

University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Patriotism in Wartime Speeches of W. Churchill and F. D. Roosevelt

Bc. Barbora Loubová

Diploma thesis

2025

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2023/2024

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Bc. Barbora Loubová**
Osobní číslo: **H23349**
Studijní program: **N0231A090011 Anglická filologie**
Téma práce: **Vlastenectví ve válečných proslovech W. Churchilla a F. D. Roosevelta**
Téma práce anglicky: **Patriotism in Wartime Speeches of W. Churchill and F. D. Roosevelt**
Zadávací katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Barbora Loubová se ve své diplomové práci zaměří na otázku vlastenectví jako tematického prvku projevů W. Churchilla a F. D. Roosevelta pronesených během druhé světové války. Práci uvede kapitola, která nastíní obsahové atributy budování vědomí národní sounáležitosti pomocí odkazů na krajinu, jazyk, minulost, hodnoty atd. Na tomto základě se autorka bude věnovat projevům obou státníků, například Churchillovým "We Shall Fight on the Beaches" (1940) a "Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat" (1940) či Rooseveltovým "The Infamy Speech" (1941) a dalším. S využitím odborné literatury provede detailní tematickou analýzu s cílem vymezit okruh způsobů a témat, které oba řečníci využili pro posílení národní hrdosti, patriotismu a odhodlanosti čelit novým výzám v podobě vojenského nebezpečí. Položí si otázku, zda Churchill a Roosevelt využili stejných prostředků a témat, jakým způsobem prezentují povahu nepřítele apod. Celou práci uzavře kapitola, která z předchozích dílčích zjištění vyvodí obecnější závěry.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Rozsah grafických prací:

Forma zpracování diplomové práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Primary sources:

Churchill, Winston. "We Shall Fight on the Beaches, 1940." <<https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/we-shall-fight-on-the-beaches.html>>.

Churchill, Winston. "Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat." <<https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1940-the-finest-hour/blood-toil-tears-sweat/>>.

Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Joint Address to Congress Leading to a Declaration of War Against Japan (1941)." <<https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/joint-address-to-congress-declaration-of-war-against-japan>>.

Secondary sources:

Addison, Paul. "The Political Beliefs of Winston Churchill." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 30 (1980): 23–47.

Emmert, Kirk. "Review of Rhetorics' Relation to Political Wisdom, by Manfred Weidhom." *The Review of Politics* 51, no. 1 (1989): 135–138.

Feuerlicht, Ignace. "A New Look at the Iron Curtain." *American Speech* 30, no. 3 (1955): 186–189.

Kaiser, David E. "Review of Churchill, Roosevelt, and the Limits of Power, by Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, and Warren F. Kimball." *International Security* 10, no. 1 (1985): 204–221.

Kimball, Warren F. "Franklin D. Roosevelt and World War II." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (2004): 83–99.

Leutze, James. "The Secret of the Churchill-Roosevelt Correspondence: September 1939 – May 1940." *Journal of Contemporary History* 10, no. 3 (1975): 465–491.

Maguire, Lori. "We Shall Fight: A Rhetorical Analysis of Churchill's Famous Speech." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 17, no. 2 (2014): 255–286.

McDowell, Sara. "Heritage, Memory and Identity." In *The Ashgate Research Companion and Identity*, edited by Brian Graham and Peter Howard, 37–53. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. Co., 2008.

Mieder, Wolfgang. "'We Are All in the Same Boat Now': Proverbial Discourse in the Churchill-Roosevelt Correspondence." In *Proverbs Are The Best Policy: Folk Wisdom And American Politics*, 187–209. University Press of Colorado, 2005.

Miller, Angela. "Everywhere and Nowhere: The Making of the National Landscape." *American Literary History* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1992): 207–229.

Ward, Jeremy K. "Winston Churchill and the 'Iron Curtain' Speech." *The History Teacher* 1, no. 2 (1968): 5–63.

Warren, Spencer. "Churchill's Realism: Reflections on the Fulton Speech." *The National Interest*, no. 42 (1995): 38–49.

Yu, Lumeng (Jenny). "The Great Communicator: How FDR's Radio Speeches Shaped American History." *The History Teacher* 39, no. 1 (2005): 89–106.

Vedoucí diplomové práce:

PhDr. Ladislav Vít, Ph.D.

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání diplomové práce: **8. dubna 2024**
Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: **8. dubna 2025**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D. v.r.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D. v.r.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 8. dubna 2024

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem Patriotism in Wartime Speeches of W. Churchill and F. D. Roosevelt jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury. Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 29.3. 2025

Bc. Barbora Loubová, v. r.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the supervisor of my thesis PhDr. Ladislav Vít, Ph.D. for his valuable advice and his guidance. I would also like to thank my family and friends for their support.

TITLE

Patriotism in Wartime Speeches of W. Churchill and F. D. Roosevelt

ANNOTATION

This thesis focuses on implementation of national identity as a tool for fostering unity in wartime rhetoric during the Second World War. The goal of the theoretical part is to introduce fundamental terms such as rhetoric, national identity, nationalism, patriotism, and propaganda. The practical part is divided into two chapters with the analysis of particularly chosen speeches. The main aim of the paper is to examine the speeches of Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and to present the different approaches of both leaders.

