

IN THE NAME OF THE BEST WITHIN YOU
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF “THIS IS JOHN GALT SPEAKING”

Valtteri Iso-Rautio
Master's Thesis
English
Department of Language and
Communication Studies
University of Jyväskylä
Spring 2022

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos
Tekijä – Author Valtteri Iso-Rautio	
Työn nimi – Title In the name of the best within you: A rhetorical analysis of ”This is John Galt speaking”	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year 05/2022	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 55
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Vuonna 1957 Ayn Randin kirjoittama <i>Atlas Shrugged</i> on saanut vahvaa kritiikkiä ja kannatusta. Teoksen viimeisessä osassa esiintyy hahmo nimeltä John Galt, josta kehittyy yksi teoksen keskeisimmistä hahmoista. Kolmannen osan seitsemännessä luvussa Galt kaappaa radiolähetyksen, ja pitää usean tunnin mittaisen puheen, joka toimii yhtenä tarinan kliimakseista. Ayn Rand on todennut Galtin puheen sisältävän objektivismin, Randin itse nimittämän aatteen, filosofian. Galtin pyrkimys on objektivistisen filosofian kautta vakuuttaa yleisönsä hylkäämään kollektivistisen arvomaailman.</p> <p>Tämän tutkimuksen tavoite on analysoida Aristoteleen eetoksen, paatoksen ja logoksen esiintymistä, tarkoitusta sekä niiden trendejä John Galtin radiopuheessa Ayn Randin teoksessa <i>Atlas Shrugged</i>. Tutkimusmenetelmäni on diskurssianalyysin alle luokiteltava, teoksen narratiivin sekä kontekstin huomioiva retoriikka-analyysi. Analyysi on laadullinen, ja pohjaa itsensä puheen kriittiseen tulkintaan.</p> <p>Tutkimus osoittaa Galtin säännöllisesti hyödyntävän Aristoteleen kolmea retorista metodia. Kukin metodi on uniikki tavassaan esiintyä, yleisyydessään ja ilmenemisessään. Metodeilla on havaittavasti omat suostuttelua edistävät tarkoituksensa, jotka ovat sidoksissa vedottavaan retoriseen metodiin. Kunkin metodin retorinen tarkoitus poikkeaa havaittavasti toisten metodien tarkoituksista. Tutkimus löysi tarkasteltavien retoristen metodien määrätietoista käyttöä tutkittavassa puheessa. Löydökset luovat pohjan Galtin puheen retorille tulkinnalle ja mahdollisesti valaisee syitä puheen sekä objektivismin suostuttelevuudelle.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords Rhetoric, literature, Ayn Rand, Objectivism, Aristotelian rhetoric, Ethos, Pathos, Logos	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	BACKGROUND.....	5
	2.1 Aristotle’s rhetoric	5
	2.2 Discourse analysis, rhetorical analysis, and rhetorical stylistics	8
3	ATLAS SHRUGGED	11
	3.1 Synopsis	11
	3.2 This is John Galt speaking	14
	3.3 John Galt’s message and its relevance to the story.....	16
4	RESEARCH DESIGN.....	20
	4.1 Research questions.....	20
	4.2 Analytic framework	20
5	THE PRESENCE OF RHETORICAL INVOCATIONS IN GALT’S SPEECH	24
	5.1 Preamble.....	24
	5.2 Ethos.....	24
	5.3 Logos.....	30
	5.4 Pathos	40
6	CONCLUSION	49
	6.1 How do Aristotelean appeals appear in the speech?.....	49
	6.2 What purpose do Aristotelean appeals serve in the speech?.....	51
	6.3 Conclusion	52
	6.4 Suggestions for further research	53
	PRIMARY SOURCE.....	54
	SECONDARY SOURCES	54

1 INTRODUCTION

In 1957, the first edition of Ayn Rand's science fiction novel *Atlas Shrugged* was published and it is commonly considered to be her magnum opus. The book takes place in the United States and follows the story of Dagny Taggart, the vice president of Taggart Transcontinental, a railroad company founded by her ancestor Nathaniel Taggart. As the government of the novel imposes more regulations on businesses in the pursuit of equity, those in charge of said businesses begin to disappear, followed by the more capable workers, leading to a situation where production of goods is slow and uncertain. The first to disappear in the story is John Galt, who fled from his workplace after realizing that continuing to contribute there would result in the forfeit of a revolutionizing engine that he had developed. John re-emerged to the public by hijacking the country's radio transmission and delivering a three-hour speech on his personal philosophy in the framework of the nation's then (according to Galt's narrative) degenerate state. This paper is dedicated to the study of persuasive and rhetorical methods present in John Galt's speech within the framework of Aristotelian rhetoric.

Ayn Rand (born Alissa Rosenbaum, 1905) was an American writer, who emigrated to the United States from the USSR due to her counter-revolutionary ideas. While growing up, Rand studied history, philosophy and screenplay writing in Saint Petersburg State University. Over her career, Rand's writing and themes became more philosophical in nature, promoting the school of thought of objectivism (Salovaara, 2018). However, even before moving to philosophical literature, Rand conveyed her objectivist ideas through fiction, such as '*The Fountainhead*' and '*Atlas Shrugged*' (Gladstein, Gladstein and Meadowcroft, 2013. 21.) Briefly put, objectivism is a philosophy which argues that ethical actions are those done to benefit oneself, and that virtues of man are not a duty to be done unto others, but something that the virtuous should possess. The virtue of selfishness is emphasized heavily, and Rand's disdain towards ideas and philosophies of collectivism and neighbourly love is clearly visible in objectivism.

Atlas Shrugged received stark criticism when it was published, being associated with hate and misanthropy, with some denouncing not only the book but Rand as well, after which Rand went through a depressive episode. However, Rand's work has also received praise in papers previously critical of objectivist themes, and gathered a following, such as the Atlas Society. Notably, in a 1991 poll by the Library of Congress, *Atlas Shrugged* was voted as the second most influential book written, only second to the Bible (Gladstein, Gladstein and Meadowcroft, 2013). Considering its reception, I would conclude that *Atlas Shrugged*, as well as the objectivist philosophy is highly divisive. As stated previously, objectivist ideas are conveyed through the fictive story of *Atlas Shrugged*, this paper's subject of study. Additionally, according to Gladstein, Gladstein and Meadowcroft (2013. 21.), Rand herself considered the speech delivered by John Galt the philosophy of objectivism. Therefore, the study of John Galt's rhetoric is interesting, as it may illuminate the kinds of persuasive methods that have earned the book its title of the second most influential.

This thesis was motivated by the lack of available research regarding this part of Rand's book from the viewpoint of persuasion and rhetoric. The content of Galt's speech has been studied more regarding Rand's philosophy of objectivism as a philosophy or a message, not in the ways and methods in which the message is conveyed. This does, however, help us towards the answer to 'What does Galt (and so, Ayn Rand) want to tell us?'. Research into Rand's work, as well as Rand herself in her non-fiction literature like "*Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology*" have given us sufficient tools to understand the message being conveyed, however, we have no information on how the information is conveyed by John Galt. Therefore, studying the delivery of the content in addition to the content itself seemed like a fruitful and due topic of study. Additionally, I argue that objectivism and John Galt's message appeals to a specific demographic, that being those whose lifestyle and worldview aligns with objectivist philosophy. Salovaara (2018) notes how the renewing fame and appeal of Rand's work for young people looking for direction and meaning is understandable, and that the notion of only following one's own rationale and to virtuously selfishly pursue one's own dreams is an attractive idea. However, Salovaara also notes that those who are affected by Rand's work seldom hold strict objectivist ideas, but rather gravitate towards other political ideologies. Yaron Brook (2007) writes that people of high financial success in fortune 500 companies and the Silicon Valley have been inspired and motivated by *Atlas Shrugged*, however, it is important to note that at the time of writing, the author was an executive director at the Ayn

Rand Institute, and as such, may have reason for bias. Minding the above, the study of rhetoric and persuasive methods in John Galt's speech can yield findings on its rhetorical trends, which are further applicable when studying the different reception of said trends. Essentially, I will ask what means of persuasion are prevalent in Galt's speech, how do they tie into the message being conveyed, and what purpose they may serve. Rhetoric is, however, a vast concept, and so, I believe that choosing a clear framework through which Galt's rhetoric is studied will greatly enhance the coherency and cohesion of my thesis, as well as narrow down the topic to make it manageable.

In addition to the lack of previous data, I have my own personal motives for the selection of this topic. Without disclosing whether I agree or disagree with Galt's message, I did find the monologue interesting. I noticed some trends and assumptions in the speech and began to wonder why the author chose to contact the audience like this. I began to think if Galt used some rhetorical devices more often than others, and if these devices were consistent with what I had perceived on my initial read of Galt's speech. In addition to the appearance of certain rhetorical devices in Galt's speech, I grew interested in the way which specific devices are utilized and to what effect. As the reception of *Atlas Shrugged* and objectivism has been mixed, perhaps the rhetoric in Galt's speech (a delivery of the objectivist philosophy) plays a part in the division of its believers and critics. Although the book has been called hatefully executed (Woodward, 1957), the speech, along with other contents of the book, must have persuaded a large audience, as the Great American Read (2018) ranks it at 20 in their "Read the 100 List", which is why I assume the persuasive methods employed in the speech to work to a degree, if not polarize its audience. As this thesis is to be a show of capability and a learning experience, the selected topic is also an opportune way of studying persuasion and rhetoric, as I believe that expanding my understanding of them through this study will help me in my future career.

The relevance of researching rhetoric (and as an extension, persuasion) is almost unlimited, as those seeking to persuade others to do and to not do, to believe and to not believe are found everywhere (Fleming, D. 1998). As Ayn Rand herself regarded John Galt's speech as a manifesto of sorts to objectivism, I would argue that there are two persuasive motives behind Galt's speech. The first being Rand's motive to credibly convey the message of objectivism through Galt, and the second being Rand's motive to advance the novel's story by presenting objectivist ideas in a manner befitting the built-up narrative. *Atlas Shrugged* and objectivism have received praise and criticism, and I believe that inspection of Galt's rhetoric

may provide information on what kinds of rhetoric devices and decisions have affected the creation of such a divide. Essentially, a study on Galt's rhetoric is a study on the way in which objectivism can be presented in a created context through linguistic and contextually charged choices.

The present study will be divided into a background section, research questions and methods, analysis, and findings. In the background section, persuasive and rhetoric frameworks will be introduced, along with relevant research. Next, the research questions and aims and methods of research are presented, explained, and supported. This is followed by the inspection of Galt's speech in the context of the utilized framework, where relations between the conveyed message and linguistic and rhetoric choices are to be examined as they appear. Finally, I will discuss the findings of the present study, as well as concluding statements and suggestions for further research of the topic.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Aristotle's rhetoric

Aristotle (2001) states that the study of rhetoric regards orated methods of persuasion. He defined rhetoric as the ability to see persuasive options in each situation (Rapp, 2002). Gross (2000) further speculated as to what exactly Aristotle meant by rhetoric and assumed that it was thought to be a productive art. Rhetoric was seen as a skillset that could be learned, and the skills to be used for an art. Concluding from these statements, rhetoric is the art of persuasion, and therefore, rhetoric and persuasion cannot be separated from one another. When explaining why rhetoric is important, Aristotle outlines four main reasons, two of which may be relevant to this thesis. He states that truth and justice tend to prevail, and if that is not the case then it can be assumed that persuasion was used to allow the opposites of truth and justice to overtake them. Additionally, he states that the art of persuasion is not to be used to deceive others, but to see through deception. Persuasion, and by proxy, rhetoric, are not solely being used for finding truth, justice, and goodness for man (see Parker, 1972; David, 2014). Without knowing what is good and just, persuasion will always be seen as manipulation to those who oppose the cause of said persuasion.

The three methods of affecting persuasion given by Aristotle (2001) are Ethos, Pathos, and Logos. Each of these methods appeals to a certain persuasive aspect. Ethos is the appeal to goodness of human character. An orator who has their audience's favour and who tells the audience what they want to hear is invoking Ethos. Pathos invokes emotional reactions from

the persuaded and uses these emotions to fortify their point. A sorrowful story about the hardship of parenthood may incline the persuaded to offer help or alms while complaints and indifference about the subject would not. Finally, Logos is the appeal to reason and logic. Deduction, sound argumentation, and appeal to facts (or what the persuaded believe or are made to believe to be facts) create a sense of authority to the persuader.

Ethos, as defined by Braet, A.C. (1992), concerns the credibility and the character of the speaker. In this study, I understand the character aspect of Ethos as the perceived image of the speaker, or simply, his likeability. This likeability may consist of sub-features such as kindness, mercy, reciprocity, or other presumably inviting qualities, or conversely, their counterparts. The appeal to credibility includes the audience's pre-existing attitudes towards the speaker, which allows for the consideration of reader perception (constructed in the narrative prior to the speech) in rhetorical success. Character credibility can contain attributes such as expertise and authority. Aristotle (2001) states that successful appeal to Ethos is achieved when the orator makes themselves seem credible. Thus, Ethos is largely built around audience perception, and does not necessarily reflect the truth, but rather, the appearance. However, Aristotle also notes how Ethos should reflect the contents of the persuasive act, and not the prior attitudes held by the audience. Narratively, Galt is unknown before the speech, thus fulfilling this requirement, whereas the reader has already been introduced to Galt and his achievements. Following Aristotle's argument, this may skew the reader's perception of Ethos in the speech, as the narrative may provide prior beliefs of credibility to the reader. I believe that Galt's Ethos largely factors into the mixed reception of objectivism and *Atlas Shrugged*, as he is not conventionally likeable. This, in turn, may dissuade those readers who prioritize, knowingly or unknowingly, the orators Ethos. Therefore, the study of Galt's Ethos, both in his goodness and credibility, may yield important findings of Galt's rhetoric's purpose.

