time*.

Another universal idea that Gandhi put forth during his broadcast was this: "It is my certain
conviction that no man loses his freedom except through his own weakness." He elaborated this notion by frankly citing the Indian situation to show that Indians lost their freedom essentially through their own weaknesses:

We represent in India all the principal religions of the earth, and it is a matter of deep humiliation to confess that we are a house divided against itself; that we Hindu and Mussalmans are flying at one another. It is a matter of still deeper humiliation to me that we Hindus regard several millions of our own kith and kin as too degraded even for our touch. I refer to the so-called "untouchables".

This kind of argument revealed that Gandhi tried to apply reasons, based on his first-hand experience of the situation, to the imagination of his universal audience. It revealed his personality as a sincere communicator, particularly his unique philosophy and his love of mankind. It also revealed that Gandhi was a man who unshakably cherished truth, justice, and consistency.

Since Gandhi constantly identified himself with the poor, he always said that he had gone to the Round
Table Conference as the representative of the dumb millions of India; he did not fail to identify himself with those poor people as he concluded his broadcast this way:

May I not, then, on behalf of these semi-starved millions, appeal to the conscience of the world to come to the rescue of a people dying for regaining its liberty.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

As we learn from his Autobiography, after three years in England, Gandhi was unable even to deliver a brief farewell speech. But after his arrival in Africa and having seen with his own eyes how oppressively the Indian people over there were being treated by the British rulers, he suddenly identified himself with his fellow people. Since then, he had been a self-confident speaker who vowed to dedicate himself to active non-violent resistance. He could now make a great number of persuasive speeches to move his people to act in the non-violent campaigns. His speaking ability rapidly developed to the level of sublimity. Late in life when he wrote his autobiography, Gandhi recalled his rhetorical experience this way:
My hesitancy in speech, which was once an annoyance, is now a pleasure. Its greatest benefit has been that it has taught me the economy of words. I have naturally formed the habit of restraining my thoughts. And I can now give myself the certificate that a thoughtless word hardly ever escapes my tongue or pen. I do not recollect ever having had to regret anything in my speech or writing.

Because the Gandhi speeches selected for this study occurred during Gandhi's rhetorical maturity, they reflect the overall rhetorical content and technique which Gandhi habitually used. An understanding derived from the analyses elsewhere in this study should have adequately revealed to us not only the nature of his rhetorical stance and practice, but also the general picture of his personality as the father of modern and independent India.

In the preceding chapters, different rhetorical tenets derived from the writings of several contemporary rhetorical theorists had been used eclectically as the instrumentality for the understanding and evaluation of the Gandhi speeches. They were the dramatistic model of Kenneth Burke, the argumentative analysis of Stephen Toulmin, the moral rhetoric of
Richard Weaver, and the philosophic rhetoric of Perelman-Tyteca. It may prove suitable to include here a summary and implications of this study.

Summary

Five major speeches that Mahatma Gandhi gave on vastly different occasions have been thoroughly analyzed according to Kenneth Burke's dramatistic model. The dramatistic situations in each of the speeches are pointed out and then inherent pentadic elements, i.e., the scene, the act, the agent, the agency, and the purpose, are identified. The number of dramatistic situations varies from speech to speech depending upon its length and its involvement. However, there emerge altogether ten different situations which have been considered in turn with an eye to the featuring element in each. It is found that out of the dramatistic pentad, the act is always ordered as the controlling element; no matter whether it is the act that is connected with the present, the past, or the future; no matter whether it is the act of the speaker himself or the audience, or anywhere else,
identified as the agent in the pentad. The pentadic analysis gives us a better insight into the message of the Mahatma. He had more concern over the means rather than the end. It also confirms very strongly that he wholly disapproved the doctrine that the end justifies the means.

Out of these five speeches, three of them again have been carefully analyzed by using the Toulmin model. The major arguments from each of the speeches are pointed out and their structures are identified in terms of the Toulmin six-components of argument; i.e., claim, data, warrant, qualifier, backing, and rebuttal. The identified warrants and backings are useful to grasp Gandhi's uses of the major premises.