KEYWORDS

wartime, rhetoric, national identity, nationalism, patriotism

NÁZEV

Vlastenectví ve válečných proslovech W. Churchilla a F. D. Roosevelta

ANOTACE

Tato diplomová práce se zaměřuje na implementaci národní identity jako nástroje posílení jednoty ve válečné rétorice během druhé světové války. Cílem teoretické části je představit základní pojmy, jako jsou rétorika, národní identita, nacionalismus, patriotismus a propaganda. Praktická část je rozdělena do dvou capitol, které analyzují vybrané projevy. Hlavním cílem práce je prozkoumat projevy Winstona Churchilla a Franklina Delana Roosevelta a představit odlišné přístupy obou vůdců.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

válečné období, rétorika, národní identita, nacionalismus, patriotismus

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	10
1. National Identity, Nationalism, and Patriotism in Rhetoric.....	12
2. Rhetoric during World War II	31
3. Patriotism and Nationalism in Speeches.....	51
Conclusion	65
Resumé.....	70
Bibliography.....	74

Introduction

Wartime rhetoric is a powerful tool which can shape public opinion and actions with the use of national identity, nationalism, and patriotism, particularly in times of crisis. One of the crises was the Second World War. During World War II, British Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill and the President of the United States Franklin Delano Roosevelt emerged as two of the most influential wartime orators. They used their speeches to mobilize their nations, boost morale, and reinforce commitment to the war effort. Both leaders understood the importance of language as a unifying force. This art of systematic use of language in speech can be represented by its umbrella term of rhetoric. This thesis explores the rhetorical differences between these two leaders, analysing how they used patriotism and nationalism to shape national identity and inspire unity among their people during the Second World War.

The first part of the thesis introduces the term rhetoric. It has long been a fundamental tool in political leadership, particularly during times of war when national unity and public morale are critical. Aristotle's concept of rhetoric, which defined rhetoric as the art of persuasion, remains relevant in understanding how leaders communicate their visions to their people. Churchill and Roosevelt were both masterful orators, and their ability to frame the war as a moral struggle between good and evil helped define the way their nations perceived the conflict. Their speeches served not only to inspire and reassure their people but also to persuade and justify their military and political strategies. This chapter outlines the various meanings of this broad concept of rhetoric and delivers several diverse theories and opinions from different authors and scholars. Moreover, this part introduces the terms such as national identity, nationalism, and patriotism. These concepts shape the way people perceive their country and their place within it. It explains the connection between the concepts, their differences, and their relevance to uniting the public.

The practical part deals with analysis of primary sources used, such as *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat* (May 13, 1940), *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (June 4, 1940), *Their Finest Hour* (June 18, 1940), and *The Gift of a Common Tongue* (1943) by Winston Churchill, and *The Four Freedoms* (January 6, 1941), *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* (Radio Broadcast, December 29, 1940), and *The Infamy Speech/Pearl Harbour Address* (December 8, 1941) by Franklin D. Roosevelt. The practical part is divided into two chapters and it applies the theories based on the statements mentioned in the theoretical part.

The first analytical chapter focuses predominantly on rhetoric. The main intention is to analyse the different rhetorical strategies of Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt in their wartime speeches. It demonstrates the differences and similarities in the use of language, especially the use of national symbols characteristic of their nation. The choice of words and rhetorical techniques, such as repetition, metaphor, and strong imagery, can evoke emotional responses and national unity. It analyses the speeches from the rhetorical perspective and focuses on the way language is structured, which directly impacts the effectiveness of rhetoric in shaping public opinion and reinforcing collective identity. Additionally, this chapter displays emphasizing and incorporating national symbols and values into the speech which makes the speech effective.

The second analytical chapter deals with the use of national identity, nationalism, and patriotism in wartime speeches. These concepts appeal to people's attachment to their nation and motivate their actions, encouraging unity and loyalty. This part investigates the leaders' appeal to people's emotions with the ideology of nationalism and patriotism. Nonetheless, this chapter pays attention to different audiences receiving the speeches. Consequently, there are introduced different national ideological concepts, principles, and values, which are typical for each nation and therefore emphasized in the speeches. This part points out the differences and similarities between the British and the American nations and their national identity and culture.

In conclusion, the main purpose of this thesis is to highlight the different patterns used by the two most prominent leaders during the Second World War. It aims to accentuate the different rhetoric of Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt and to underscore the differences between British and American national identity, values, and ideals. The analytical part is followed by a chapter delivering a more general conclusion.