Pathos, the appeal to emotional reactions, attempts to shift the judgement of the audience in the speaker's favour. Invoked emotions may be both positive or negative, and their appeal can be further divided into three perspectives: context, or the circumstances of the persuaded, the target of riled emotion, and the purpose of the appeal (Braet, 1992). This study seeks to inspect the appeal to emotions from these three perspectives. Pathos can be further broken down into rhetorical devices which can be attributed to it. Examples of such devices are promises, warnings, and reciprocity, among others. Note that while reciprocity is mentioned in both Ethos and Pathos, the way in which they are understood in each respective invocation is

different; Sub-appeals, when attributed to Ethos, are studied in the way they depict the persuader, whereas when attributed to Pathos, are studied through the appeal to emotions.

Logos is the rhetorical device of logical reasoning, which is created in response to the rhetorical mode of apparent or real proof (Aristotle 2001). The invoker of Logos, according to Aristotle, by definition, uses either examples or enthymemes to include reason in their arguments. The logical credibility of arguments is created by either the proof created by other arguments, or the supposed self-evidence of claims. Aristotle noted how modes of persuasion must be used in a manner which considers the popular audience, whose base of knowledge may be limited (Aristotle, 2001). Therefore, I argue that Logos, the appeal to logical proof, contains methods of reasoning which are understandable by the public. For this study, the purpose of Logos is further understood as the clarity and understandability created by invocations of Logos, which extends the reach of real or apparent proof. This extended interpretation of Logos is supported by Fahnestock (2005), who argues that understandable language has a larger rhetorical reach than difficult or convoluted language. As the purpose of rhetoric is to persuade others, understandable language enables efficient reasoning to a larger audience, as some would be unable to follow difficult language; arguments cannot make sense to an audience who do not know what is being argued (Fahnestock, 2005).

According to Aristotle (2001), Ethos, Pathos, and Logos are invocations which should only be considered to reside in the contents of a rhetor's speech. For example, the popular image of an orator is not to be considered an appeal to Ethos, their tragic past an appeal to Pathos, or their previous success an appeal to Logos. However, the present study is interested in John Galt's rhetoric in his delivery of his speech, as well as his persuasive methods, contextual and separate from context, which are viewed from the perspective of Aristotle's Ethos, Pathos and Logos. Therefore, Aristotelian appeals will be studied in Galt's speech while considering the ways in which narrative contextual factors amplify or modify his appeals. The inclusion of the narrative context is important because of Galt's references to the world which has been built in the preceding 1000 pages. To avoid excessive repetition, this thesis will refer to Aristotle's rhetorical framework of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos as Aristotelian rhetoric and appeals, (rhetorical) invocations, rhetorical devices, and (rhetorical) appeals. Furthermore, when referring to a specific rhetorical device, the name of said invocation is used interchangeably with its meaning (for example, Pathos can be referred to as the appeal to emotions).

Aristotle's authority as a rhetor is great, and I believe his definitions of, thoughts on and applications of the art to be a credible and useful framework for my thesis. My focus when referring to Aristotle's framework will be on the three persuasive methods, Ethos, Pathos, and Logos, and how Galt's speech and rhetoric utilizes these methods. Examples of how Aristotle's rhetoric has been used in the analysis of rhetoric in speeches can be seen in studies such as Finlayson's and Martin's 2008 study of political speeches. In their study, epideictic (referring to the evaluation of another) rhetoric was inspected as the main Ethos of an orator's speech, and the persuasive effects of the orator's chosen invocation of Ethos studied. This example shows that Aristotle's rhetorical invocations can be shaped into different, more specific or applied, tools of rhetoric, such as epideictic rhetoric. Zhiyong (2016) has written an article on the ways in which David Cameron used the three invocations in a political speech, which used a discourse analysis as its research method. To elaborate, the study referred to specific excerpts found in the speech in its study of rhetorical instances and found rhetorical and linguistic strategies within Cameron's appeals. While I believe the present study to proceed differently, the interpretation and analysis of rhetoric in Zhiyong's study is an apt example of using Aristotle's framework in rhetoric analysis of speeches. Another similar study, which used Aristotle's framework in the study of rhetoric in speech, was written by Fanani, Setiawan, Puwati, Maisarah, and Qoyyimah (2020). Fanani et al. (2020) approached a speech by Donald Trump slightly differently from the approach of the previous study, by placing emphasis on how mood and grammar change depending on the invocation. While I am not looking to imitate the exact emphasis or method of either of the studies utilizing Aristotle's rhetoric, they both offer relevant reference to the approach of this thesis, and, I would argue, reinforce the relevance of this thesis' framework in contemporary research.

2.2 Discourse analysis, rhetorical analysis, and rhetorical stylistics

Discourse analysis is a collection of methodologies in which text can be studied in a manner which refutes the idea that language can be understood as a neutral reflection of meaning (Gill, 2000). Discourse analysis in general cannot be reduced to a single approach, but instead, different methodologies can be identified as discourse analysis due to their shared attitudes towards the study of language. Gill (2000) establishes four common themes of discourse analysis: concern with discourse, language as constructive and constructed, discourse as an

action, and rhetorical construction of discourse. Such attitudes as the idea that discourse is constructed and that it contains a rhetorical organisation create a fruitful environment for the study of the rhetoric of language. Underneath the scope of discourse analysis, the field of rhetorical analysis can be specified as one of its sub-genres, specialising in the study of text from the perspective of a rhetorical framework. Rhetorical analysis is the study of texts to decipher the communicative performance of text or discourse by reviewing specific features present in them (Zachry, 2009). Zachry (2009) states that rhetorical analysis is intertwined with existing rhetorical theory, and as such, when conducting rhetorical analysis, the theoretical framework should be outlined specifically enough to create clear conclusions in relation to the chosen framework. This, however, is stated to be a difficulty of rhetorical analysis, as the theory and art of rhetoric have developed and expanded into numerous different theoretical concepts and practices. However, three theoretical categories can be outlined as more common in rhetorical analysis than others, with those being traditional, new rhetorical and critical-postmodern, although it is not uncommon for there to be some transfer between theoretical frameworks in rhetorical analysis.

Traditional rhetoric is the rhetorical framework created approximately between the classical era and the beginning of the twentieth century, with one example of a traditional rhetor being Aristoteles. Traditional rhetoric created the foundations upon which later rhetorical theory has been built and can be characterized by the way in which it sought to find the meaning of rhetoric and to define any specific parts of rhetoric, such as the division between persuasion through speech and violence, and any further divisions, such as Ethos, Pathos, and Logos. Additionally, Aristotle suggested a division between types of rhetorical performances, which are stated to be useful for traditional rhetorical analysis and the inspection of communicative situations and their purposes. These categories are the deliberative, forensic, and demonstrative (Zachry, 2009). First, deliberative rhetoric concerns the actions that should be taken, such as the ways in which a population could bring their community back from a state of non-production. Second, forensic draws attention to concurrent injustices through the observation of past events, for example, what has happened in a community to result in an undesirable situation. Finally, demonstrative rhetoric regards the public image of a person or an entity, and how the public should react to the person or entity in question. An example of this would be oration about a corrupt minister, who has not acted in the interest of those whose trust they previously enjoyed.

The purpose of rhetoric is persuasion, that is, the effect of having changed something through means of persuasive acts. In this sense, rhetorical language is closer to a communicative medium, rather than a mode of representation. Fahnestock (2005) refers to Quintilian's standard of rhetorical word choice, which states that the words which best represent the orator's ideas, and those that most efficiently cause the desired effect in the minds of others, are the words most opportune in rhetoric. Fahnestock highlights the above sentiment as an apt representation of rhetorical stylistics. Stylistics, sometimes called linguistic analysis, is the study of texts through the style of the language. Abdulmughni (2019) argues that stylistics seeks to create objective and verifiable information about textual bodies through the study stylistic components of a sentence, from phonemes to sentences. While both discourse analysis and stylistics regard the study of texts, Abdulmughni uses the above point to differentiate stylistics from discourse analysis, as discourse analysis seeks to review the language of texts from perspectives above the sentence, such as through context and circumstance. However, due to the strictness of definition of stylistic analysis, a differentiation between literary and rhetorical stylistics can be made. Fahnestock (2005) separates rhetorical stylistics and literary stylistics by highlighting the necessary communicative consideration in rhetorical stylistics. While literary stylistics concerns itself with the language, in rhetorical stylistics, the concept of style, methods, and devices must be reviewed with an understanding of the ultimate purpose of communication and persuasion. In short, rhetorical stylistics regards language as a means of communication, while literary stylistics views language as representational, and the methodological differences between the two are rooted in this differentiation. Fahnestock (2005: 217) exemplifies this with the use of difficult words in texts; literary stylistics is unlikely to pay attention to the use of difficult language, whereas rhetorical stylistics must consider the effect of such stylistic choices on the communicative effect of language in relation to the persuaded and their ability to comprehend such language. Simply put, rhetorical stylistics is bound to consider the textual style in relation to its context, thus bringing it into the scope of discourse analysis.

3 ATLAS SHRUGGED

In this chapter, I introduce the general story of *Atlas Shrugged* as well as John Galt's speech.

3.1 Synopsis

Atlas Shrugged is a dystopian story about increasing government control and exploitation of producers seemingly in the name of the common good. The events of the book span multiple years, but the period that the events take place is never explicitly stated. For example, technological elements found in the book correspond with what was in use when the book was written, with the exception of any sci-fi elements driving the book's plot forward, such as a new type of metal and a remote annihilator. *Atlas Shrugged* was written and published during the rising popularity of dystopian literature in the 20th century, and included popular dystopian themes of the time, such as the loss of individuality, socialist (or more precisely, collectivist) revolution and its consequences by the hands of a strong government (Pospíšil, J., 2016). It is important to consider the possible motivations for the story inspired by the concurrent climate of in the United States, as well as the author's background. Rand emigrated from the USSR due to her resistance of the collectivistic political climate (Mirasova, 2018), and similar attitudes are, I argue, present in the book's narrative. Additionally, it could be argued that Rand's narrative bias was empowered by the post-great war idea of the American Dream and the surge of capitalism, as meritocratic and productive values are abundant in the story's heroes, whereas those that Rand narratively antagonizes and presents as unlikeable are of little merit

or achievement.

Atlas Shrugged is divided into three parts, each of which consists of ten chapters. The protagonist of the story, Dagny Taggart, is the executive head of the railroad company called Taggart Transcontinental. Her brother, Jim Taggart, is the president of the company. The siblings are the first juxtaposition between the heroes and the villains of the story, those being the capable like Dagny and the incapable like Jim. The division of the capable as good and incapable of evil is a constant theme in the book.

Part one of the book tells of the development of a new metal called Rearden Steel, and the adversity the development of said compound faced due to the negative light such an invention would cast on the national science institute, as the institute has not produced new results of their own. Henry Rearden, a steel manufacturer, and the supplier of Taggart Transcontinental's steel begins the development of a new metal compound capable of lasting for a far longer time than the concurrently used steel. The compound is, however, criticized and poorly appreciated by the nation's science institute, which referred to the compound as experimental and unsafe for use. It is later confirmed that the institute knew that the metal compound would be a better alternative for regular steel, however, the institute did not want to appropriately promote Rearden Steel as they themselves had not made worthwhile scientific advancements. This acts as one of the first notable governmental interventions to free production and acts to set the audience in opposition of regulation. Despite the negative press that the compound received, Taggart Transcontinental Agrees to build a railroad using Rearden Steel, and the virgin voyage of the tracks, now known as the John Galt Line, is successful. The part ends during the voyage, as the train reaches the oil fields of Ellis Wyatt, which had been set ablaze with Wyatt nowhere to be found.

Part two depicts the emergence of excessive governmental control and is when the dystopian themes of the book begin to appear. The part fleshes out governmental figures and their process of influencing production with regulations. Most notable of these regulations is directive 10-289, which consists of eight points. The directive forbids resignation or job switching, the closing or opening of new businesses, and any new inventions. Additionally, corporate production, worker salary, and civilian consumption must be frozen to their normal levels. Finally, any patents, new or old, are to be voided by the directive. This directive results in the struggling of businesses and workers, and more producers begin to vanish. In the meanwhile, Dagny finds a strange engine in an abandoned factory, which is discovered to be a

prototype of an engine capable of producing power from environmental electricity. However, Dagny does not know how to operate or finish the device and seeks to find someone who does. Once a person capable of understanding the device is found, he too, almost vanished before Dagny. Fortunately, Dagny was able to follow the person taking her engineer away by plane, which ended in her crashlanding, concluding part two.

Part three, *A is A*, begins as Dagny recovers from the crash to find herself in a hidden valley, where the disappeared men of merit have sought refuge. They had been scouted by John Galt, who thus far had been narratively a person of non-existence, although his existence had become more predictable. John Galt turns out to have been the inventor of the miracle engine. He had abandoned its development due to his previous employment's collectivisation, not wanting to produce for inappropriate payment and recognition. Once Dagny had recovered, she returned to the world outside of the valley, and kept attempting to survive in the now extremely unstable world devoid of those capable of running operations. John Galt is discovered to have been residing in the world outside as well, working as an unskilled labourer for Taggart Transcontinental. Official figures, now wanting to gain the co-operation of Dagny, include her in a radio broadcast, where she was to give an encouraging statement on the nation's degenerate situation. However, this radio broadcast is hijacked by Galt, and he proceeds to deliver a lengthy speech about the disappearance of great minds, and how he was the one to have taken them away. Galt explains his own philosophy, his reasoning for his actions, what is causing the fall of the United States, and how it could be remedied. After the speech has been delivered, the government begins their search for John Galt, and find him through Dagny. Galt is then imprisoned in a hotel, where he is visited by different government officials and acquaintances, who try to persuade him into helping fix the economy. However, as they do not reach an understanding, and after Galt had humiliated them when faced with an ultimatum, Galt is taken to be tortured. The book ends, somewhat abruptly, as Galt is rescued by Dagny, Henry Rearden, and Francisco D'Anconia.

