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Mussolini and Goebbels

Both Mussolini and Goebbels make good use of metaphors as they try to pass across their messages. The metaphors are mainly of evil and bad health to show the status in which their countries were in after the world war. Mussolini claims that the they were is a state of marasmus which simple implies the bad economic state in which the country was in and how the soldiers were not able to continue with the fight. Goebbels also terms the people who contribute towards the erosion of German culture as germs within their midst. Germs cause death if not handled well and this is what Goebbels uses to refer to the people who are helping in doing away with their culture as germens.

Both of them talk about nationalism and socialism as a way of solving the problems that they had difference in their look at socialism. I believe the difference in attitude comes as a result of the different things that the two countries faced.

Goebbels argues that anti-Semitism is good for the well-being of the Germans. This is because according to him, the Jews are the major enemies of the Germans and must be removed from their midst. Mussolini on the other hand identifies Russians, Austrians and Germans as the major enemies of fascism (Kaes et al, pp 138).

Diary of the dark days

The piece by Guehenno is a collection of his thoughts on whether Petain will be able to move the country forward or not. First he claims that he is too old to make any rational decisions for the country and is likely to repeat every stupid thing that the oppressors will tell him to say. According to him, there are a group of Frenchmen who were not at peace with other people and would therefore rejoice in this defeat.

He refers to the divisions that took place in the country fifty years ago as some of the things that led to the defeat. The people are not in any way together and that is why some of them would rather celebrate the defeat of the country. The groups that feel the country has been defeated and are sad about it does not support the Petain government. On the other hand, the others rejoice in the formation of this government as they believe it will continue to add to the sorrows of the French.

When he says that the country is only an idea, he implies that it the duty of the Frenchmen to either support France or not. Just like one would have their thoughts on any idea, the country is also left to such possibilities (Guehenno, pp 10).

The reunification of Germany

In Kohl’s speech it is evident that the major point of interest that he has is the unification of the two Germanies after the fall of the Berlin wall. He tries to prove why it is important to unify both sides of Germany as well as the larger part of Europe that are not in unity. He also intends to use the idea of contractual community suggested by the prime minister as a way of convincing the citizens that the unification is the most important thing.

The major tradition that he refers to as he tries to argue out the need for unification is the federal government. The federal government will continue serving as the overall government on the land and they will offer help to people from both sides of the country.

The context that he refers to in this case is the economic and political cold war that resulted to division between the two sides (Adam et al, pp 120).

Islamic headscarves in France

Soud talks about the manner in which primary school played an active role in separating people based on where they come from. She says that in the school where she went, the French were in a more advanced section while the other people were left in the middle school. This created a notion among the students as they already knew that they were superior that the others.

Although her decision to wear a Muslim headscarf was a requirement by the religion, she also did it as a way of showing that she loved her religion and was determined to overcome all the obstacles she faced. People would ridicule her for being a Muslim and the best way she used to fight back and show her determination was the use of the headscarf.

When she went with the headscarf to her place of work, the experience was a bit different. She found tolerant people who even went ahead to tell her that they were willing to deal with any person who would discriminate her based on her religion. It is a fact that made her feel that the country was making progress in the right direction (Bowen, p 76).
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