1. National Identity, Nationalism, and Patriotism in Rhetoric

The purpose of this chapter is to explore how national identity, nationalism, and patriotism are reinforced and manipulated through wartime rhetoric to unite populations and justify military actions. It begins by introducing the theory of rhetoric, focusing on how language and persuasive techniques are strategically employed to create impactful speeches during times of conflict. By examining the meanings and connection of these concepts, this chapter demonstrates how national identity functions as a unifying force, fostering a sense of collective belonging, shared heritage, and common purpose. It delves into how national identity is constructed and reinforced, often by appealing to cultural symbols, historical narratives, and emotional bonds that connect deeply with the public. Furthermore, this chapter investigates the role of nationalism and patriotism as powerful rhetorical tools used to inspire loyalty, mobilize support, and frame the enemy in a way that strengthens the perceived morality of a nation's cause. Nationalism is examined not only as a source of pride but also as a mechanism to justify military actions, and to promote sacrifice. In contrast, patriotism is explored as a more personal and emotional attachment towards one's homeland, often invoked to encourage unity and resilience in the face of hardship.

The term rhetoric has met with many different meanings, starting at the times of Plato and Socrates in the ancient era to modern definitions by George Campbell, Kenneth Burke, and many others. Aristotle defined rhetoric as “the faculty of discovering in any particular case all of the available means of persuasion.”¹ In other words, for Aristotle rhetoric is an art which requires the skill of assessing a particular situation to find the best way to persuade the audience. It involves understanding the unique context, concretely who the audience is, the purpose, the setting, and the context. It is about the choice of suitable persuasive techniques to deliver the message as effectively as possible. Aristotle distinguishes between three types of persuasion: “the forensic, epideictic, and deliberative, claiming that deliberative (or political) is the most important branch.”² He claims that deliberative oratory must be considered a political skill.³ In the same book, *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*, Wayne C. Booth delivers an explanation of the three types:

¹ Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004), 4.

² Hugh Lawson-Tancred, Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*. Penguin Classics (London; New York: Penguin, 1992), 32-33.

³ Lawson-Tancred, Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*, 95.

Deliberative – attempts to make the future. Politicians or committee members debate about how to act or vote; husbands and wives and architects debate about house remodeling. Forensic – attempts to change what we see as truth about the past (attempts which may of course also affect the future). A lawyer skillful in rhetoric can sometimes make it clear that a death penalty decision for murderer was false, thus creating a new reality – for defendants, prosecutors, victims, and their families. Historians can debate about how much blame to give Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon for the Vietnam War. Epideictic – attempts to reshape views of the present. An orator or birthday-party friend can change the reality of how we value people and their creations. A hero can be revealed as a con artist, or a CEO turned from hero to villain. A widely mocked art movement can be turned into a celebrated artistic revolution.⁴

Similarly to Aristotle, Cicero argues that rhetoric is speech designed to persuade, and he divides rhetoric into *The Five Canons*. He says that “rhetoric is one great art comprised of five lesser arts: inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, and pronuntiatio.”⁵ These five canons might be translated as invention/discovery, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery, and can be applied regardless of the type or purpose of a speech. As Richard Toye explains each component, he states that invention focuses on the process of generating arguments appropriate to the topic and the audience. Invention considers the audience’s nature and potential reactions to the attempt for a persuasive and relevant message. The second canon of rhetoric, arrangement, revolves around the organization of a speech, which significantly influences its audience. Style recognizes the right choice of words and how they are put together. To bear in mind, orators should avoid using neutral words since the words can “be likened to the choice of weaponry.”⁶ This might be supported by Robert Greene saying, that while trying to impress the audience, “some you can trick by cloaking your extraordinary ideas in ordinary forms; others, more resistant and dull, must be awoken with extreme language that bristles with newness.”⁷ To put it differently, some people can be convinced by presenting bold ideas in a familiar, ordinary

⁴ Booth, *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric*, 17.

⁵ Booth, *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric*, 4.

⁶ Richard Toye, *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 49.

⁷ Robert Greene, *The 33 Strategies of War* (New York: Viking, 2006), 562.

way. Others, who are more stubborn or unimaginative, need to be shaken awake with striking, fresh language. Cicero's canon of memory speaks for the ability to withhold the speech and remember its content effectively.⁸ Delivery includes aspects such as accent, posture, gestures, and tone of voice. These features have a significant impact on how the speech is received by the audience.⁹ To put it briefly, invention focuses on what to say, arrangement ensures how to organize it, style defines how to say it, memory helps retain it, and delivery ensures how it is conveyed. Alina-Elena Onet concentrates on such aspects of rhetoric which influence the audience. In her article *Rhetoric in Times of Conflict*, she underlines the power of linguistic devices in shaping and influencing decisions. The careful use of tone, emphasis, vivid imagery, and well-placed rhetorical questions form the basis of persuasive arguments.

These linguistic devices may include persuasive techniques such as rhetorical questions, emotional appeals, logical reasoning, anecdotes, and lively imagery. Apart from these, the use of pronouns, modalities, hyperbole, repetition, and metaphor can also be employed to enhance the persuasive impact of language.¹⁰

By using a variety of rhetorical techniques, politicians, for instance, are able to make their speeches more convincing and meaningful.