There is much more to the book, however, due to its scope, it would not serve this paper to give an in-depth review of the events, characters, and concepts found in the 1160 pages. This briefing serves as an introduction to the story and to the dynamics relevant to this study.

3.2 This is John Galt speaking

Chapter 7 of *Atlas Shrugged's* third part, 'This is John Galt speaking', contains the subject of this thesis' study. The chapter begins by describing the situation in the studio, where several government officials are preparing to deliver a broadcast to soothe national unrest and to reassure the audience of the economy's stability. Shortly before the broadcast begins, the officials are informed of radio interference from an unknown frequency, which cannot be suppressed. At the agreed upon time, John Galt begins delivering his speech in the government's stead. The speech is approximately 62-pages long and serves as one of the most significant developments in the story. Rand herself considered the speech to describe the philosophy of objectivism (Gladstein, Gladstein and Meadowcroft, 2013), and the contents are made ever more relevant in the narrative context of the impending economic and societal catastrophe caused by the nationalizing of production and collectivist ideologies. Essentially, it could be argued that the speech is being given in the imaginary worst-case scenario thought up by Rand, and that the context of the story is built to suit the narrative of Galt's speech; the speech conveys the philosophy of objectivism, while the context works to affect its importance. Therefore, I believe this specific speech to be the quintessential deliverance of the book's message and why I view it as an opportune excerpt for persuasive analysis.

To briefly describe Galt's speech, after hijacking the radio-channels of the country, he begins by introducing himself, as until now, John Galt was not thought to be a real person, but someone no one knew. Galt tells about how he has been hiding for 12 years, and that he went into hiding after his previous employer began collectivising the factory among its employees, knowing that any breakthroughs that he would make while working there would go to those who did not contribute to it. This breakthrough was already in development and was a motor that could harness atmospheric electricity. He argues that the dire situation that the nation is in is because of the state and their efforts to collectivise production, and that he has taken those who contribute the most in production away from the state, showing how nothing can properly operate without the minds of those above the common. Galt does not only accuse the state, but those who have accepted or embraced the state, noting how their suffering is in part their own fault. He goes on to talk about the moralistic stance that collectivism has, and then introduces his own morality, which begins to clearly resemble objectivist philosophy. Galt speaks of the morality of reason, that the moral is rational, and conversely, the irrational is immoral. His

speech also rebels against duty and sacrifice, claiming how free will is a prerequisite of morality, and thus, duty and sacrifice enforced upon others is outside of morality; the morality of one's acts can, according to Galt, only be judged when said acts were the result of one's own undisturbed judgement. He lists three values that anyone should hold in higher regard than anything in order to live (by his definition, as a human), which are reason, purpose, and self-esteem. These three are stated to contain within them the seven virtues that prove existence: rationality, independence, integrity, honesty, justice, productiveness, and pride, which are explained after the listing. These values and virtues are prevalent throughout the rest of Galt's speech. Galt introduces the ideas of two groups of mystics, those of mind and those of muscle. The first depicts religion, the second government. These two are juxtaposed with Galt's ideas of freedom and morality, emphasizing the argued irrationalities (and so, immoralities) taught by the mystics. Galt concludes by showing the door out of the story's situation by telling of the future the nation could have, and by stating the ideas to be adopted to change the world. Finally, he offers the win-condition of his own oath: "I swear – by my life and my love of it – that I will never live for the sake of another man, nor ask another man to live for mine" (p. 1069), which is the final sentence of the speech.

To preface the study of Galt's speech, I will provide a summary on the contents of said speech, as well as necessary explanations on how and why some points are key. I would outline four features of Galt's speech as central. These are not necessarily single paragraphs or parts of the speech, but themes or reoccurrences of argument. The first point is Galt's personal beliefs on morality and epistemology, which encompass values such as Galt's five virtues: rationality, independence, pride, productiveness, and justice. Second, Galt makes the argument that A is A, and that anything but the absolute of A being A is nonsense (and possibly evil). Galt's third essential point is the Zero, which is described as non-existence and non-A. The second and third point are arguments to support Galt's views and are thematically quite close to each other. However, as my thesis is a study on persuasion, I see merit in the separation of these two points because of their differing application. The two are absolutes, one referring to rationality and logic (A is A), and the other to anything outside of the first (the Zero). The difference in their use after their introduction is, I would argue, the division of justification and condemnation in an uncomplicated manner. While they are only different viewpoints of the same argument, A being A may be used when explaining why something is just, and the Zero may be used as a reprimand of the A that is not A, quite like how morality and immorality, two opposing sides

of the same concept, could be used for justification and condemnation respectively. Finally, the fourth point worth expounding is Galt's application of the above to the context of the book. Without application, I argue that the text would be but a manifesto, which does not serve the purposes of the story, nor does it capitalize on the world and its state (in both senses) that the reader is immersed in. These four presented themes are, I find, the crux of Galt's message. The first three are relevant both in their introduction and in their application, as their introduction sets logical premises for the understanding of Galt's philosophy and argumentation, and their application reinforces and contextualises his arguments to further persuade the audience. The four presented themes are constantly present in varying degrees throughout the speech and provide a relevant point of departure for rhetorical analysis.

This study aims to conduct rhetorical analysis on the persuasive elements of Galt's speech within the framework of Aristotle's rhetoric. Galt's argumentation can be divided into subject matters, which are central to the use and study of his persuasion, as they are the topics of which Galt aims to persuade his audience. The most prevalent of these subject matters are Galt's background and merit, his juxtaposition of parties, his morality, and his logic. To assert his position as a significant character, Galt draws attention to his capability as an innovator, and to his position as the one depriving the world of ability. Galt often compares the state to himself and to those who he represents, and respectively assigns concepts of failure and success to these parties. Finally, Galt's speech asserts its own logic, through which he proceeds to approach morality. Thus, to convince his audience of his arguments on logic and morality, persuasive methods are emphasized in the presentation of his claims. These topics are relevant examples of subject matters, which, in this study, are closely inspected from the perspective of Aristotelean rhetoric. Additionally, the way in which the subject matter is linguistically presented is studied through the lens of rhetorical discourse analysis.

3.3 John Galt's message and its relevance to the story

John Galt's speech delivers a message containing objectivist and meritocratic ideas in a manner which utilizes the immediate applicability of his message to the context of the book. His messages are conveyed through exemplification and contextualisation and are supported by his rationale and argumentation. In this segment, I differentiate Galt's message from the key points presented in chapter 3.2. While these key points are part of his message, they are understood

as tools for its advancement, rather than the final message. Below, Galt's message is presented in a manner in which any reader can understand it, supported by his arguments and philosophy, as well as contextualised to clarify the narrative significance of the message.

First and, to me, the most evident of Galt's messages, is the notion that the need for something is a claim to nothing, or positively put, one's worth is the worth that one brings. Essentially, this means that Galt does not believe in providing for those who are incapable of providing for themselves, as the need for food is not a justification for its attainment; hunger does not equal the rightful claim to sustenance. Conversely, if one is capable and productive, perhaps producing more than they need, they are entitled to keep their excess worth. This excess worth, in simple terms, is profit. Notably, Galt's message of deserving is not limited to concrete matters such as currency or food, but instead, is extended to interpersonal relationships. For example, respect should, in Galt's opinion, be the cause of respectable factors. Love should be the cause of being loveable. The need or want for either does not, by itself, justify the demand for them. Galt argues for this objection of charity through property rights, noting how human rights and property rights cannot be valued differently. He states how the prioritisation of human rights over property rights would lead to a situation in which one person becomes the property of another. For example, a starving person has the human right to life, and so, the property rights of another with excess food are justifiably denied when his excess is redistributed. In this scenario, the results of one's work are justified to be another's property, which is then argued to reflect slavery, which is explicitly stated in Galt's speech. Additional reasoning is applied to the notion of need being a claim when Galt notes how those who do not provide value should not be valued higher than those who do. If need, often resulting from incapability (according to Galt), is the claim to value, often produced by the capable, then worthless people are valued higher than valuable people precisely because of their lack of value.

The above argument is, in its entirety, applied to the narrative situation of the United States. Collectivisation and government regulation benefitting those doing poorly at the expense of those doing well is constantly increasing in conjunction with the citizens' decreasing wellbeing. For the reader, one of the more immediate events to which this argument is applicable to is Henry Rearden's struggle against directive 10-289, where his metal compound patent has been stripped from him without consent, his metal production restricted so that smaller manufacturers could remain in business, and his workers supplemented with government mandated employees. Additionally, the notion of interpersonal relationships being

included in this argument is visible in Rearden's family. The narrative has presented Rearden's brother and wife as particularly thankless and despicable through false perceptions of power and entitlement. Rearden ultimately realizes that they hold no power, and that their demand for certain treatment due to their relation mean nothing and severs his relationships with them. To conclude, Galt's message about need being a claim to something is immediately relevant to the audience as, thematically, the looming narrative threat has been collectivisation and increased government control intending to redistribute value. The decline of wellbeing within the story is attributed to these collectivist efforts, and so, Galt's opposition of these in conjunction with arguments and contextualisation add relevance to his message.

The second prevalent message of Galt's speech is, I find, the glorification of individualism and of the self. Galt encourages acting in self-interest and defies other's ability to control the individual. Galt appreciates self-esteem and considers it one of the factors enabling one to become great and encourages his audience to discover their self-esteem through merit of their own. Self-interest is discussed mainly through the depreciation of selflessness, which is seen, for example, in Galt's discussion of sacrifice. He makes the separation between a selfish act and a sacrifice through multiple examples, however, it can be reduced to the following: if one gives away for a cause which one deems positive, the act is selfish, and if one gives away for a cause which one deems negative, the act is a sacrifice. This is elaborated in an example of two starving children, where giving food for your own child is a selfish act, as you want your child to eat at your expense, whereas allowing both yourself and your child to go hungry to feed a stranger's child is a sacrifice. In this example, Galt's message makes acting in self-interest the seemingly moral thing to do. The relevance of self-interest in Galt's message enhances when inspected with the narrative in mind. In the story, collectivism is justified through concepts of good for all, even at the expense of the self. The nobility of sacrifice driven by the government contrasts with Galt's opinion of irrational sacrifice and noble selfishness. In short, Galt believes that decisions that are freely made by individuals are better than decisions which have been made for individuals.

Finally, Galt's message emphasizes certainty and inflexibility. The meaning of this message is seen in Galt's statement about compromises. He states that all issues have a wrong and a right side, and that anything in between right and wrong is evil. He claims that being wrong can be honest, however, not willingly being completely wrong or right means that the person on the edge of these two is evil, as they knowingly allow some wrong in the issue.

Simply put, Galt claims that compromises acknowledge what is wrong and intentionally include some of that wrong in their decision. This claim is further exemplified by comparing it to a compromise between food and poison, which is a compromise, yet poisonous. This inflexibility is present throughout Galt's speech in his argumentation and in his ideals, as well as after the speech when Galt is being imprisoned and tortured. Flexibility and compromises are attributable to the narrative villains of the story, be it the government or its sympathisers, who seek to please the majority and to come to a compromise with productive characters. Because of this, the narrative is built to represent the government as indecisive and incapable of making beneficial decisions for the nation. Galt's absolute stance on matters is the narrative contrast to this, which elevates its saliency in his message.

In conclusion, Galt is the narrative antithesis to the story's villain, and his message reflects this. Causes behind past events which have negatively affected the economy and the nation are known to the reader, and Galt's speech brings these failures to light to the narrative audience while discussing the alternative his ideology would offer.

4 RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 Research questions

This thesis aims to understand the rhetoric and persuasive language choices in Galt's speech in light of Aristotle's rhetorical framework.

The research questions of this thesis are the following:

1. How do Aristotelean appeals appear in Galt's speech?
2. What purpose do Aristotelean appeals serve in the speech?
3. What trends can be found in Galt's rhetoric?

4.2 Analytic framework

As a discipline, rhetoric is teleological, meaning that rhetoric is concerned with the effect it has, as opposed to the causes behind it (van Dijk, 1985). Rhetoric can thus be called the amplifying the communicative efficacy of speech. Importantly, rhetoric is not solely linguistic; while elements of language can significantly contribute to persuasion, and act as the medium of persuasion, they alone do not appropriately explain the persuasiveness of messages. According to van Dijk (1985:15), when defined as a tool for enhanced communicative efficacy, rhetoric must be closely associated with both discourse and context. In essence, rhetoric regards tools and devices in language, which extend the persuasive reach of language, and which must

always be considered within its own social situation. These core arguments and definitions regarding rhetoric create the basis for analytical consideration of this study.

Because the studied material is from a novel, and the studied subject is rhetoric, a specific feature of the text, a combination of discourse analysis and literary analysis best serves the analytic aims of this study. To properly understand the contents of the speech, the context of the book must be taken into careful consideration (Freeman, 2002). Therefore, while the focus of my study is the speech, proper literary analysis requires that I keep the preceding thousand pages in mind while interpreting the meanings that the audiences (readers and fictional characters) may perceive. I believe that the combination of literary analysis and context-dependency logically leads the study towards a literary analysis from the perspective of discourse analysis.