By applying the Weaver concept of the philosophical nature of the speaker's major premise, Gandhi's philosophical position could be discernable from his warrants and/or his backings. And it was also found that his philosophical positions always imply certain kinds of sober acts to be performed in accordance with the non-violent principles. And this is essentially concurrent with the conclusion
derived from the dramatistic analysis. Both the dramatistic and argumentative analyses are mutually incorporated in manifesting that the philosophy that dominated within the speeches was realism. If these analyses are correct, it may be concluded that Gandhi was a realist rather than an idealist as some people tend to casually believe when encountering some of his lofty and, perhaps, elusive ideals.

After having studied these speeches in terms of their dramatistic and argumentative constructs, a further examination was made with an eye to their impact upon the universal audience. Here an unspoken philosophic concept of the audience is used as a frame of reference. It is found that a number of messages extracted from those speeches that have already been studied plus from one special broadcast speech, clearly illustrate a kind of universal appeal which Gandhi apparently intended to address to the universal audience. The truth and impact from those messages do not seem to die out, but they seem to persist with rhetorical significance.
Implications

The first implication emerging from this study is concerned with the methodology of rhetorical criticism. It is eclecticism that has been used in this study and has proven extremely useful. It has testified to us that out of the various and well-established rhetorical systems, a critic may select some germane principles that appear to him to be the best and then combine them into a unitary yardstick for an evaluation of the man's rhetorical acts, and also into an instrumentality through which the general nature of the man's rhetoric may be precisely discerned.

This study therefore confirms that eclecticism is one of the most useable approaches to the qualitative study of speeches. Moreover, the eclectic approach frequently contributes to the reassurance of our conclusion of some kind. For instance, as appeared in this study, after having used the Burkeian approach, we concluded that Gandhi was a man who had more concern about the means rather than the end or
he was a realist rather than an idealist. This particular conclusion was again confirmed by the Toulmin and Weaver approach. Therefore such a conclusion has achieved a high degree of cogency.

The second implication generated by this study relates to the universe of discourse. All of the six major speeches by Gandhi that have been selected for this study extended over the period of twenty-five years—from 1906 to 1931. All of these speeches could be perceived as the rhetorical responses to vastly different rhetorical situations. Except for the speech of 1906, all of the Gandhi speeches that have been examined in this study were given during the time when Gandhi’s initial ethos was the most potent. However, our analysis clearly reveals that in none of these speeches did Gandhi rely on a means of persuasion based upon the using of his ethos or ethical proof. On the contrary, both the dramatistic analysis as well as the analysis of arguments according to the Toulmin model show that the fundamental means of persuasion that Gandhi relied upon in all of his speeches are predominantly his own universe of thought, i.e., his conviction of the superiority of the doctrine of non-violence, his disapproval of the doctrine that the end justifies the means, his
conviction that a man seeking for truth as his goal has to follow the path of non-violence, and above all he must also be a man of action.

The history of India's independence movement tells us that India's accomplishment of her independence with honor was more than significantly due to the potent charismatic leadership and wisdom of Gandhi. However, the finding of this study reveals that Gandhi rarely used his charisma or his ethos in his discourse. This may lead us to theorize that the more charismatic power the rhetor possesses, the less frequently he should use it in his universe of discourse; or the more confirmedly and consistently the rhetor relies upon his solid universe of thought, the more charismatic impact he will have upon the minds of his universal audience.

The third implication which may be construed from this analysis is the fact that this study supports the 'effectiveness' viewpoint, especially as advocated by Wayland Parrish. It is an approach to rhetorical criticism which ignores the actual effect of the speech on the particular audience, but interprets and evaluates
a speech in terms of its effect upon the universal audience. This study has focused only upon the argumentation and content within the speeches under investigation. An attempt has been made to evaluate them in terms of the universal appeals and the universal audience. However, this kind of approach, while ignoring the actual immediate effect, provides us with an insight into the true nature of the mind of the man whose impacts upon mankind are phenomenal, which is, of course, deserving of our painstaking study.

The fourth implication lies on the fact that contemporary Western rhetoric, represented by Burke, Toulmin, Weaver, and Perelman can be used efficiently as an instrument for the critic in his undertaking of the rhetorical criticism, even though the man and his message and the rhetorical context under investigation were indigenous to other cultures vastly different from that of the Western. This may suggest that the fundamental principles of contemporary rhetoric of the Western thought can be applicable
to general rhetorical practice within the Eastern culture. If this implication is correct, the label "Western" that qualifies the term rhetoric signifies merely a system of rhetoric originated in the Western world, but it does not necessarily limit its workability solely within the Western culture. Or the study may signify the appropriateness of Western rhetoric in those instances where the speaker was educated in the West as Gandhi was.