Rhetoric is the skill of shaping language to achieve its purpose. Its main goals can be summarized as informing the mind, engaging the imagination, evoking emotions, and influencing decisions. As George Campbell recapitulates, the role of rhetoric is "to enlighten the understanding, to please the imagination, to move the passions, or to influence the will."¹¹ This depicts the multi-layered purpose of rhetoric. Essentially, Campbell implies that effective rhetoric doesn't just aim to convey information but it appeals to logic, emotions, imagination, and desires to deeply engage and persuade its audience. This approach indicates that rhetoric appeals to both the rational and emotional sides of human nature, making it not only informative but also inspiring and motivating. Kenneth Burke believed that rhetoric entailed "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols."¹² He emphasizes the idea that rhetoric is about creating unity and cooperation

⁸ Toye, *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*, 51.

⁹ Toye, *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*, 49.

¹⁰ Alina-Elena Onet, "Rhetoric in Times of Conflict: A Study of Famous War-Time Speeches," *Nicolae Bălcescu" Land Forces Academy, Sibiu, Romania* 30, no. 2 (July 2024): 1–2.

¹¹ Booth, *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric*, 6.

¹² Toye, *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*, 77.

through shared symbols and meanings. According to Burke, rhetoric isn't just about persuasion, but it is about using language to connect with others on a symbolic level, appealing to values, beliefs, and common understandings which people naturally recognize. In this view, rhetoric strengthens a sense of shared purpose by addressing the shared ideas and beliefs which help people find a common ground.

As revealed, rhetoric uses language as a way to encourage cooperation among people. Kenneth Burke describes the human creature as “the symbol-using (symbol-making, symbol-misusing) animal.”¹³ To put it simply, humans naturally tend to ascribe meaning to certain things, such as language, rituals, cultural icons, and tradition to serve as symbols which then shape our values and social connections. For example, a nation’s flag is more than cloth and colour. It also represents ideas of identity, heritage, and pride.¹⁴ By the strategic choice of words, the right style of speech, and the emotional appeal of memory, rhetoric allows orators to influence the audience. This often involves an appeal to shared values to shape the audience’s thoughts, emotions, and actions. These values often include concepts of national pride, honour, freedom, or democracy. Most importantly, it is necessary for the orator to find such values which are common and shared, even when the speaker and audience hold opposing views. The essential feeling of unity, identity, and loyalty can be strengthened by the national symbols as previously explained by Kenneth Burke. This might be supported by the British sociologist Anthony Smith who agrees that to win over the audience it is crucial to pay attention to national symbols which are shared throughout the community. He explains, that these symbols

include the obvious attributes of nations — flags, anthems, parades, coinage, capital cities, oaths, folk costumes, museums of folklore, war memorials, ceremonies of remembrance for the national dead, passports, frontiers — as well as more hidden aspects, such as national recreations, the countryside, popular heroes and heroines, fairy tales, forms of etiquette, styles of architecture, arts and crafts, modes of town planning, legal procedures, educational practices and military codes - all those distinctive customs, mores, styles and ways of acting and

¹³ Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 6.

¹⁴ Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, 6–7.

feeling that are shared by the members of a community of historical culture.¹⁵

Such symbols form and represent the national identity. Furthermore, national identity helps individuals understand who they are by connecting them to a shared culture and collective personality. This shared identity provides a sense of belonging and stability, especially in a rapidly changing world. For many people feeling lost or uncertain, reconnecting with their national culture can feel like rediscovering their true selves.¹⁶ To provide a more specific meaning of national identity, Kenneth R. Olwig argues, that the term “identity” has its roots in Latin, meaning “the same,” which is connected with “unity and persistence of personality.”¹⁷ Moreover, the concept of national identity is closely related to nationalism. As Smith states, “nationalism, the ideology, and the movement must be closely related to national identity, a multidimensional concept, and extended to include a specific language, sentiment and symbolism.”¹⁸ He defines nationalism as “an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity, and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential ‘nation’.”¹⁹ Nationalists believe in achieving unity with the aim of designing a shared identity for a particular segment of the population. According to Louis Wirth in *Types of Nationalism*, members of such a segment

may be conceived as a people, who, because of their belief in their common descent and their mission in the world, by virtue of their common cultural heritage and historical career aspire to sovereignty over a territory or seek to maintain or enlarge their political or cultural influence in the face of opposition. Nationalism refers to the social movements, attitudes, and ideologies which characterize the behaviour of nationalities engaged in the struggle to achieve, maintain, or enhance their position in the world.²⁰

In other words, nationalism refers to the actions, ideas, and movements which help these groups achieve their intentions or protect their identity. Under these conditions, symbolism and

¹⁵ Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991), 77.

¹⁶ Smith, *National Identity*, 17.

¹⁷ Olwig, Kenneth R. “‘Natural’ Landscapes in the Representation of National Identity.” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, edited by Brian Graham and Peter Howard, 81. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. Co., 2008.

¹⁸ Smith, *National Identity*, 24.

¹⁹ Smith, *National Identity*, 73.