Discourse analysis is a method of analysis which is, due to its scope and utility, difficult to reduce to a narrow definition. Discourse analysis regards discourse as a vehicle of meaning, be it written, signed, spoken, or any method of conveying meaning, and differs from the analysis of language by considering extralinguistic factors. Essentially, discourse analysis studies the flow of meaning in discourse, which can be created by language, by context, by circumstance, and other factors relevant to the discourse. (Johnstone, 2018). As has been discussed prior in this paper (chapter 2.2), each of these factors are of interest for the present study. Additionally, Potter and Edwards (1996) write that discourse analysis sees two main situations for discourse, with the second of these being how discourse is situated in rhetoric, which is separate from conversation, and thus, does not need multiple active participants. Gill (2000) also argues that discourse analysis could be divided into four primary categories, one of which is the conviction in the rhetorical organisation of discourse. The above sources support my own assumption of fit between the data chosen, and the content being analysed, providing relevant perspectives of discourse and literary analysis for use in the present study.

In their book about the analysis of political speeches and their rhetoric, Charteris-Black (2018) writes about the utility of critical discourse analysis in studying power relationships and linguistic choices designed for persuasion. Critical discourse analysis, as defined by Charteris-Black (2018: 87), is a field of study which inspects the ways that arguments are constructed, which is stated to give a point of continuity to classical rhetoric, such as Aristotle's rhetoric. According to Charteris-Black, persuasion and context are two consistent points of interest in all critical analysis of discourse. The author notes how critical discourse analysis carefully

considers the social context in discourse, such as the relative social position of the persuader and the persuaded. In addition to close examination of context in discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis is said to consider different types of contexts, which the author refers to as speech circumstances. This is supported by Wodak and Meyer (2001) who argues that a critical approach to discourse analysis requires the consideration of social processes and structures in the study of meaning. Charteris-Black divides the process of critical discourse analysis into three steps. First, the analysis of speech circumstance (or, to reiterate, the multiple contexts affecting the speech, such as relations of power, the purpose of the speech, and the time, place, and situation in which the speech is delivered.) Second, identification and analysis of features (lexical choices, sentence patterns, style, and manner, for example). Third, and last, interpretation and explanation of discourse. While John Galt's speech is not explicitly stated to be a political speech, I argue that it could well be associated with the kinds of political speeches that Charteris-Black discusses. As such, I believe that elements of critical discourse analysis, such as close consideration of different contexts and the aforementioned analytical stages, are applicable and fruitful in the study of John Galt's rhetoric.

As the studied material is to be reflected upon in the framework Aristotelian rhetoric, I would argue for the benefits of emphasizing discourse analysis' features of qualitative content analysis in this study, as I believe said method to assist in emphasizing the relevant data. This is supported by McNeill (2006), whose article refers to content analysis as the close study of a particular body of data, with the intent of finding patterns, or, as I call them in this thesis, trends. I find that the process of analysing the research content and identifying trends, suggested in McNeill's article, serves the purposes of this thesis well, and brings about features of mixed method research by including qualitative (reason and effect of rhetoric) and quantitative (appearance of trends) research. As this thesis studies the entire speech from the perspective of rhetoric and persuasion, any method that would be solely focused on specific parts of the excerpt would likely leave out possibly relevant information. Persuasion is also not reducible to any measurable or reoccurring features; a corpus analysis would not serve the purposes of this thesis. However, paying attention to the appearance of clustered instances of specific persuasive appeals may be a fruitful way of reviewing trends in the speech.

In summary, the study of rhetoric requires the consideration of context in addition to solely linguistic features of the discourse. The purpose of Galt's speech is to affect the political climate of the story, and to persuade large-scale change in the story. As Galt is narratively a

person of great significance, it is reasonable to consider him a person of power. Additionally, he persuades his audience to shift political power away from the state, further increasing the existence of power relations in his rhetoric. While the speech does consist abstract and non-contextualised arguments, Galt often refers to events and attitudes in the story, which add significant rhetorical power to his speech. As such, I believe that a critical approach of Galt's speech as discourse is best suited to the study of his rhetoric. The perspective of Aristotelian rhetoric as this thesis' framework does not hinder the efficacy of critical discourse analysis, but rather, I would argue, offers a point of reference for the analysis. The study is, thus, conducted by analysing Galt's speech through the contents and structure of his speech, as well as through the contextual factors or speech circumstances found in his discourse, which is then inspected within the framework of Aristotelian rhetoric.

Research on the data initiated with a primary reading of the excerpt without particular focus. After this, I noted my initial insights on the persuasion of the speaker. From here on, I colour-coded instances of rhetoric with coloured markers corresponding to each Aristotelian appeal. Next, I began reading through the excerpt again, however, now paying attention to the speaker's use of persuasive tactics and discourse strategies, such as themes, linguistic choices, listings, repetition, structure, question answering and context-dependent output. For example, simplification of issues or arguments could be categorized as linguistic (word or theme) choices, or, when presented in a context relevant to the audience or story, context dependency. Further, if this simplified argument was exemplified through multiple facets, it could be categorized under structural strategies, such as repetition. These were then inspected and documented from the perspective of this thesis' framework. From then on, data was reviewed, and findings revised repeatedly, until no noteworthy new findings were documented.

5 THE PRESENCE OF RHETORICAL INVOCATIONS IN GALT'S SPEECH

5.1 Preamble

Discussion of Aristotelean rhetoric in Galt's speech is divided into three sub-chapters, each covering their respective rhetorical appeal. Each rhetorical appeal is studied through the content and structure of Galt's arguments and message. When appropriate, rhetorical instances which support the same argument are discussed in conjunction with each other regardless of their position in the speech. Otherwise, rhetorical instances are inspected in order of appearance within the speech. When specific arguments of Galt's rhetoric are discussed, citations directly from the speech are added to support, contextualise, and exemplify arguments and findings. In addition to clarifying my findings and arguments, the cited excerpts serve to bridge the gap between the audience and the speech, as this thesis does not introduce Galt's speech in its entirety.

5.2 Ethos

Of the studied rhetorical invocations, Ethos is most effected, I find, by the contextualisation of Galt's speech. By appearance, Ethos does not fluctuate much in appearance, nor is it the most applied rhetorical device. Ethos is mostly appealed by Galt's repeated introductions of himself through varying perspectives, such as his name, what he is

capable of, what he has done, what he wants, and who he is. He never strives to create a friendly image of himself, which becomes evident from his tone and from his way of addressing and perceiving his audience; Galt speaks condescendingly, and at times with hostility, to his audience. Instead, his personal credibility stems from his narrative significance as the man behind the mass disappearances of producers, from his philosophy, and from his skill as an engineer.

The story at the time of John Galt's speech was constructed so that the narratively unknown speaker could appear and provide the audience precisely what they need. John Galt is, by definition, a *Deus Ex Machina*; a miraculous character who suddenly appears and gives a solution to the audience's desperate situation. This context works to immensely increase Galt's credibility, as his capabilities perfectly align with the needs of his audience. It almost seems like the speech and the story were created with each other in mind, giving Galt all the answers to all the questions brought about by the exact failures and principles that Galt opposes. In short, while Galt's Ethos is in part created by his exposition of himself, it must be acknowledged that, in context, what Galt considers himself to be is exactly what the United States needs to survive.

In Galt's speech, the invocation of Ethos differs in circumstance depending on the identity of the audience. At the beginning of the speech, Galt is narratively unknown, and thus, did not have immediate credibility attributed to his person. As the speech progresses, however, Galt introduces himself in stages. First, he introduces himself as the person behind the disappearances of industrial tycoons. Second, he introduces himself through his philosophy, which contains the crux of objectivist ideology. Third, Galt contextualises his ideas by finally explaining who he is, what he is capable of, how his ideas resulted in his actions, and how his actions have resulted in the concurrent state of the story, thus finishing a narrative back-and-forth of the present – philosophy – past – philosophy – present. This feature is important to note in the analysis of Ethos, as it creates a divide between the persuasion of the reader, and the persuasion of those listening to Galt's speech on the radio. The reader is, presumably, aware of who Galt is, what he has done, and that he is an engineering prodigy. However, narratively, it is stated late into the speech, that Galt had invented an engine capable of converting electricity from the atmosphere into usable energy, adding to his character's Ethos. Because of this disparity in character knowledge, the reader is, I would argue, more likely to attribute Galt with characteristic credibility, than someone in the position of those hearing Galt's speech

with only the knowledge gradually gained throughout its duration. However, most moral principles present in Galt's speech elaborate on the comparatively limited understanding that even the reader may have, which curtails the persuasive experience between the reader and the hearer.

When Galt explains his part in the disappearance of great men, he gives a summary of the circumstance that has led, with only the exception of Dagny, all those he has confronted to flee society.

"while you were dragging to your sacrificial altars the men of justice, of independence, of reason, of wealth, of self-esteem - I beat you to it, I reached them first. I told them the nature of the game you were playing and the nature of that moral code of yours, which they had been too innocently generous to grasp. I showed them the way to live by another morality - mine. It is mine that they chose to follow." (p. 1010)

The above example highlights two invocations of Ethos: First, the notion that Galt is quicker to reach his target than the state is, and second, that Galt's morality is one that these admirably presented people are inclined to accept, when the alternative is the state's morality, which, when set into context, has been a destructive one. Galt goes on to elaborate on how the disappearances were not only delivered, but also instigated, by him. Without having talked about himself yet, he creates an association between himself and the disappeared by referring to the disappeared and himself as "we" and "us", hence implicitly claiming his own authority to compare to that of those he evacuated. Later, Galt begins to refer to the evacuated as "the men of the mind". Galt's membership of the disappeared and the consistent praise he gives them works to increase his own credibility. However, this relies on the narrative notion that Galt is correct, therefore, reader susceptibility to persuasion depends on whether they agree with Galt's logic or not. For example, when Galt reiterates how he had convinced others to leave society and draws attention to how those presented as admirable held Galt's moral beliefs all along, but were simply unaware of how to practise them, accepting this statement increases Galt's character's credibility, while not accepting the statement does not.

After Galt has presented his morality of reason and its tenets, he reintroduces himself by contextualising his ideology to the concurrent state of the United States. Interestingly, Galt's way of addressing the listener occasionally shifts away from a depreciating tone during his second self-introduction.

"Are you beginning to see who is John Galt? I am the man who has earned the thing you did not fight for, the thing you have renounced, betrayed, corrupted, yet were unable fully

to destroy and are now hiding as your guilty secret, spending your life in apologies to every professional cannibal, lest it be discovered that somewhere within you, you still long to say what I am now saying to the hearing of the whole of mankind: I am proud of my own value and of the fact that I wish to live." (p. 1021)

In the above excerpt, Galt can be seen asserting that the listener, whom he berates for his actions and lack-there-of, wants the same thing as Galt does. He depreciates the denial of value and seeks to convince his audience about their shared goals, which are romanticised by Galt's assurances about a connection between these goals and a fair world. This connection is reinforced by the stark contrast between the dystopian state of the nation during the speech and its presented alternative, making it difficult to disagree with Galt (provided that the audience considers collectivism and objectivism as the only possibilities). Essentially, the audience is placed in a situation where disagreeing with Galt would seem to imply satisfaction with the current state of the nation. One could understand Galt's tone as a signal of potential forgiveness to those who have accepted collectivism, as they are condemned for their past, yet they could be forgiven if they accepted Galt's ideas. This notion is repeated throughout the speech when Galt seems to make a sudden shift from condemnation to bargaining. In addition to the above excerpt, examples of such bargaining are when Galt directly addresses those who do not accept the present, and when he promises to open a free new world for those who deserve (by accepting Galt's values) to enter. Willingness to accept change and to show leniency to those with good within them makes Galt's character more likable, however, this increase in likeability may not raise his Ethos above zero for some readers.

The discussion of earning and personal effort as the correct tool for personal gain, be it money, love, appreciation, respect, or happiness, works to invoke Ethos in Galt's message in two immediately recognisable ways. Galt explicitly states that he does not seek that which is not his, nor does he want that which is undeserved.

"Just as I support my life, neither by robbery nor alms, but by my own effort, so I do not seek to derive my happiness from the injury or the favor of others, but earn it by my own achievement. Just as I do not consider the pleasure of others as the goal of my life, so I do not consider my pleasure the as the goal of the lives of others. Just as there are no contradictions in my values and no conflicts of interest among rational men, men who do not desire the unearned and do not view one another with a cannibal's lust, men who neither make sacrifices nor accept them." (p. 1022)

Galt attempts to make it clear to the audience that he is not malevolent. He does not wish to deprive anyone anything without consent, without volitional trade. He also invokes the categorical imperative, the idea that one should act in a manner one considers acceptable of

others, or, in biblical terms, to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Notably, however, in Galt's philosophy, this rule seems to manifest from the perspective of negative liberty, where the ideal way to treat others is to not rule over them. Instead of the plunder of what others have, Galt advocates for the earning of material and non-material values, which he at first asserts unto himself, not the audience; While Galt makes demands on the behaviour of people, he does so to himself first, leading by example. The presented principles are further emphasized as just with the juxtaposition of the contrary to cannibalism. However, even without the reference, the way in which Galt presents his ideas inclines the audience to agree through the assertion of non-contradiction and rationality, and the likely reluctance to disagree with the importance of earning what one receives. Essentially, Galt asserts that he is not a thief, that he condemns theft, and that, because of his conviction to earning, he is incorruptible.

Galt accuses the state and those benefitting from its actions of blanking out the causes behind effects to evade the acknowledgement of the importance of those who enable process and progress. He proceeds to draw attention to how the disappeared are said enablers, and how, regardless of the degree of volitional neglect by others, the degradation of the nation is due to their absence.