Today the once-prevailing assumption represented by Rudyard Kipling's lines, "Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," has almost died out. What we need today is an understanding of each other's ways of thinking, values, and culture as a whole. This study is completed with a humble hope that it may contribute to such an understanding.
Suggestions for Further Studies

(1) An analysis of Gandhi's speeches could be practically undertaken by employing a great variety of approaches, in addition to the one completed in this study. An Aristotelian pattern which basically focuses upon the speaker's ethos, logos, and pathos could be efficiently used; so could the Ciceronian canons of rhetoric which include Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory, and Delivery. Also one may wish to employ the Burkeian concept of identification alone. While none of these approaches are decidedly superior, they are supplementary to each other and they should provide in a different perspective a new insight into Gandhi himself and his rhetoric. These methods, of course, demand the critic's mastery of other rhetorical theories as well as his possession of some more relevant data concerning the speaker, the speech, the audience, and the occasion. These data may be in part secured from the body of this dissertation and from a wealth of sources given in the Bibliography.
(2) While this study is limited to Gandhi's rhetoric of non-violence, the rhetorical situations which occurred during the long period of his lifetime were numerous and varied. A critic may wish to study Gandhi's rhetoric in depth by focusing upon some other aspects of his rhetoric, either in terms of a specific theme or over a certain period of time in his public career. These are, for instance, the rhetoric of anti-untouchability, the rhetoric of social protest, Gandhi's rhetoric of the Salt March, Gandhi's rhetoric at the Round Table Conference, London, etc.

(3) While this study focuses upon Gandhi's message and argumentation, a further study may focus on the Gandhi charisma as a means of persuasion for Gandhi's charismatic power was extraordinarily significant. Such a study may compare and contrast his charisma with his message, his symbolic gestures, and himself as an example to others.
(4) In consideration of a possibility that an application of the Western rhetorical principles could be made under the Eastern contexts as exemplified in this study, many more rhetorical studies of this sort could be undertaken with reference to some other public figures of the East, living or dead. Such studies would contribute not only to expand the boundary of the theory of rhetoric, but also to promote a better understanding between the East and West.
APPENDIX A
The 'Great Trial' Speech
March 18, 1922

1 I owe it perhaps to the Indian public and to the
2 public in England to placate which this prosecution
3 is mainly taken up that I should explain why from a
4 stanch loyalist and co-operator I have become an un-
5 compromising disaffectionist and non-co-operator. To
6 the court too I should say why I plead guilty to the
7 charge of promoting disaffection toward the government
8 established by law in India.
9
10 My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in
11 troubled weather. My first contact with British author-
12 ity in that country was not of a happy character. I
13 discovered that as a man and as an Indian I had no
14 rights. More correctly, I discovered that I had no
15 rights as a man because I was an Indian.
16
17 But I was not baffled. I thought that this treat-
18 ment of Indians was an excrescence upon a system that
19 was intrinsically and mainly good. I gave the govern-
20 ment my voluntary and hearty co-operation, criticizing
21 it freely where I felt it was faulty but never wishing
22 its destruction.
23
24 Consequently, when the existence of the Empire
was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a volunteer ambulance corps, and served at several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906, at the time of the Zulu revolt, I raised a stretcher-bearer party and served till the end of the "rebellion." On both these occasions I received medals and was even mentioned in dispatches. For my work in South Africa I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal. When the war broke out in 1914 between England and Germany, I raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly, in India, when a special appeal was made at the War Conference in Delhi in 1918 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits, I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda, and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted. In all these efforts at service I was
actuated by the belief that it was possible by
such services to gain a status of full equality in
the Empire for my countrymen.