²⁰ Louis Wirth. “Types of Nationalism,” *American Journal of Sociology* 41, no. 1 (1936): 723.

language play a crucial role in such processes, evoking the “‘mass sentiment’ notably through slogans, ideas, symbols and ceremonies.” To make a clear distinction between national identity and nationalism, nationalism can be summarized as a political stance based on the cultural and social phenomenon of national identity. It is a political belief that draws its roots from national identity.²¹ This emotional and symbolic awakening of a targeted group of people sharing certain values had been recognized by German Romantics. As Anthony Smith quotes, German Romantics agree that the idea of nationalism “signifies the awakening of the nation and its members to its true collective ‘self, so that it, and they, obey only the ‘inner voice’ of the purified community.”²² Explained differently, this “awakening” encourages both the nation and its people to act according to their internal (historical and cultural) beliefs, free from other external influences. Similarly, the “inner voice” represents the true values and beliefs of a nation, guiding its people to act in accordance with their shared culture and identity. The “purified community” means a group of people who are united by what they have in common as a nation. Smith highlights the key collectively shared elements which define national identity, namely: “an historic territory or homeland, common myths and historical memories; a common, mass public culture; common legal rights and duties; and a common economy with territorial mobility for its members. A nation can therefore be defined as a named human population sharing a historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members.” The themes focusing on the historical past and memories usually refer to the golden ages or a golden era of the nation.²³ The nationalists and orators promote the nation’s unique identity by reminding people of the nation’s heroes and the time of the nation at its peak. The remembering of these idealized heroes and sages symbolizes the nation’s antiquity and continuity. Nonetheless, according to Smith, nationalists aimed to unite and activate “the people” by emphasizing their supposed ethnic history.²⁴ In opposition to Anthony Smith stands a Modernist John Breuilly, who disagrees with Smith’s concept of ethno-symbolism which emphasizes the cultural and historical roots. In *Nationalism and the State*, Breuilly describes nationalism as “a form of politics.” In other words, he disagrees with the idea that nationalism draws on language or culture, meaning that the idea of nationalism is not deeply historical. He argues that the historical development of nation-states was originally based on political unity rather than

²¹ Smith, *National Identity*, 73.

²² Smith, *National Identity*, 87.

²³ Smith, *National Identity*, 87.

²⁴ Smith, *National Identity*, 69.

ethnic, cultural, or linguistic homogeneity.²⁵ Drawing on this theory, an example of the “melting pot” of the United States of America might be presented. The idea of the melting pot framed America as a blend of different cultures rather than a nation defined by a single ethnic or cultural identity. As explained by Ethel M. Albert, “the idea of the melting-pot functioned as a safe-guard against the problem of basic cultural diversity.”²⁶ In agreement with Heike Paul, the melting pot idea represents a key part of the nation’s identity. This idea suggests that people from different backgrounds come together to form a united, society, shaping them into a single nation. It highlights the ongoing mix of cultures and the changing nature of American identity. Paul refers to Benedict Anderson’s concept of *Imagined Communities* which suggests that nations need both a shared history and a vision for the future. For the United States, a country of immigrants, the challenge has always been how to unite people from different origins. The melting pot became the main way to describe this process, reflecting the diverse and evolving nature of American society.²⁷ This idea framed America as a blend of different cultures rather than a nation defined by a single ethnic or cultural identity. In accordance with Krishan Kumar, a similar situation applies to the United Kingdom, since the collective British national identity depends on a shared, inclusive identity rather than a separate English, Scottish, or Welsh one.²⁸ This shows that there are nations including people of different ethnic roots, frequently sharing the same citizenship and territory.

In the context of territory, Smith points out that “nationalism is about ‘land’, both in terms of possession and (literal) rebuilding, and of belonging where forefathers lived and where history demarcates a ‘homeland.’”²⁹ This statement expresses both the possessive and emotional relations to a territory. One of the most prominent emotional relations to land, concretely the homeland, might be the one of family. In this case, the nation is portrayed as one family with common family ties and roots attached to a particular territory. The citizens are often depicted as brothers and sisters of the motherland or fatherland, speaking their common mother tongue.³⁰ Supported by Benedict Anderson, this emotional tie is often described by the use of language. The usage of idioms or the language of kinship for the word motherland

²⁵ John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (Manchester University Press, 1993), 14.

²⁶ Ethel M. Albert, “Conflict and Change in American Values: A Culture-Historical Approach,” *Ethics* 74, no. 1 (October 1963): 24.

²⁷ Heike Paul, *The Myths That Made America: An Introduction to American Studies* (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2014), 258–259.

²⁸ Krishan Kumar, *Nation and Empire: English Literature and the Nineteenth-Century Colonial Experience* (London: Polity Press, 2000), 578.

²⁹ Smith, *National Identity*, 70.