"Who pays for the orgy? Who causes the causeless? Who are the victims, condemned to remain unacknowledged and to perish in silence, lest their agony disturb your pretense that they do not exist? We are, we, the men of the mind." (p. 1038)

The audience is aware of the dystopian situation in the United States, and thus, explanations for the reasons behind the unfortunate events are sought. Galt responds to this desire by setting himself and those he represents against the state and the philosophy it enforces. Galt attempts to persuade the audience to believe that he is correct in claiming the causality between collectivism and the unstable society present during the speech. Furthermore, Galt uses his actions as proof for his claims, and connects the concurrent and past events to the accused moral bankruptcy of those in administrative power. In the process, Galt seeks to increase his credibility by making the audience believe that he is correct because he understands the causality of events, and that he understands causality because of his morality, possibly leading some to believe he is just.

Galt names the denial or disregard of causality, specifically, the omission of only the cause of an effect, a blank-out. Narratively, he holds immense potential for the betterment of the lives of others through efficient production of energy, and so, he compares himself to a

cause. Galt assumes a position of authority by associating himself with production, and by claiming that those who seek to ignore him do it to escape their dependency on him. Galt recounts how a disdain for the acknowledgeable existence of himself, due to his ability, is what the blank-outs of others seek to bypass; as Galt is a cause, a blank-out is the denial or disregard of his existence. He states that the audience does not want him to live, as then they would have to accept his part in their reality, nor do they want him to die, as they understand that they would benefit from his existence, therefore only leaving the possibility of denying him but not what he creates. Essentially, Galt knows his own worth, his adversaries' tools of suppressing his claim to it, and how to counter said suppression.

"Did you want to know who is John Galt? I am the first man of ability who refused to regard it as guilt. I am the first man who would not do penance for my virtues or let them be used as the tools of my destruction. I am the first man who would not suffer martyrdom at the hands of those who wished me to perish for the privilege of keeping them alive. I am the first man who told them that I did not need them, and until they learned to deal with me as traders, giving value for value, they would have to exist without me, as I would exist without them; then I would let them learn whose is the need and whose the ability - and if human survival is the standard, whose terms would set the way to survive."
(p. 1050)

Here, Galt presents his conditions for his return through an ultimatum in which the world must choose either him and what he offers or the collectivist system which he defies. Galt's ultimatum does not increase his credibility through likeability, but rather, through the presentation of a desperate situation where collectivism cannot be sustained; the audience is given the choice between the concurrent decline of society, or Galt's ideology, which he emphasizes through his capability of independence, as he has less to lose than those incapable of it. In the above excerpt, Galt efficiently establishes that he is a real person (his existence), and that he is a capable person (what his existence can do). Beginning with a rhetorical question which refers to the story's core idiom, who is John Galt, he sets conditions which strengthen the following statements. He then begins a barrage of statements which repeat the lead: I am the first man, both in response to who is John Galt, and to create an image of a pioneer to the audience. In his introductory listing, he contrasts his actions to those actions which have led to the concurrent degeneracy of the state, thus implying his own virtue. He proceeds to further inflate his value by phrasing his closing statements in a manner which contrasts Galt's independence to the audience's dependency on his existence. Galt's self-esteem may inspire or discourage individual hearers or readers, however, regardless of the view, Galt's position of power invokes Ethos, as his importance as a character solidifies to the audience, and as he

explicitly presents (some of) his conditions for his return.

During his closing statements, Galt tells of the kind of society he would build atop the ruins of the current one, and of those who deserve to enter. In these statements, he glorifies the society of his vision, demonises the concurrent one, claims his own system immovable, and the ones supporting the contrary impotent. Galt presents himself and those he represents as the arbiters of entrance to his ideal society, thus claiming intellectual or administrative authority over those seeking to enter. The persuasiveness of these closing arguments relies on the rapport created between the audience and Galt over the speech, possibly behaving like a persuasive catalyst.

Overall, Galt's invocation of Ethos relies heavily on his achievements, capability, logic, and terms. The reader already knows much about Galt's achievements and what his past, which led him and the story to the concurrent point, whereas this information is gradually conveyed to the narrative audience through exemplification and emphasis which increases the credibility of Galt's character to both audiences. The narrative environment is optimal for Galt's delivery, which artificially places him into a position of authority, and enables his juxtaposition of what is and what could or should be; because of the context of the story, Galt's speech is delivered when his character is precisely what is required to revert the decline of the United States, and the reasons which led to the decline are precisely the ones Galt's speech can counter. It could be stated that the events of the story worked in part to set the optimal stage for Galt's appearance, as if the fictional saviour was created first, and the issues he would fix were created later, so that they could all be corrected by the character.

5.3 Logos

The first instances of invoking Logos share the theme of drawing attention to the state of the nation, the withdrawal of the innovators, and the resulting controversy of interest.

"You have destroyed all that which you held to be evil and achieved all that which you held to be good. Why, then, do you shrink in horror from the sight of the world around you? That world is not the product of your sins, it is the product and image of your virtues. It is your moral ideal brought into reality in its full and final perfection. You have fought for it, you have dreamed of it, you have wished it, and I - I am the man who has granted you your wish." (p. 1010)

The notion enforced by the state that the industrialists are the oppressors, the enemies of the nation and of common good, is being overturned by the above statement. The above refers to how Galt has been behind the disappearances of industrial tycoons, the supposed enemy, and how the deprivation of these claimed vices has brought about a national shortage of material, production, labour, and order. The juxtaposition of the moral ideal and the environment it has created works to make the listener doubt the ideal, as the ideal is not thought to be the creation of a dystopia. Galt emphasizes the notion that the concurrent state is indeed the representation of the ideal not just by referring to it as the final perfection of their morality, but by claiming that he, and those whom he has taken away from society, are not fighting the moral climate, but assisting it. This is further supported in a closely following statement:

“There is a difference between our strike and all those you’ve practised for centuries: our strike consists, not of making demands, but of granting them. We are evil, according to your morality. We are useless, according to your economics. We have chosen not to exploit you any longer. We are dangerous and to be shackled, according to your politics. We have chosen not to endanger you, nor to wear the shackles any longer. We are only an illusion, according to your philosophy. We have chosen not to blind you any longer and have left you free to face reality – the reality you wanted, the world as you see it now, a world without mind.” (p. 1010)

By listing the transgressions of which the withdrawn are accused, and how the nation is now free of these transgressions, Galt is trying to make his audience question the truthfulness of the accusations and of the claim that the supposed transgressors are the enemy of the nation. The device of setting premises, which Galt immediately answers or comments on, is the main way in which he makes logical connections at the beginning of the speech, and one that persists throughout the speech. The introductory instances of Logos exist, in addition to persuade the audience about Galt’s message, to convey the idea that the concurrent state of the nation was not caused by the greed and oppression of those that Galt represents, but conversely, by their voluntary withdrawal. Consequently, this acts as an early argument against the state and their new legislation and its enforcement.

Following the introductory part, as Galt begins to discuss his own perspectives, epistemology, values, and morality, Logos is consistently invoked throughout the segment. Here, the invocation of Logos begins to revolve around objectivist ideas. For example, the division of issues into absolutes, and through those absolutes, controversy becomes wholly illogical. As objectivist ideas are presented, they are henceforth accepted as truthful, and referred to when presenting new ideas.

Galt's presentation of his arguments is logically constructed and easy to follow. When making arguments, he often begins by stating the basic premise of the phenomenon, which is followed by elaboration, exemplification, and metaphor in no particular order and in no specific quantity, as can be seen in the following excerpt:

"Man's mind is his basic tool of survival. Life is given to him, survival is not. His body is given to him, its sustenance is not. His mind is given to him, its content is not. To remain alive, he must act, and before he can act he must know the nature and purpose of his action. He cannot obtain his food without a knowledge of food and of the way to obtain it. He cannot dig a ditch - or build a cyclotron - without a knowledge of his aim and of the means to achieve it. To remain alive, he must think." (p. 1012)

In the above example, Galt's argument is immediately stated in simple terms, followed by practical applications of the argument. The above arguments are presented in a manner which is unlikely to alienate the audience with ambiguous meanings or difficult-to-follow logic, which increases its persuasive power. Galt's language is simple, his sentences short, and his arguments supported with clear contrasting of affirmation and negation (one is but the other is not). Additionally, Galt's exemplification of the necessity of the mind is self-evidently simple and repeated with varied applications: To achieve a goal, one must know what it is and how to achieve it, and the goal, in Galt's examples, is the attainment of food, the digging of a ditch, and the building of a cyclotron. Due to the simplicity of his exemplification, the audience may have difficulties disagreeing with the logic of Galt's claim, which is why the above is an example of Logos; it is unlikely that any listener would think to themselves that one could live without acting or to think without learning, which is the logical proof Galt is appealing to. Additionally, the chaining of (through the acceptance of Galt's previously stated points) logical examples and metaphors assists the persuasive force behind Galt's statements and is a reoccurring device in many invocations of Logos.

When talking about his own philosophy, Galt layers the initial presentation of his ontology, epistemology, and axiology. This division serves a rhetorical purpose in creating logical bases to which Galt can refer to when proceeding to share his ideas. For example, Galt begins to describe his philosophical views with the statement:

"Existence exists - and the act of grasping that statement implies two corollary axioms: that something exists which one perceives and that one exists possessing consciousness, consciousness being the faculty of perceiving that which exists." (p. 1015)

This argument is elaborated on through Galt's chosen application, thus resulting in these axioms, existence, and consciousness, becoming tools for further logical deduction, where they

no longer require proof or elaboration, other than through the exemplary applications where they have constituency. An apt example of this follows the presentation of these axioms, in which Galt first introduces the claim that A is A, a staple of his speech's logic both through the confirmation of his statements as truthful and sensible, and the appraisal of anything not following this rule as illogical.

"A is A. A thing is itself. You have never grasped the meaning of this statement. I am here to complete it: Existence is Identity, Consciousness is Identification. – Whatever you choose to consider, be it an object, an attribute or an action, the law of identity remains the same. A leaf cannot be a stone at the same time, it cannot be all red and all green at the same time, it cannot freeze and burn at the same time. A is A. Or, if you wish it stated in simpler language: You cannot have your cake and eat it too." (p. 1016)

Here, the concepts of existence or identity are no longer explained, but rather, taken as immovable truths, therefore creating a logical framework for the elaboration of new ideas through the application of previously explained concepts. Additionally, similarly to previous examples, the repetition of examples persists to create a clear and logical statement of his idea. The examples are, in comparison to the abstract idea, uncomplicated, which is rhetorically an opportune choice, as it does not estrange listeners from following Galt's logic. Finally, in the example, the argument is closed with an explicitly stated simplification of Galt's argument, which is also a pre-existing proverb, the logic of which has been established through the popularisation of its use.

When presenting his own agenda, Galt supplements his logic invoking arguments with references to his own position, or to the state of the nation during the speech.

"You who are worshippers of the zero – you have never discovered that achieving life is not the equivalent of avoiding death. Joy is not 'the absence of pain,' intelligence is not 'the absence of stupidity,' light is not 'the absence of darkness,' an entity is not 'the absence of a nonentity.' Building is not done by abstaining from demolition; centuries of sitting and waiting in such abstinence will not raise one single girder for you to abstain from demolishing – and now you can no longer say to me, the builder: 'Produce, and feed us in exchange for our not destroying your production.' I am answering in the name of all your victims: Perish with and in your own void. Existence is not a negation of negatives. Evil, not value, is an absence and a negation, evil is impotent and has no power but that which we let it extort from us. Perish, because we have learned that a zero cannot hold a mortgage over life." (p. 1024)

Here, while Galt is not a builder by profession, the audience understands the way in which he is setting himself into society, and, through repeated examples of the current principle, conveys the message of illogical deduction and unfairness. First, the argument is supported by claims that are selected so that the audience would not dispute them, such as how a lack of pain does

not equal joy. Second, a division between producers and the abstinent is made, and Galt associates himself and those who he represents as producers, and compares abstinence to a void incapable of creating, which, contextually and logically, makes his audience associate the government with the abstinent.

In his speech, Galt's morality is largely based on logic and non-controversy of claims and ideas. Therefore, his morality is most often argued for through examples, repetition, and comparison. When presenting his views on the morality of good and evil, he emphasizes the role of volition in defining the goodness of a person or an act, stating that an act without volition is not subject to evaluation regarding morality. In other words, Galt argues that good and evil must be choices, as one who was born evil or is inclined towards evil has never made the moral decision to be evil.

"A sin without volition is a slap at morality and an insolent contradiction in terms: that which is outside the possibility of choice is outside the province of morality. If man is evil by birth, he has no will, no power to change it; if he has no will, he can be neither good nor evil; a robot is amoral." (p. 1025)

This notion refers to the accusations of the state that humans are inherently evil, and that they are to abjure their self-interest and their material wealth to obtain morality, to sacrifice. This contradicts Galt's statement about morality's prerequisite for volition. According to Galt, it is not possible for anyone to be inherently evil, as morality is the result of choice, not of circumstance. Regarding the requirement of sacrifice, Galt offers a definition which, in my opinion, redefines or narrows the semantics of the word "sacrifice", as well as depicts sacrifice in a negative light to the audience. According to Galt, sacrifice is the rejection of the precious, but never of the less valuable. This statement is supported by multiple easily understandable practical examples, which also contrast sacrifice to what Galt does not determine to be a sacrifice.

"If you exchange a penny for a dollar, it is not a sacrifice; if you exchange a dollar for a penny, it is. If you achieve the career you wanted, after years of struggle, it is not a sacrifice; if you then renounce it for the sake of a rival, it is. If you own a bottle of milk and give it to your starving child, it is not a sacrifice; if you give it to your neighbor's child and let your own die, it is" (p. 1028)

The presence of these examples serves a significant purpose, as they describe situations in which an individual makes the reasonable decision, such as feeding their own child as opposed to a stranger's child, or trading currency at a profit as opposed to trading at a loss. With these examples, Galt asserts that reasonable decisions are not sacrifices, and, conversely, the

decisions in Galt's abhorrent examples are. This creates a comparison of the positive outcomes of self-interest and the negative outcomes of sacrifice, which correspond to Galt's ideology and to the state's ideology respectively.