The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt
Act, a law designed to rob the people of all real
freedom. I felt called upon to lead an intensive
agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab hor-
rors beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala
Bagh and culminating in crawling orders, public
floggings, and other indescribable humiliations. I
discovered too that the plighted word of the Prime
Minister to the Mussulmans of India regarding the
integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam
was not likely to be fulfilled. But in spite of the
forebodings and the grave warnings of friends, at
the Amritsar Congress in 1919, I fought for cooper-
ation and working with the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms,
hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his pro-
mise to the Indian Mussulmans, that the Punjab wound
would be healed, and that the reforms, inadequate
and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new
era of hope in the life of India.
But all that hope was shattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was whitewashed and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service and in some cases continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue, and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw too that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart, but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude.

I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A disarmed India has no power of resistance against any aggressor if she wanted to engage in an armed conflict with him. So much is this the case that some of our best men consider that India must take generations before she can achieve the Dominion status. She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages just the supplement she needed for adding to her
meager agricultural resources. This cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes as described by English witnesses. Little do town dwellers know how the semistarved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town dwellers of India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for the crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history. The law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign exploiter. My unbiased examination of the Punjab Martial Law cases has led me to believe that at least ninety-five per cent of convictions were wholly bad. My experience of political cases in India leads me to the conclusion in nine out of every ten the condemned men were
totally innocent. Their crime consisted in the love of their country. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred justice has been denied to Indians as against Europeans in the courts of India. This is not an exaggerated picture. It is the experience of almost every Indian who has had anything to do with such cases. In my opinion, the administration of the law is thus prostituted consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter.

The greatest misfortune is that Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am satisfied that many Englishmen and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world and that India is making steady though slow progress. They do not know that a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organized display of force on the one hand, and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defense on the other, have emasculated the people
and induced in them the habit of simulation. This awful habit has added to the ignorance and the self-deception of the administrators. Section 124-A, under which I am happily charged, is perhaps the prince among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen. Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has an affection for a person or a system, one should be free to give the fullest expression to his disaffection, so long as he does not contemplate, promote, or incite to violence. But the section under which Mr. Bunker [a colleague in nonviolence] and I are charged is one under which mere promotion of disaffection is a crime. I have studied some of the cases under which mere promotion of disaffection is a crime. I have studied some of the cases tried under it, and I know that some of the most loved of India's patriots have been convicted under it. I consider it a privilege, therefore, to be charged under that section. I have endeavored to give in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection. I have no personal
ill will against any single administrator, much less
152 can I have any disaffection toward the King's person.
153 But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected toward
154 a government which in its totality has done more harm
155 to India than any previous system. India is less
156 manly under the British rule than she ever was before.
157 Holding such a belief, I consider it to be a sin to
158 have affection for the system. And it has been a
159 precious privilege for me to be able to write what
160 I have in the various articles, tendered in evidence
161 against me.
162
163 In fact, I believe that I have rendered a service
to India and England by showing in non-co-operation
164 the way out of the unnatural state in which both are
165 living. In my humble opinion, non-co-operation with
166 evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good.
167 But in the past, non-co-operation has been deliber-
168 ately expressed in violence to the evildoer. I am
169 endeavoring to show to my countrymen that violent
170 non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that as
171 evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal
172 of support of evil requires complete abstention from
violence. Nonviolence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the judge, is either to resign your post, and thus dissociate yourself from evil if you feel that the law you are called upon to administer is an evil and that in reality I am innocent, or to inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country and that my activity is therefore injurious to the public weal.
APPENDIX B

Speech on the Eve of the Salt March
March 11, 1930

1 In all probability this will be my last speech
to you. Even if the Government allow me to march
tomorrow morning, this will be my last speech on the
sacred banks of Sabarmati. Possibly these may be the
last words of my life here.

6 I have already told you yesterday what I had to
say. Today I shall confine myself to what you should
do after I and my companions are arrested. The pro-
gramme of the march to Jalalpur must be fulfilled as
originally settled. The enlistment of volunteers
for this purpose should be confined to Gujarat. From
what I have seen and heard during the last fortnight
I am inclined to believe that the stream of civil
resisters will flow unbroken.