³⁰ Smith, *National Identity*, 78–79.

denotes something to which one is naturally tied.³¹ Nonetheless, this idea of a nation being a family embodies Anderson's theory of *Imagined Communities*. He interprets the declared group as a socially constructed community, imagined by the people who perceive themselves as part of it, sharing the same values and memories. His statement describes community as imagined, since even in the smallest nations, most members will never personally meet, know, or even hear about the majority of their fellow citizens.³² This fictional "super-family" and ties, claiming a shared ancestry set the members of a nation apart from non-members.³³ The idea of community is an imagined, occasionally political, ideology. According to Anderson, "all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined."³⁴ A nation is seen as a community because, despite inequality and exploitation, it is imagined as a bond of equal comradeship. This feeling of unity has led millions over the past two centuries to willingly die for these shared ideas.³⁵ Putting forward the regard of mother tongue, language functions as a unifying force, a symbol of connection, a nation's cohesion, and autonomy. Ferdinand Tönnies presents another concept of community called *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* which is a key work in social and political theory. This German scholar makes a distinction between *Gemeinschaft*, translated as community, and *Gesellschaft*, standing for civic society. He describes community as a small-scale community where relationships are personal, close, and based on shared values and tradition. These communities emphasize natural will, meaning that the actions of members are guided by inherent motivations and emotional bonds. To put it differently, such communities are characterized by emotional bonds and a sense of belonging, blood ties, and ancestry. They are rooted in place with cultural customs passed down through generations, with instinctive actions, which are motivated by emotion and collective good of a community. An example can be portrayed as a rural village where neighbours know and support each other. Civic societies, on the other hand, are large-scale, competitive societies characterized by impersonal, contractual relationships and rational will. Interactions of members are motivated by individual interests and calculated benefits. In other words, *Gesellschaft* represents modern, impersonal structures where relationships are formal and motivated by self-interest, with decisions made based on rational calculation and individual benefit. This might be demonstrated in a large corporation where relationships are professional,

³¹ Benedict R. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London; New York: Verso, 1991), 143.

³² Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.

³³ Smith, *National Identity*, 12.

³⁴ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.

³⁵ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.

or in urban life where individuals live among strangers. Tönnies believed that communities (Gemeinschaft) are built through shared customs, language, and traditions, where people form close, personal bonds because they know and care about each other.³⁶ In contrast, Anderson argued that nations are imagined communities, where people feel connected even though they have never met. This sense of unity comes from symbols like flags and national anthems, as well as media and rituals that make people feel part of something bigger.³⁷ Tönnies saw community as naturally growing over time, while Anderson showed how nations are carefully created.

In contrast to Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, Tara Zahra in *Imagined Noncommunities* introduces the concept of national indifferences. She argues, that people in Central and Eastern Europe were often unsure or chose their participation in a nation based on practical reasons. Zahra's theory suggests that national identity is not always something people naturally feel strongly about but is often forced by political leaders. This challenges the view that nationalism is unavoidable and shows how ordinary people stand and sometimes even push back against nationalist influences. For instance, in Bohemia, bilingual families often chose schools based on benefits rather than nationalist loyalty.³⁸ Zahra's argument suggests that nationalism is not always an unavoidable force but something that political leaders or elites push onto people. Tim Edensor cites Smith saying that in alternative contexts such elites (re)construct "a conceptual language within which members of pre-existing ethnic, linguistic or political communities could express a sense of their collective being."³⁹ For instance, during the nineteenth-century Irish Gaelic Revival the nationalists intended to restore the original de-Anglicised Gaelic Ireland, with a number of Gaelic references present in literature and slogans. The aim of the nationalist movement was to restore the Irish language, causing the majority of the literature to be written in Irish and translated into English later on.⁴⁰ With regard to language during World War II, Winston Churchill used Anglo-Saxon words. Louis Foley in *Churchill's "Anglo-Saxon" Words* quotes Churchill saying "[m]y method is simple. I like to use Anglo-Saxon words with the least number of syllables." According to Foley, not only are the short words more distinct and easier to understand, but Anglo-Saxon words with no French influence

³⁶ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society*, ed. Jose Harris, trans. Jose Harris and Margaret Hollis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1–26.

³⁷ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.

³⁸ Tara Zahra, "Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis," *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 103–107.

³⁹ Tim Edensor, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (London: Routledge, 2002), 8.

⁴⁰ Ríona Nic Congáil, "Life and the Dream: Utopian Impulses Within the Irish Language Revival," *Utopian Studies* 23, no. 2 (2012): 434.

are “somehow more truly English.”⁴¹ Nonetheless, speaking a mother tongue can embody a resistance towards imperial domination or other nations speaking a different language. Also, it passes on a cultural heritage through art, such as literature. Newspapers, books, and pamphlets allowed individuals, who may have never met, to feel as a part of a shared imagined community.

Unity is not the only pillar of the nationalistic ideas. To be specific, Anthony Smith summarizes all the key themes of nationalism, which are:

1. autonomy, the aspiration on the part of the members for their national community to live in accordance with its own laws and rhythms, free from all outside interference;
2. unity, the desire of the members for both territorial unification and unimpeded mobility throughout, as well as for social solidarity, fraternity and sorority;
3. identity, or distinctiveness, the recovery by the members of the ‘innate’ individuality of the national community, and its tangible embodiment and visible projection in ritual and artistic form;
4. authenticity, the rediscovery by some of its members of the ‘true nature’ and sense of being of the national community in its unique origins, history and culture;
5. the homeland, a sense of belonging, memory and attachment by the members of the community to an ancestral or historic territory regarded as uniquely ‘theirs’;
6. dignity, the belief on the part of the members that their community should be accorded prestige and status commensurate with its true ‘inner worth’;
7. continuity, the conviction on the part of the members that they are linked with often remote ancestors and earlier cultures in the homeland in a relatively unbroken line of succession;
8. destiny, the conviction on the part of the members that the national community has a foreordained, and usually glorious, path of progress peculiar to itself.⁴²

⁴¹ Louis Foley, “Churchill’s ‘Anglo-Saxon’ Words,” *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts* 6, no. 4 (1966): 142.