The morality of the state dictates that acting in public interest is always more valuable than acting in self-interest. To illustrate how this is argued in the narrative: if a baker bakes bread, and gives it away, the value of the bread is higher than if the baker ate the bread himself; the satiation of hunger is noble only when it is not one's own hunger. Galt goes on to criticise the logic of the state's morality by questioning the different moral valuation of similar things and sensations when received or experienced by different people, or, more specifically, people other than the self. This criticism follows the same rhetorical pattern as many previous claims, where it is set into multiple examples and inspected through those. Unlike most previous claims, the morality of value allocation and its virtue is delivered through multiple rhetorical questions, which work to emphasize the illogical, whereas previous repetition of examples has had the function of emphasizing the logical. Galt asks why it is moral to allocate a self-produced value outside of oneself, while the value is of similar significance when kept, and calls to question the selfishness of accepting an externally produced value. Drawing from the above examples and insights, Galt's critique of the morality of sacrifice and the virtue of selflessness is based on the idea that these goals are achievable through the foregoing of personal good, which is exaggerated to mean the possibility or probability of personal harm. This helps in creating a contradiction of interest in the audience, which Galt reinforces with select realizations of the kind of sacrifice that the state values, and by questioning the morality of accepting value when the keeping of said value is immoral. Galt's examples regarding morality fit both into the purview of Logos and Pathos, with aspects of Logos assisting the audience in understanding Galt's message and in reaching similar conclusions, while aspects of Pathos are linguistic choices amplifying his message.

Galt addresses the concurrently ruling morality by introducing his understanding of earning and deserving, and by describing the system under which value is distributed during the time of the speech. Galt makes it clear that he believes the morality of sacrifice to oppose, bypass or ignore causality.

"A morality that holds need as a claim, holds emptiness – non-existence – as its standard of value; it rewards an absence, a defect: weakness, inability, incompetence, suffering, disease, disaster, the lack, the fault, the flaw – the zero." (p. 1032)

The above excerpt refers to the redistribution of both material and non-material values in collectivist systems, such as the one being implemented in the story of *Atlas Shrugged* during the speech. In the context of the book, an example of a material need being the claim for something would be the forced redeeming of Henry Rearden's steel patent, because other metal manufacturing businesses could not remain in the market while having to compete with Rearden. The inability of these opposing steel manufacturers to produce a comparable metal compound or to streamline the production of regular compounds to offer competitive prices is a representation of the zero. In this example, the zero, the manufacturer who is incapable of producing desirable metal, is aided at Rearden's expense. In other words, the zero is rewarded for its own incapability, which may appear to be an appeal to Logos to some. However, Galt goes on to include those opposite to the zero, and to describe the relation between the two groups, which adds a logical layer to Galt's message.

"Who provides the account to pay these claims? Those who are cursed for being non-zeros, each to the extent of his distance from that ideal. Since all values are the product of virtues, the degree of your virtue is used as the measure of your penalty; the degree of your faults is used as the measure of your gain." (p. 1032)

As those who do not create value, the zeros, make claims to value, their needs must be fulfilled by those who create value, the non-zeros. Somewhat dramatically, Galt notes how the amount of value one produces dictates the amount of value they owe to those creating less than them, which contextually fits the story, as the highest earning industrialists have been most negatively influenced by the demands of the state. The way in which the above statement is phrased makes the implied injustice clear to the audience. The stark comparison of "fault" and "virtue" complemented by the terms "penalty" and "gain" simplify the issue for the audience, which may assist in their persuasion.

As stated previously, when speaking about needs warranting claims, Galt includes his views on the need for non-material values in his speech. By non-material values Galt means emotions, such as happiness, love, safety, respect, or trust. According to Galt, just as no person deserves material that does not belong to them or that they have not traded for value, no person deserves the emotions of other without offering something in return. When presenting this idea, Galt has assumed the notion that need is a non-cause, meaning that the alms given to someone whose only claim to them is their need for said alms makes these alms causeless; undeserved or unearned value is, when possessed by the needy, causeless.

“As there can be no causeless wealth, so there can be no causeless love or any sort of causeless emotion. An emotion is a response to a fact of reality, an estimate dictated by your standards. To love is to value. The man who tells you that it is possible to value without values, to love those whom you appraise as worthless, is the man who tells you that it is possible to grow rich by consuming without producing and that paper money is as valuable as gold.” (p. 1033)

The relevance of the above excerpt comes from the justifications that the state has given to their collectivist actions. In the story, the state has been advocating for a culture of unrequited caring and love for those around you, which is why selflessness and sacrifice is held in high regard. Additionally, compared to the hearers, the reader is in a more informed position regarding narrative issues of absolute love, as tensions between an ungrateful family and their (narratively) abused provider have been described throughout the story. The Logos of the excerpt relies on the audience’s understanding of causality, which is then applied to Galt’s message. Additionally, this excerpt assists in bringing the law of causality into Galt’s rhetoric as a fact of nature, which, once applied in a seemingly rational manner, is no longer questioned in its further applications by the audience. Here, the law of causality in emotions can be understood as follows: Trust, the effect, demands trustworthiness, the cause, and the cause can never precede the effect. Galt goes on to accuse political and religious powers, the mystics, of attempting to reverse causality for their own goals or principles, such as the creation of something from nothing by the sheer power of wanting it to be. Causality is labelled the enemy of those content with the concurrent system of economy and value, as causality does not enable the miracles that it promises, such as equality. Causality is explained as identity (existence of existence) applied to action, meaning that for something to happen, something must exist to make it happen, which is exemplified repeatedly with small additions and alterations to said examples, resulting in the statement: “An action not caused by an entity would be caused by a zero, which would mean a zero controlling a thing, a non-entity controlling an entity, the non-existent ruling the existent”. When elaborated as such, the denial of causality is nonsensical, making it easy for the audience to agree with Galt. However, this is, again, only if the premises and the definitions are accepted as they have appeared, and if Galt’s claims about mystics are not questioned. Logos is, in the discussion of causality and its applications, utilized in a manner which makes Galt’s message easier for the audience to grasp. By reinforcing the audience’s understanding of causality in accordance with what it was like previously, Galt assumes a state of shared understanding of his premises, which is then applied to relevant or easy-to-understand examples, such as the impossibility of factory operation without the person creating the factory,

or the impossibility of eating a cake before baking it. Once reliability in Galt's understanding of causality is established, he proceeds to apply ideas of causality to new contexts, in which the applicability may not be questioned, making Galt's claims seem logical. By making the audience believe that they understand the principles behind Galt's assertions, they may be dissuaded from doubting Galt, as doing so could be interpreted as the audience not understanding his logic.

In his speech, Galt is explicit about his views on the differences of people regarding their capabilities and attempts to persuade the audience to recognise and accept this division. The crux of his division is the argued vast difference in developmental significance between those who revolutionize and those who enjoy the quality of life enabled by said revolutions without contribution to further them. The topic is initiated with a mention of Galt's resignation from his former place of employment, after which he begins describing his idea of a world without those of ability akin to his.

"If you want to know what your world lost when I quit and when my strikers deserted your world – stand on an empty stretch of soil in a wilderness unexplored by men and ask yourself what manner of survival you would achieve and how long you would last if you refused to think, with no one around to teach you the motions, or, if you chose to think, how much your mind would be able to discover – ask yourself how many independent conclusions you have reached in the course of your life and how much of your time was spent on performing the action you learned from others – ask yourself whether you would be able to discover how to till the soil and grow your food, whether you would be able to invent a wheel, a lever, an induction coil, a generator, an electronic tube – then decide whether men of ability are the exploiters who live by the fruit of your labor and rob you of the wealth that you produce, and whether you dare to believe that you possess the power to enslave them." (p. 1048)

The above statement contains the basis of Galt's thought on the differing roles of those who produce and those who do not. It takes a stance on deserving and earning while making references to previously established logic like causality. In the excerpt, the realization of the audience's reliance on past and present developments is emphasized by asking how well they grasp them, and what their life would be without those who made their lifestyle possible. Once it has been established that the consumer of innovation is not capable of matching the contributions of past and present innovators, the logical contradiction is presented. In the story, those who have developed new products, such as Rearden's steel compound, have narratively been the ones suffering from new legislation and collectivist policies because of their ability. In the discourse of state officials and intellectuals, those producing innovation and gaining monetary benefit from it have been labelled exploiters. Hence, the excerpt creates an

understandable example of a similar case, which questions the logic of accusing those who invent, be it the wheel or the generator, of transgressing against those who do not. The comparison is a simplification of the issue, which helps the audience understand Galt's point. The final statement about enslavement is a reference to the forcing of collectivism on those who produce more than they consume, which can be related to the events of the story thus far. Persuasion regarding this issue is built around Galt's ability to convince his audience of the narratively accepted yet neglected benefits of great minds. This is later exemplified further by asking the audience how much of a factory worker's productivity is due to their own muscle and mind, and what is the productive share of the person who provides the machinery which the worker operates. He draws attention to the necessity of accepting past innovations as the enabler of concurrent possibilities and argues that the accusations of wronging others are not to be directed at the men of ability. Such an application of Logos allows the audience to imagine a situation themselves and to possibly reach the conclusion towards which Galt is leading them makes the audience. This, consequently, reinforces the both the message and the audience's position, as the conclusion they drew is one that they believe to have made themselves; It is made to seem like the audience freely chose to arrive at the conclusion.

Galt's usage of Logos exhibits a few notable trends. However, its purpose does not seem to radically fluctuate. One of the more common methods of invoking Logos is the simplification of his claim, which is then applied to multiple examples, which may increase or decrease in complexity, approach narratively relevant topics, or gradually shift the topic towards new, seemingly related claims. His speech is structured in a way in which he introduces concepts and ideas, attempts to persuade the audience about their truthfulness, and relies on the acceptance of these ideas in the argumentation of future concepts. In this way, some of his claims are further supported by following discussions, in which his previous claims are applied to a new subject, allowing for further justification for what has been previously argued. However, this does rely on the audience's stance on Galt's logic, and if the basis of Galt's reasoning is never accepted as truthful or logical, the reason of future claims is not evident when it is built on the foundation of previous arguments. Overall, the application of Logos is most prevalent in situations where Galt introduces his philosophy, which is represented as the philosophy of absolute reason, as objective. In practice, Galt's Logos succeeds in lowering the barrier of understanding his message and claims, the content of which can thus contain other invocations; Logos amplifies the figurative visibility of Galt's philosophy.

5.4 Pathos

Contrary to my initial expectations, Galt's speech displays a heavy reliance on Pathos. The device is even used for the reinforcement of other persuasive means, such as his own credibility and his gradually more pathetic examples in instances of repetition. In the first paragraph where Galt gives his primary introductions, the chapter's namesake paragraph, his attempts to invoke Ethos are immediately distinguishable as ones supported by words which invoke emotion in his audience.

"For twelve years, you have been asking: Who is John Galt? This is John Galt speaking. I am the man who loves his life. I am the man who does not sacrifice his love or his values. I am the man who has deprived you of your victims and thus has destroyed your world, and if you wish to know why you are perishing - you who dread knowledge - I am the man who will now tell you." (p. 1009)

Clearly, Galt is trying to establish his person and, in part, his authority as the speaker, however, by examining his word-choices, I argue that the more distinct effect is the emotional riling of the audience, rather than the increase of Galt's personal credibility. The use of his name is immediately followed, with no set context, by the notion that he loves his life, and that he will not sacrifice this love. To the reader, love for one's life is, supposedly, a relatable expression of emotion. However, in the context of the book, those who Galt opposes, and vice versa, are accused of hating not only their life, but life in general, creating a persuasive division between different addressees. The abjuration of one's love for their life is depicted as an act of sacrifice, which emphasises the value of said love, as sacrifice is narratively presented as senseless. Essentially, Galt creates relatability with his expression of love, and alienates those without it, who, coincidentally, are the ones antagonising Galt. Referring to the disappeared workers, Galt declares that he has taken them away, and that they are the victims of his audience. By placing the withdrawn tycoons in the position of the victim, Galt invokes guilt in those who, in his mind, wronged them, connecting the destruction of their world to his will. In this short introductory statement, Galt effectively assigns himself the role of a protector of the wronged, who acts out of a love so unconditional, that he will not succumb to external demands.

One of Galt's common arguments invoking emotional reactions in his audience is the concept of life and the act of living it. This argument, however, assumes that the audience either values life, or feels shame if they are accused of not living it. The way in which the concept of living is presented assists in persuasion in more ways than solely invoking survival.

“No, you do not have to live as a man; it is an act of moral choice. But you cannot live as anything else – and the alternative is that state of living death which you now see within you and around you, the state of a thing unfit for existence, no longer human and less than an animal, a thing that knows nothing but pain and drags itself through its span of years in the agony of unthinking self-destruction.” (p. 1015)

Here, the ideal act of living is not separate from Galt’s idea of humanity, which is referenced to in the claim of living ‘as a man’. Galt imposes that, to live a moral life, one must fill his expectations of a human, and that in failing to do so, one is excluded from humanity and morality. The state with which Galt frightens his audience is visible in the concurrent state of the nation, which effectively contextualises his warning, assisting in understandability, and thus, strengthening his appeal. In addition to contextual factors, Galt’s choice of words makes his appeal to emotions quite evident; In the short example excerpt, terms such as pain, agony, self-destruction, as well as the concepts of existence devoid of life and non-humanity are used, which creates a dramatic effect and adds weight to Galt’s speech. However, the excerpt does not solely rely on the invocation of negative emotions, but also offers hope through choice which the audience can make. Supporting this appeal to positive emotions, Galt precedes the above example by calling upon the audience and addressing the uncorrupted within them, implying that a change for the better is possible, given that the audience wills it. This appeal to hope within the audience repeats later in the speech.