15 But let there be not a semblance of breach of
peace even after all of us have been arrested. We have
resolved to utilize all our resources in the pursuit

170
of an exclusively non-violent struggle. Let no one commit a wrong in anger. This is my hope and prayer. I wish these words of mine reached every nook and corner of the land. My task shall be done if I perish and so do my comrades. It will then be for the Working Committee of the Congress to show you the way and it will be up to you to follow its lead. That is the only meaning of the Working Committee's resolution. The reins of the movement will still remain in the hands of those of my associates who believe in non-violence as an article of faith. Of course, the Congress will be free to chalk out what course of action commends itself to it. So long as I have not reached Jalalpur, let nothing be done in contravention to the authority vested in me by the Congress. But once I am arrested, the whole general responsibility shifts to the Congress. No one who believes in non-violence, as a creed, need therefore sit still. My compact with the Congress ends as soon as I am arrested. In that case there should be no slackness in the enrollment of volunteers. Whenever possible, civil disobedience of salt laws should be started. These laws can
be violated in three ways. It is an offence to man-
ufacture salt wherever there are facilities for doing
so. The possession and sale of contraband salt (which
includes natural salt or salt earth) is also an offense.
The purchasers of such salt will be equally guilty.
To carry away the natural salt deposits on the sea-
shore is likewise a violation of law. So is the
hawking of such salt. In short, you may choose anyone
or all of these devices to break the salt monopoly.

We are, however, not to be content with this
alone. Wherever there are Congress Committees,
wherever there is no ban by the Congress and wherever
the local workers have self-confidence, other suitable
measures may be adopted. I prescribe only one condi-
tion, viz., let our pledge of truth and non-violence
as the only means for the attainment of swaraj be
faithfully kept. For the rest, everyone has a free
hand. But that does not give a licence to all and
sundry to carry-on on their individual responsibility.
Wherever there are local leaders, their orders should
be obeyed by the people. Where there are no leaders
and only a handful of men have faith in the programme,
they may do what they can, if they have enough
self-confidence. They have a right, nay, it is
their duty, to do so. The history of the world is
full of instances of men who rose to leadership by
sheer force of self-confidence, bravery and tena-
city. We too, if we sincerely aspire to swaraj and
are impatient to attain it, should have similar
self-confidence. Our ranks will swell and our
hearts strengthen as the number of our arrests by
Government increases.

Let nobody assume that after I am arrested
there will be no one left to guide them. It is not
I but Pandit Jawaharlal who is your guide. He has
the capacity to lead. Though the fact is that those
who have learnt the lesson of fearlessness and self-
effacement need no leader, but if we lack those
virtues, not even Jawaharlal will be able to produce
them in us.

Much can be done in other ways besides these.
Liquor and foreign-cloth shops can be picketed. We
can refuse to pay taxes if we have the requisite
strength. The lawyers can give up practice. The
public can boycott the courts by refraining from lit-
igation. Government servants can resign their posts.
In the midst of the despair reigning all round people
quake with fear of losing employment. Such men are
unfit for swaraj. But why this despair? The number
of Government servants in the country does not exceed
a few hundred thousand. What about the rest? Where
are they to go? Even free India will not be able to
accommodate a greater number of public servants. A
Collector then will not need the number of servants
he has got today. He will be his own servant. How
can a poor country like India afford to provide a
Collector with separate servants for performing the
duties of carrying his papers, sweeping, cooking,
latrine-cleaning and letter-carrying? Our starving
millions can be no means afford this enormous expend-
iture. If, therefore, we are sensible enough, let us
bid good-bye to Government employment, no matter if
it is the post of a judge or a peon. It may be dif-
ficult for a judge to leave his job, but where is
the difficulty in the case of a peon? He can earn
his bread everywhere by honest manual labour. This
is the easiest solution of the problem of freedom.

Let all who are co-operating with the Government in
one way or another, be it by paying taxes, keeping
titles, or sending children to official schools,
etc., withdraw their co-operation in all or as many
ways as possible. One can devise other methods,
too, of non-co-operating with the Government. And
then there are women who can stand shoulder to
shoulder with men in this struggle.