⁴²Anthony D. Smith, *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach* (London: Routledge, 2009), 62–63.

These elements work together to evoke unity among members of a community and a sense of belonging, which is naturally needed by humans. Together, these elements define and strengthen the bonds of national identity. However, the ideology of nationalism applies not only to the togetherness of individuals sharing the same national identity but also to differentiate one nation from another. The article by Isabel Loupa Ramos, Fátima Bernardo, Sónia Carvalho Ribeiro, and Veerle Van Eetvelde delivers another statement made by Shelley Egoz, saying that

by using the concept of identity, people define themselves as an individual, but also as a member of a group that shares some common characteristics. But identity is also a way to distinguish “myself” from others or other groups that do not share these characteristics and that are thereby different. This process both strengthens the identity, but can also exacerbate into a source of discrimination and social conflict.⁴³

In opposition to this, Leonie Huddy argues that “national identity is typically associated with mild-positive bias for one’s own country over others [...] but does not imply any necessary hatred of outsiders,” whereas “nationalism has greater potential to divide them, especially in ethnically diverse societies.”⁴⁴ She also argues that national identity and nationalism are closely linked, describing nationalism as an “attachment to the nation that spills over into chauvinism and a dislike of outsiders.”⁴⁵ Discrimination and social conflict often arise when groups define themselves in opposition to the other ones. Stefania Porcelli introduces the concept of “us” vs “them” which can lead to prejudice, stereotypes, and unequal treatment. The first group of ‘us’ represents people who are a part of the community and share common values. The group of ‘them’, in contrast, stands for those who are considered as different, not being a part of the group. This concept focuses on inclusion and exclusion and emphasizes the differences between groups, which might consequently lead to discrimination and separation.⁴⁶ In addition to this, the concept distinguishes such tendencies of people as “those driving for separation, those demanding reform, and those aiming for unification within a larger entity.”⁴⁷ This shows that

⁴³ L. Ramos, Fátima Bernardo, Sónia C. Riberio, and Veerle Van Eetvelde, “Landscape identity: Implications for policy making,” *Land Use Policy*, 53 (May 2016): 37.

⁴⁴ Leonie Huddy, “National Identity, Patriotism, and Nationalism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, ed. Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, Jack S. Levy and Jennifer Jerit (online: Oxford University Press, 2023), 771.

⁴⁵ Huddy, “National Identity, Patriotism, and Nationalism,” 770.

⁴⁶ Stefania Porcelli, “Elizabeth Bowen’s Wavering Attitude toward World War II Propaganda,” in *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, ed. Gae Lyn Henderson, M.J. Braun (Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 2016), 97.

⁴⁷ Geoff Eley, “Nationalism and the State by John Breuilly,” *Social History* 9, no. 3 (October 1984), 396.

nationalism is not always about separation, but it can also be about reforming an existing system or bringing fragmented groups together. Supported by John Etherington “we” (us) refers to people in the homeland (“here”) and “the other” (them) refers to people outside it (“there”). National identity is connected to these boundaries, showing who belongs and who is different based on place.⁴⁸ As Tim Ederson quotes Anthony Smith, this distinction between “us” and “them” is provided by the evidence of ethnic symbols. Ederson also cites, that the collection of shared symbols serves “to unite a group of people with shared experiences and memories and differentiate them from outsiders,” referencing to distinction of groups.⁴⁹ The fixed ideas about who “we” are, compared to “them,” can create exclusive national identities that focus on clear differences, rather than more open and inclusive ways of defining a nation.⁵⁰ Moreover, Gae Lyn Henderson, M. J. Braun, and Stefania Porcelli argue that this distinction between “us” and “them” occurs in wartime rhetoric. The word “they” is important in propaganda because it highlights the divide between “us” and “them,” often hiding deeper ideological conflicts. As Porcelli explains, “the pronouns ‘they’ is particularly significant with respect to the language used for propaganda purposes, which usually hides an ideological conflict between ‘us’ and ‘them,’” where “us” refers to the heroes and “them” represents the enemy.⁵¹ Moreover, Sigal R. Ben-Porath says, that “the undemocratic consequences of focusing on identity can grow into a significant threat due to the centrality of loyalty in wartime.”⁵² In other words, focusing too much on identity during wartime can harm democracy by prioritizing loyalty over freedoms, leading to unfair treatment and restrictions on rights. He also states that “wartime creates a demand for unconditional loyalty and ‘treats everything short of such loyalty as an act of unforgivable treason.’”⁵³ To put it simply, during wartime, there is a strong appeal for complete loyalty, and anything less than that is seen as a serious betrayal.