“Whoever is now within reach of my voice, whoever is man the victim, not man the killer, I am speaking at the deathbed of your mind, at the brink of that darkness in which you’re drowning, and if there still remains within you the power to struggle to hold on to those fading sparks which had been yourself – use it now. The word that has destroyed you is ‘sacrifice’. Use the last of your strength to understand its meaning. You’re still alive. You have a chance.” (p. 1027)

Galt makes it seem like he understands his audience better than they do, and that he is offering to help them in returning to what they were before they were made into victims. What Galt argues has been taken away from his audience is their mind, and as a result, their humanity. The excerpt makes Galt’s framing of roles clear, by referring to those hearing him as the victim, while referring to the other as the killer. While freely interpretable by the audience, I argue that the purpose here is to appeal to any suffering his audience may have recently experienced, thus leading the audience to assume the role of the victim. If so, the audience would also be inclined to agree with Galt, as he is giving instructions on how to maintain their mind and humanity. Here, Pathos is invoked through the juxtaposition of the killer and the victim, and through the description of the undefined victims fight for life and their capability for survival. His choice

of words and attitude towards the audience both appeal to the audience's emotions. In general, when he appeals to the audience's hope, Galt, somewhat uncharacteristically, assumes a more likeable and supportive role.

Galt's arguments about morality, reason, and humanity are tightly connected to each other, and their coverage is laced with both topic-inherent and artificial appeals to emotion. In addition to the arguably inherent emotional appeal of morality, Galt's own views of it are presented in a way that appeals to enjoyment and happiness as by-products of a life following his morality. Before the introduction of his own morality, Galt criticizes the dominant morality of selflessness and collectivism by claiming that those in power have indoctrinated the masses to believe that one's own happiness is immoral, and that a moral existence is one that takes away from one's own life. From this sentiment he deduces that to unconditionally live for the sake of others is the sign of "a suicidal animal", who chooses not to make the choices which give one the value of a human. This acts to deprive those who prefer the state's morality from their humanity. This division is strengthened by Galt's inclusion of reason and thinking into his argumentation, both of which he states to be a matter of choice, and as can be seen in the previous excerpt, the application of which lead to morality.

"A rational process is a moral process. You may make an error at any step of it, with nothing to protect you but your own severity, or you may try to cheat, to fake the evidence and evade the effort of the quest - but if devotion to truth is the hallmark of morality, then there is no greater, nobler, more heroic form of devotion than the act of a man who assumes the responsibility of thinking." (p. 1017)

A rational process, which means the volitional act of thinking, is blatantly stated to be the standard of morality when truth is the goal. Here, Galt uses the concept of truth as the anchor of his claim, upon which the rest of his rationale depends. Truth can be presumed to be seen as a desirable state by his audience, meaning that the statement is built around a common understanding, which the audience is unlikely to dispute. Once this shared sentiment regarding truth is established, Galt connects the act of thinking to the devotion to truth with select concepts such as heroism and nobility, which invokes a desire to fit the description of Galt's moral being. The excerpt primarily consists of the appeal to positive emotions and conveys to the audience the virtuous nature of those who agree with Galt. However, the invocation of the positive is by no means the prevalent use of Pathos in Galt's morality.

"Are you seeking to know what is wrong with the world? All the disasters that have wrecked your world, came from your leaders' attempt to evade the fact that A is A. All the

secret evil you dread to face within you and all the pain you have ever endured, came from your own attempt to evade the fact that A is A. The purpose of those who taught you to evade it, was to make you forget that Man is Man.” (p. 1016)

The story’s past events which lead up to the concurrent near collapse of society are explained by the foregoing of Galt’s philosophy of A being A. The state, referred to here as “leaders”, are accused of the destruction of the world, while the individual is accused of their own suffering, however, the blame is partially deflected by the notion that their evasion of A is A was caused by outside indoctrination. Contrary to the previous example, the above argument draws on negative emotions by referring to the unfortunate state of the US, and by blaming ideologies or acts (the refusal of A being A) and entities (those who adapted said ideology). The excerpt has a repeating statement, the conclusion of which invokes the same longing for humanity as the previous positive invocations. The phrase “that A is A” is repeated twice, and finally, in Galt’s third statement it is substituted with “that Man is Man”, which acts to contrast the two, and consequently, implies that the denial of one is comparable or causal to the denial of the other; To refuse that A is A is to refuse one’s humanity. In addition to the abjuration of one’s humanity caused by the evasion of A being A, Galt states that, on an individual level, pain experienced, and evil contained by people is attributable to the same evasion, appealing to the audience’s will to be virtuous. In short, Galt’s appeal to negative emotions is contextualized by reference to the environment’s concurrently dominant attitudes and their flaws, which are then blamed for the misery of individuals. Whereas the appeal to positive emotions was mainly directed at the individual and their acts, Galt’s appeal to negative emotions focuses on accusing larger entities such as the state of unfavourable acts, which have influenced the individual. The argument that it has been the state that has taken away the morality in feeling joy for oneself repeats throughout the speech, which is laced with references to hunger for power, dehumanisation, and to the concurrent societal situation. In Galt’s Pathos, the potential for happiness is in the individual, yet the blame for misery in whatever is in control of the individual.

In his arguments about the definition of sacrifice, Galt invokes Pathos by including contextually unrelated, arguably exaggerated examples in his repetition. When applying his reasoning to instances of sacrifice and non-sacrifice (cited in Logos), Galt’s examples become gradually more pathetic at first, moving from emotionally void instances like monetary value to somewhat moving instances of career ambition, and ending his listing by making an example of a dying child. A very similar example is repeated soon after in a separate

excerpt:

“If you wish to save the last of your dignity, do not call your best actions a ‘sacrifice’: that term brands you as immoral. If a mother buys food for her hungry child rather than a hat for herself, it is not a sacrifice: she values the child higher than the hat; but it is a sacrifice to the kind of mother whose higher value is the hat, who would prefer her child to starve and feeds him only from a sense of duty. If a man dies fighting for his own freedom, it is not a sacrifice: he is not willing to live as a slave; but it is a sacrifice to the kind of man who’s willing. If a man refuses to sell his convictions, it is not a sacrifice, unless he is the sort of man who has no convictions.” (p. 1029)

This excerpt attempts to persuade the audience to understand and agree with Galt’s argument on what is and is not sacrifice. Unlike in the first example (cited in Logos), the examples in the above text are not gradual in their appeal to emotions. The first example is, again, of a dying child, and of the kind of mother who would value a commodity over the life of her child. Supposedly, the idea of a mother whose higher value is a hat is to be an absurdity, which is then used when Galt defines sacrifice in said instance. This is not only done to shock the audience, but to redefine and distance them from sacrifice, which Galt deems undesirable. The definition is shifted from the act of surrender of one thing for the attainment of value to the self to the surrender of one thing for the attainment of value to another; Galt argues that if one wills the outcome, it is not a sacrifice. The following examples exhibit slightly less pathetic language, however, it should be noted how the second example acts as a counterpart to the first, gendered example of motherhood. Taking part in warfare can be generalized as a concept which mainly concerns men and considering the period and location where *Atlas Shrugged* was published, I would argue that war and patriotism is used here as a relevant method of appealing to the emotions of those affected by war. Like the first example, the latter two invoke Pathos both with their themes, as well as with the unflattering association created by Galt to those who believe their acts to be sacrifices. Better than most other claims by Galt, the excerpt succeeds in the crafting of such an emotionally loaded paragraph, that the message seems to drown in its own presentation, the rhetorical efficacy of which is thus unclear.

When arguing for the source and significance of rights, Galt’s Pathos is distinct in the two most prominent paragraphs of these arguments. Beginning with the concept of rights, Galt claims that no divinity or government entity can assert rights upon a human, and that it is the law of identity (A being A) from which rights come from. He elaborates on this notion with claims of existence and survival requiring the right to think and to act, and to keep what the former two create. While survival may incite some emotions, Pathos is, however, applied in

the following contrast to a situation where rights are taken away. Galt states, ineloquently, that the taking away of one's rights is evil and anti-life, asserting an ethical value to his claims. He goes on to address the division of rights into human rights and property rights, and their relationship. Galt states that these two are inseparable, and that human rights being held superior to property rights asserts that ownership of other humans is a right for the incompetent, who depend on the forced contributions of others for their survival. This appeals to feelings of unfairness, and references legal slavery. Galt calls those who suffer from the elevated human rights of others as 'betters', and states that they are used as 'productive cattle', implying the dehumanisation of those who are more capable by those who depend on them. He finishes with the claim that the prioritisation of human rights over property rights is inhuman, and that those who believe in this discrepancy of priority are not to be considered human themselves. While present in much of Galt's Pathos, ideas of humanity and its loss are more distinct when discussing rights.

Thus far Galt's Pathos has deal with two groups, those being those in power and those not in power, however, the narrative consists of a third group, which includes those who have fled society. The group which Galt represents is notably underrepresented in arguments which appeal to emotion, with only a single relevant instance where Galt appeals to the audience for pity or understanding regarding the enforced role of his group. By the introduction of the following excerpt, the concept of the blank-out has been introduced, which is exemplified by the removal of cause.

"Now we are chained and commanded to produce by savages who do not grant us even the identification of sinners - by savages who proclaim that we do not exist, then threaten to deprive us of the life we don't possess, if we fail to provide them with the goods we don't produce. Now we are expected to continue running railroads and to know the minute when a train will arrive after crossing the span of a continent, we are expected to continue running steel mills and to know the molecular structure of every drop of metal on the cables of your bridges and in the body of the airplanes that support you in mid-air - while the tribes of your grotesque little mystics of muscle fight over the carcass of our world, gibbering in sounds of non-language that there are no principles, no absolutes, no knowledge, no mind." (p. 1039)

This excerpt refers to the state's refusal to acknowledge the contributions of those who contribute more, while still demanding them to produce equal amounts. Galt is making the claim that they do not receive the recognition that they are entitled to, and that they are expected to lower themselves to the status of the common worker. This, effectively, is referencing the blanking out of causes for effects, which are taken for granted, as Galt and those who have fled

represent the cause, and their contribution the effect. The excerpt invokes feelings of unfairness, which is then supported by selective language, such as the implication of slavery with chains, which have been shackled by savages, the state. When listing examples of what the state expects of these non-existent non-contributors, the use of quotidian instances, which affect the lives and livelihood of his audience, assists in appealing to the understanding and emotion of the narrative audience. The rhetorical purpose of this paragraph is to contextualise much of Galt's message in a manner which makes the withdrawal of producers more acceptable. While Galt's arguments explain his own actions, instances of Pathos are more prevalent when invoking feeling of unfairness towards the self, which, assuming a prioritisation of self-interest, is a more effective emotional appeal to the audience.

Appeal to Pathos is not as evenly distributed within the speech as other appeals, and instead, commonly appears in clusters. These clusters are not, however, normally separate from other appeals; Different rhetorical appeals can and do overlap. Interestingly, the exception to this is found in Galt's closing statements, where an unusually large cluster of Pathos is found in an otherwise rhetorically (in the Aristotelean framework) desolate environment. Galt's closing statements vary in content yet share the features of grandeur typical for the culmination of ideas in a speech. The topics range from the return of the country to its previous state, in which the citizens of reason, which promises protection of property rights, and where all are free to succeed and fail, with only themselves and their merit as the determiner. A world which, according to Galt, is fair, and where the good in people is protected, but evil is not, and where what others show you is justice, and what you see in others is respect. Following his promises of a better world, Galt calls upon those who still have not fled, and who still make sacrifices, who still serve their narrative subjugator, and pleads them to save the greatness of their soul, and to leave the enemy to die. These statements and pleads are Galt's final effort to create a division between the individual and the state, in which the state is trying to take away from its citizens, whereas the citizen is capable of greatness, which Galt has moulded for the audience over his speech. Galt's words are meant to empower the individual by offering an idealised, post-government world, in which values that are generally viewed as positive are the norm, and where curiosity and development are supported, unlike in the concurrent system, which values stagnation to prevent greatness and to level the quality of life of all regardless of merit.

*"In the name of the best within you, do not sacrifice the world to those who are its worst.
In the name of the values that keep you alive, do not let your vision of man be distorted by*

the ugly, the cowardly, the mindless in those who have never achieved his title. Do not lose your knowledge that man's proper estate is an upright posture, an intransigent mind and a step that travels unlimited roads. Do not let your fire go out, spark by irreplaceable spark, in the hopeless swamps of the approximate, the not-quite, the not-yet, the not-at-all. Do not let the hero in your soul perish, in lonely frustration for the life you deserved, but have never been able to reach. Check your roads and the nature of your battle. The world you desired can be won, it exists, it is real, it is possible, it's yours." (p. 1069)

Galt incites what he calls 'the best within' his audience, which is contrasted to the worst within the world, that being the collectivists. Galt assumes his audience's values, now presumably influenced by his speech, which is seen by his plea to deny the human who does not fit into said values. Ugly, cowardly, and mindless are selected to represent those who disagree with Galt, and are then associated with non-objectivist sentiments, which can be seen in Galt's listing of expressions of uncertainty. This implies that the objectivist is one who fits into these generalized positive attributes, which the audience may be inclined to strive for. The paragraph finishes with Galt's confirmation of a better world, which he assures is within the grasp of those who will it, and, considering the concurrent state of the US, is a solution to a narratively prevalent problem. However, following the excerpt, Galt explains that the switch to his world is not easy, and that, to be rid of a world where people are to be a sacrifice for all but themselves, a complete detachment from the present world is necessary. Again, Galt refers to those living in a collectivist system as a sort of sacrifice, which dissuades the audience from continuing to unjustly supply such a system. Instead, Galt persuades the audience to fight for their person, their pride, and their mind. By referring to the protection of these as opposed to self-sacrifice, Galt is making it seem like the world they are living in right now seeks to deprive one of these attributes, which respectively represent their body, their life, and their self-esteem; The argument is that to not fight for the values which Galt invokes, is to give up on existence. A reasonable assumption is that one's life and its contents are a prime target for the appeal to emotions, which may be why it had been saved for Galt's closing statements. In essence, the Galt's final arguments take much of what has been said over the speech, and make a final, empowering, yet judgmental, appeal to the audience's emotions. This appeal is mainly visible in Galt's choice of words, his juxtaposition of what he sees as value and non-value, and in the promise of a better world, into which everyone has a chance for entry.