You may take it as my will. It was the only
message that I desire to impart to you before starting
on the march or for the jail. I wish there to be no
suspension or abandonment of the war that commences
tomorrow morning, or earlier if I am arrested before
that time. I shall eagerly await the news that ten
batches are ready as soon as my batch is arrested. I
believe there are men in India to complete the work
begun by me today. I have faith in the righteousness
of our cause and the purity of our weapons. And
where the means are clean, there God is undoubtedly
present with his blessings. And where these three
combine, there defeat is an impossibility. A
satyagrahi, whether free or incarcerated, is ever victorious. He is vanquished only when he forsakes truth and non-violence and turns a deaf ear to the Inner Voice. If, therefore, there is such a thing as defeat for even a satyagrahi, he alone is the cause of it. God bless you all and keep off all obstacles from the path in the struggle that begins tomorrow. Let this be our prayer.
APPENDIX C

Speech at Dandi
April 5, 1930

1 When I left Sabarmati with my companions for
2 this seaside hamlet of Dandi, I was not certain in
3 my mind that we would be allowed to reach this place.
4 Even while I was at Sabarmati there was a rumour that
5 I might be arrested. I had thought that the Govern-
6 ment might perhaps let my party come as far as Dandi,
7 but not me certainly. If someone says that this
8 betrays imperfect faith on my part, I shall not deny
9 the charge. That I have reached here is in no small
10 measure due to the power of peace and non-violence:
11 the power is universally felt. The Government may,
12 if it wishes, congratulate itself on acting as it
13 has done, for it could have arrested every one of us.
14 In saying that it did not have the courage to arrest
15 this army of peace, we praise it. It felt ashamed
16 to arrest such an army. He is a civilized man who
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feels ashamed to arrest such an army. He is a civilized man who feels ashamed to do anything which his neighbours would disapprove. The Government deserves to be congratulated on not arresting us, even if it desisted only from fear of world opinion.

Tomorrow we shall break the salt tax law.

Whether the Government will tolerate that is a different question. It may not tolerate it, but it deserves congratulations on the patience and forbearance it has displayed in regard to this party.

If the civil disobedience movement becomes widespread in the country and the Government tolerates it, the salt law may be taken as abolished. I have no doubt in my mind that the salt tax stood abolished the very moment that the decision to break the salt laws was reached and a few men took the pledge to carry on the movement even at the risk of their lives till swaraj was won.

If the Government tolerates the impending civil disobedience you may take it for certain that the Government, too, has resolved to abolish this tax sooner or later. If they arrest me or my companions
tomorrow, I shall not be surprised, I shall certainly
not be pained. I would be absurd to be pained if
we get something that we have invited on ourselves.

What if I and all the eminent leaders in Gujarat
and in the rest of the country are arrested? This
movement is based on the faith that when a whole
nation is roused and on the march no leader is nec-
essary. Of the hundreds of thousands that blessed
us during our march and listened to my speeches there
will be many who are sure to take up this battle.

That alone will be mass civil disobedience.

We are now resolved to make salt freely in every
home, as our ancestors used to, and sell it from place
to place, and we will continue doing so wherever pos-
sible till the Government yields, so much so that the
salt in Government stocks will become superfluous.

If the awakening of the people in the country is true
and real, the salt law is as good as abolished.

But the goal we wish to reach is yet very far.

For the present Dandi is our destination but our real
destination is no other than the temple of the goddess
of swaraj. Our minds will not be at peace till we
have her darshan, nor will we allow the Government any peace.

Those Headmen who have resigned their posts should prove themselves true to their word and should regard it as a sin to serve this Government till freedom is won.

For the last four or five days, I have been speaking about other constructive activities also, and they should be taken up immediately in this Jalalpur taluka. Surat district is notorious for the drink habit, and the Jalalpur taluka is particularly so. Now that the wind of self-purification is here, it should not be a difficult task to eradicate the drink evil altogether. There is a sin in every leaf of the palm tree. Its only value lies in the ruin it brings us. This plant is like poison to us. All palm trees should therefore be cut down.

There should not be a single person in Jalalpur taluka wearing foreign cloth. Everyone who comes to Dandi should come with the intention to participate in, and offer his mite to, this swaraj yajna.
I would not like anyone coming to Dandi wearing foreign cloth. If it is our wish to turn Dandi into a place of pilgrimage or a bulwark of swaraj, everyone coming here should be dressed exclusively in khadi. I know that the stock of khadi in the khadi stores are about to be exhausted and if, therefore, you fail to get a full-length sari or dhoti and come wearing only a khadi langoti, you will be welcome here as a civilized person. If, ignoring my suggestion, any of you come to Dandi wearing foreign cloth, I shall have to place at the points of approach to Dandi, volunteers who will kneel before you and request you to wear khadi. If you feel offended by their doing so and slap them in the face, those satyagrahis will let themselves be slapped.