Throughout the speech, Pathos is invoked mainly through Galt's choice of words and concepts, which are then applied to his arguments for dramatic effect. Prevalent pathetic themes include life and death, fairness and unfairness, freedom and servitude, and hope and despair. The context of the book is referenced in some instances, which adds emotional load to

Galt's narrative audience, while possibly contextualising Galt's appeals to the reader. Pathos is found in the contents of Galt's speech, acting as a vehicle for his message. A reoccurring characteristic of Galt's Pathos is the method in which emotions are appealed depending on the subject matter. When appealing to negative emotions, Galt tends to refer to how those he is persuading are wronged, subjugated, enslaved, or dehumanized, whereas appeals to positive emotions usually act to empower his audience. Appeals to positive emotions are notably fewer in the speech, and the use of negative emotions seems, at times, like fearmongering. This is quite ironic, considering the following argument by Galt:

*"You, who have lost the concept of the difference, you who claim that fear and joy are incentives of equal power – and secretly add that fear is the more 'practical' – you do not wish to live, and only fear of death still holds you to the existence you have damned."
(p. 1024)*

For most of Galt's speech, appeals to emotion are separate from himself, apart from one previously covered excerpt. Instead, emotions are riled to feel anger towards those in power, or to invoke heightened self-esteem on an individual level. The appeal to positive and negative emotions exhibits some overlap, however, instances of significant separation are detectable within the speech, such as the cluster of positive appeals concluding Galt's speech, or his arguments on sacrifice and his gruesome applications of the state's morality. By appearance, Pathos is quite common, appearing approximately as often a Logos does, yet not as regularly as Logos.

6 CONCLUSION

In this segment of the thesis, the findings of my analysis are discussed in respect to my research questions. These conclusions are divided into two parts: the first reviews the appearance of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos based on my findings. The second seeks to draw conclusions of the purpose of each invocation. Conclusions of trends in the studied invocations are included within these two parts, as the present trends are tightly connected to the respective findings.

6.1 How do Aristotelean appeals appear in the speech?

Ethos, Pathos, and Logos are prevalent in Galt's speech both separately and in conjunction with each other. In my analysis I found that the least invoked device of the three was Ethos, with Logos and Pathos appearing far more commonly and in similar amounts to each other. The appeal to different devices did not imitate the others; the allocation and appearance of the three appeals were distinct. The most regular in appearance of the three devices was Ethos, which showed no significant gaps or clusters of usage throughout the speech. Conversely, both Logos and Pathos were more concentrated in certain parts of the speech. Of the two, Logos, while still more evenly distributed, seemed to form a shallow bell curve, appearing more often in the middle of the speech, with fewer instances at the beginning and, notably, the end of the speech. Pathos is, I find, the most fluctuating of the methods, often appearing in clusters which are relatively far apart from each other. The most notable example of this is, in my opinion, the closing statements of the speech, in which I found Pathos to be

the most overrepresented when compared to other rhetorical appeals. The above observations are general conclusions drawn from the text. However, it should be noted that exceptions to the regularities and irregularities of appearance exist; while Pathos, for example, is more clustered than the other two appeals, it too is occasionally more evenly distributed.

Each of Aristotle's three rhetorical appeals exhibited some regularities in their usage and their purpose in Galt's speech. Galt's appeal to Ethos was largely constructed around his expertise, authority, and reasoning. In his introductions, Galt builds his character through his capability, even when it may seem that he is directly answering the question of his identity, such as when he answers the question by telling what he has done and what he could do. Galt's appeal to Ethos also has the largest discrepancy depending on the audience which is being persuaded; the reader is already aware of Galt's existence, ability, and person, whereas the narrative radio audience consists mostly of unaware listeners. Thus, some of Galt's personal credibility is reconstructed and elaborated on during the speech for the reader and introduced to the listener. In short, Galt's Ethos is more apparent in his ability, rather than his character. Galt's expertise is contextually constructed, as his ability finds purpose from narrative events leading up to the speech, artificially creating a need for his specific skillset. His likeability is, however, not quite as clear. Galt makes few attempts to increase his likeability, which is evident in his absolute refusal to help without equal exchange of values.

The appearance of Logos in Galt's speech is frequent and erratic. Logos is slightly more common in the middle of the speech when Galt argues for his philosophy. Logos often takes the form of exemplification and repetition, which is applied after newly and presently introduced arguments. Logos is seldom apparent in word choice, but rather, the composition of clauses and paragraphs; it primarily appears structurally, which may then be supplemented with select words. Galt's examples include stark simplification, which may then be gradually contextualised or exaggerated through the repetition of examples, which assists in the invocation of other persuasive appeals. It must be noted, however, that Galt's appeal to logic relies on itself. He has constructed his Logos in a way in which he can refer to previous arguments as if they had been accepted by his audience. Therefore, a member of his audience who has not accepted his reasoning to begin with, is not as likely to be persuaded by Galt's appeal to reason.

Pathos is a common appeal, and it is displayed in themes and concepts selected by Galt. It appears approximately as often as Logos, yet its appearance is differently distributed.

The invocation is prevalent in Galt's argumentation of morality and fairness, and when addressing the individual, particularly in his closing statements. Pathos is primarily invoked through the incitement of anger towards the state and concurrent policies, or through inspiration towards the individual. Typical manifestations of Pathos include references to life, freedom, virtue, choice, and hope, as well as their counterparts. These themes often appear in juxtaposition to their counterparts, which reinforces the audience's emotional reaction. As Galt's Pathos appears as the content of Galt's speech, it can be included into structures created by Logos, and thus, synergize with other rhetorical appeals.

6.2 What purpose do Aristotelean appeals serve in the speech?

Galt's positive Ethos is constructed through his ability. This emphasis on his capability as a character works to create an image of Galt as an expert. This image is applied into the context of the book, and supplemented with other persuasive devices, which elevates Galt's characters authority. Notably, the way in which Galt delivers his speech is unlikely to increase his likeability, which could decrease his Ethos. He speaks of himself as someone who has taken away from the nation, and how he is allowing the current system crumble under itself, essentially holding the quality of the citizens life hostage. The perspective assumed by the audience, I would argue, significantly impacts the way in which Galt's person is perceived. If the audience relates more to those whom Galt represents, his morality is less likely to invoke animosity in them. Conversely, if the audience relates to those who have been benefitting from what Galt opposes, or who would suffer from what he demands, they may perceive Galt's morality and ultimatums as unfair. While Galt does state ways in which his ideals could improve the lives of others, the focus is largely on how miserable reality would be without him and those whom he represents. This rhetoric exaggerates the narrative need for Galt, which inclines the audience to pay attention to Galt's reasoning and to his demands. Essentially, Galt's Ethos asserts that he has the answers to the concurrent issues of the US, and that he is willing to fix the country, given that his conditions are met. Galt's speech is a vehicle for these conditions and demands, which is why those who want a solution to the issues that Galt can address are persuaded to listen to him. In short, the primary purpose of Galt's Ethos is to give his audience a reason to hear him, which is achieved through his ability and narrative power.

Logos is appealed in a manner which assists Galt's audience to follow his logic, and to lead his audience to similar conclusions to his own. Examples and repetition are applied to ease the audience's thought process, as Galt's philosophy is, at times, quite abstract. Without the simplification and application of Galt's arguments, the invocation of Logos would not be as efficient, as a portion of his audience would not be able to follow Galt's ideas. Furthermore, I would argue that repetition and exemplification have their specialized purposes in reinforcement of Galt's Logos and Pathos respectively. Repetition of examples often applies previously argued principles and ideas, which further contextualises Galt's philosophy. Sequentially, repetition allows for more examples with differing contents, which allows Galt to invoke Pathos while making seemingly logical arguments. Logos is, therefore, applied to not only convince his audience of his argumentations reason, but also to allow his audience to better understand his arguments, and to allow the application of narratively relevant content in his arguments.

6.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, Galt's speech exhibits significant use of all three of Aristotle's appeals, which appear in unique ways, and which have distinct purposes. My initial beliefs of the application of rhetorical invocations were wrong, as I believed Pathos to be the least invoked, with Logos being the most invoked. Ultimately, Galt's speech showed heavy reliance on Pathos, which may, however, be unnoticed on the first read-through of the speech. Trends in their appearance signify that their application is not random, but instead, reinforces their purposeful rhetorical use. Essentially, Galt's Ethos works to attract the audience's attention, his Logos to make his message clear and give structure to his arguments, and his Pathos to enhance the salience of his arguments and create a hero-villain division. Galt's rhetoric is largely constructed by the narrative context, which could be argued to exist as a stage for Galt's speech, the rhetorical significance of context is most tied to Galt's Ethos, whereas it is the least relevant in Logos. Galt's rhetoric is cumulative, meaning that early agreement inclines the audience to agree with future claims, while they still refer to past principles and arguments to reinvoke or strengthen said arguments. Conversely, I find that early or fundamental disagreement with Galt significantly reduces the persuasive power of Galt's rhetoric. This, consequently, may explain the stark division in the reception of objectivism and *Atlas Shrugged*.

6.4 Suggestions for further research

The present study has studied the presence of Aristotle's rhetorical appeals in John Galt's speech and found notable trends in their appearance and purpose. While the depth of analysis for each appeal is appropriate for the level of the present study, I believe there to be much left undiscovered even within the framework of this study. Each individual appeal could be studied separately, and even then, the appeals themselves could be further divided into smaller segments of analysis, such as the stylistic analysis of a given appeal. Regarding Aristotelean appeals, even a quantitative analysis may yield unprecedented findings and conclusions. Furthermore, I would argue that the speech contains a notable amount of other rhetorical devices, as well as rhetorical fallacies, which could be studied from the perspective of this study's research questions, or from completely different applicable perspectives. The results of this study could be used as the base for a closer inspection of a given Aristotelean appeal. For example, Galt's Pathos could be divided into the invocation of positive and negative emotions, and their appearance and themes studied further. Alternatively, I would also see value in a case study of reader persuasion in the framework of this study's findings, which could then be qualitatively measured to seek confirmation of the present findings.

PRIMARY SOURCE

Rand, A. (2005). *Atlas shrugged*. Penguin.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abdulmughni, S. A. S. (2019). Stylistics, literary criticism, linguistics and discourse analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(2), 412.

Aristotle. (2001). *Rhetoric*. Virginia Tech.

Braet, A. C. (1992). Ethos, pathos and logos in Aristotle's Rhetoric: A re-examination. *Argumentation*, 6(3), 307-320.

Brook, Y. (2007). The influence of Atlas Shrugged. *The Ayn Rand Institute*, October 9, 2007.

Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor* (2nd edition.). Palgrave.

David, M. K. (2014). Language, power and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164-170.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Discourse and Literature: New Approaches to the Analysis of Literary Genres*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fahnestock, J. (2005). Rhetorical stylistics. *Language and Literature*, 14(3), 215-230.

Fanani, A., Setiawan, S., Purwati, O., Maisarah, M., & Qoyyimah, U. (2020). Donald Trump's grammar of persuasion in his speech. *Heliyon*, 6(1), e03082.

Finlayson, A., & Martin, J. (2008). 'It ain't what you say...': British political studies and the analysis of speech and rhetoric. *British politics*, 3(4), 445-464.

Fleming, D. (1998). Rhetoric as a Course of Study. *College English*, 61(2), 169-191.

Freeman, M. H. (2002). Cognitive mapping in literary analysis. *Style*, 36(3), 466-483.

Gill, R. (2000). Discourse analysis. *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*, 1,

172-190.

Gladstein, M. R., Gladstein, M. R. & Meadowcroft, J. (2013). *Ayn Rand*. Continuum.

Gross, A. G. (2000). *Rereading aristotle's rhetoric*. ProQuest Ebook Central, 24-36.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis* (Third edition.). Wiley Blackwell.

McNeill, P. (2006). *Research methods*. Routledge.

Mirasova, K. (2018). Peculiarities of Nostalgia in Ayn Rand's Novel *Atlas Shrugged*. *Humanities*, 7(4), 121.

Parker, D. H. (1972). Rhetoric, ethics and manipulation. *Philosophy & rhetoric*, 69-87.

Pospíšil, J. (2016). The Historical Development of Dystopian Literature.

Potter, J., & Edwards, D. (1996). Discourse analysis. In *Introducing psychological research* (pp. 419-425). Palgrave, London.

Rand, A. (2005). *Atlas shrugged*. Penguin.

Rapp, C. (2002). Aristotle's rhetoric.

Salovaara, J. (2018) Ayn Rand ja objektivismi. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-201810254530>

The Great American Read (2018). Read the 100 List. <https://www.pbs.org/the-great-american-read/books/#/>

Woodward, H. B. (1957). Non-Stop Daydream. *The Saturday Review*, 25.

Zachry, M. (2009). Rhetorical analysis. *The handbook of business discourse*, 68-91.

Zhiyong, D. (2016). Logo, Pathos and Ethos in David Cameron's Political Speech: A Rhetorical Analysis. *KKU International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 63-74.