Dandi was chosen not by a man but God. How otherwise could we have chosen for the battle-field of satyagraha such an out-of-the-way place—a place where no food grains are to be had, where there is scarcity of water, where thousands can assemble only with difficulty, walking ten miles from the railway
station, and where if you are travelling on foot,
you have to negotiate creeks full of slush and mud?
The truth is that in this struggle we have to put up
with suffering. You have made the road from Navsari
to Dandi famous throughout the world by arranging for
free drinking-water at frequent intervals all along
it. If this struggle did not have your approval,
your blessings, why would you be doing this?
Dandi should be a sacred ground for us, where
we should utter no untruth, commit no sin. Everyone
coming here should come with this devout feeling in
his heart. If you brothers and sisters come forward
as true volunteers and commit civil disobedience of
the salt law, no matter what force the Government
threatens to use against you, and if you do whatever
else you may be required to do, we shall have in us
the power to attain in a single day what we hold to
be our birthright.

Time was when I was infatuated with British rule,
as British law taught that the person of every indi-
vidual is sacred. According to that law, the police
cannot kill or manhandle a man even though he might be
guilty of murder. It is the duty of the police to
produce the man alive before the court. Nor has the
police any authority outside the jail to seize from
a person even goods alleged to have been stolen.

But here the very opposite is true. How otherwise
can the police have the authority to decide whether
I hold a handful of salt or pebbles?

Every man's house is his castle. Our body also
is a fort of a kind. And once salt has entered that
fort, it should not allowed to be forced out of it
even if horses are made to trample on your heads.

From today we should begin cultivating the strength
of will to see that a fist holding salt does not open
even if the wrist should be cut off.

Unauthorized entry into a house is a barbarous
act. It is for a judge to decide whether I hold in my
hand salt or dust. The English law holds the human
person to be sacred. If every official assumes the
authority of a judge and enters our homes, he would
be acting as a robber.

But the officers in India, when they feel impelled,
completely at their sweet will and, resorting to the 149 Act of 1818, render them all ineffective.
150 They have started arresting one leader after another. But according to the principle of this 151 struggle, that the leader is one who endures the 152 utmost suffering, one of those left outside should 153 assume leadership and take the movement forward.
154 This is a struggle not of one man but of mil- 155 lion of us. If three or four men can fight and win 156 swaraj, they will rule the country afterwards. Hence 157 in the struggle for swaraj millions should offer 158 themselves for sacrifice and win such swaraj as will 159 benefit the vast masses of the country.
160 The Government is taking away from us all the 161 eminent leaders one after another. If we get ready 162 to follow in their footsteps and do the duty shown 163 by them, we can smile at what the Government is doing, 164 but if we fail to do our duty we should feel ashamed.
165 The leaders are behind the bars, and now we in our 166 turn should take their place.
167 It is true that many of the leaders in and out-
168 side of
169
have been wounded because they would not part with
the salt in their hands, and that, at places, some
were beaten so hard that they became unconscious.
But I remain unmoved. My heart now is as hard as
stone. I am in this struggle for swaraj ready to
sacrifice thousands and hundreds of thousands of
men if necessary. Since we have embarked upon a
movement which will send thousands to jail, how can
we weep over their imprisonment? In this game of
dice we are playing, the throw has been as we wanted.
Should we then weep or smile? This is God's grace;
let us remain unmoved and watch His miracles.

If in spite of our breaking several laws
the Government takes no notice of the camp here till
the 13th, we shall disband it after that date and
go somewhere else. But this plan depends entirely
on the Government. For the present, we can but take
what the Government gives.

If you have not yet gone out to remove salt,
let the whole village get together and go. Hold the
salt in your fist and think that you are carrying in
your hand salt worth Rs. 6 crores. Every year the
Government has been taking away from us Rs. 6 crores
through its monopoly of salt.

You can today take the pledge not to eat salt supplied by the Government. You have a mine of salt right at your doorsteps.
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