Concerning wartime matters, Cezar M. Ornatowski in his article *Rhetoric Goes to War: The Evolution of the United States of America’s Narrative of the “War On Terror”* refers to Kenneth Burke’s words, that “as the art of persuasion and argument, rhetoric has traditionally

⁴⁸ John Etherington, “Nationalism, Territoriality and National Territorial Belonging,” *Papers: Revista de Sociologia* 95, no. 2 (February 2010): 332.

⁴⁹ Tim Ederson, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*, 8.

⁵⁰ Tim Ederson, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*, 24.

⁵¹ Porcelli, “Elizabeth Bowen’s Wavering Attitude,” 97.

⁵² Sigal R. Ben-Porath, “Wartime Patriotism,” in *Handbook of Patriotism*, ed. Mitja Sardoč (Springer, 2020), 701.

⁵³ Ben-Porath, “Wartime Patriotism,” 702.

been considered in contrast to violent conflict, with persuasion, or, [...] symbolic inducement, the preferable alternative to the contest of war.”⁵⁴ Ornatowski argues, that

At its most basic rhetorical level, the war narrative defines the reason for war, the identity of the opposing sides, the stakes in the conflict, the ends to be pursued, as well as, implicitly or explicitly, the conduct, means, and duration of the conflict.⁵⁵

The war narrative explains why a war is happening, who the enemies are, and what the goals are. It also suggests how the war should be fought, what methods should be used, and the probable duration. However, during wartime, instead of stressing the differences within the nation, the aim of politicians and orators is to unite the members with an appeal to emotions of unity and love of their nation.

The evoked closeness towards one’s country might be summarized by the term patriotism. Human geographer Yi-Fu Tuan describes the term patriotism as “the love of one’s terra patria or natal land.”⁵⁶ In other words, patriotism represents love for the fatherland – an emotion, which is “rarely tied to any specific locality,” and is “evoked by abstract categories of pride and power, on the one hand, and by certain symbols, such as the flag on the other.”⁵⁷ Patriotism represents a feeling of attachment toward one’s country alongside with a willingness to protect and follow the country’s tradition and culture. According to Leonie Huddy, patriotism, in contrast to nationalism “is far more likely to unite citizens of a nation.” Patriotism is strongly aligned with national identity, as “both involve positive feelings for the nation and generate national solidarity and a liking for co-nationals.”⁵⁸ Stephen J. A. Ward delivers one of the categorizations of patriotism based on the strength of its emotional influence and its attitude toward other nations. The categories are extreme, moderate, and weak patriotism. Extreme patriotism sees one’s country as superior to others, prioritizes its interests above all else, and often involves uncritical support for its actions. This attitude can lead to prejudice against other nations and is closely related to extreme nationalism. Moderate patriotism reaches a balance, expressing love for one’s country while avoiding feelings of superiority or exclusion. It supports

⁵⁴ Cezar M. Ornatowski, “Rhetoric Goes to War: The Evolution of the United States of America’s Narrative of the ‘War On Terror’,” in *African Yearbook of Rhetoric*, ed. Philippe-Joseph Salazar (South Africa, University of Cape Town, 2012) 1.

⁵⁵ Ornatowski, “Rhetoric Goes to War,” 2.

⁵⁶ Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1990), 133.

⁵⁷ Tuan, *Topophilia*, 100.

⁵⁸ Huddy, “National Identity, Patriotism, and Nationalism,” 772.

the nation's prosperity within moral boundaries, encourages critical reflection on its actions, and promotes an inclusive attitude toward other countries. Weak patriotism, on the other hand, minimizes the importance of loyalty to one's country and focuses on the dangers of extreme patriotism.⁵⁹ In general, patriotism varies in what it focuses on, how strongly it is felt, and how it approaches relationships with other nations and cultures. Nonetheless, Yi-Fu Tuan presents another distinction yet with its attention to place. Tuan distinguishes two kinds of patriotism: local and imperial. As he reveals, "local patriotism rests on the intimate experience of place, and on a sense of the fragility of goodness: that which we love has no guarantee to endure. Imperial patriotism feeds on collective egotism and pride."⁶⁰ To put it differently, local patriotism is rooted in pride and emotional attachment to a specific region or community, emphasizing local traditions, heritage, and identity. It demonstrates a sense of belonging and unity within a smaller community. On the other hand, imperial patriotism represents a loyalty to an expansive empire. It often overshadows local identities as it embodies a unity under the dominant one. Since local patriotism highlights regional uniqueness, imperial patriotism seeks to strengthen power and loyalty across other territories. Nations shape spaces into meaningful places by projecting their identity and values onto them. This process makes landscape one of the prominent symbols of cultural and historical identity, both individual and collective. The ideologies of patriotism and nationalism tend to be evoked amongst the nation when, as mentioned above, there is a common feeling of need to distinguish itself from others. This happens most frequently when the country is under attack or under imperial power. Supported by Ben-Porath, "war and perceived threats on national security tend to generate a strong unification response."⁶¹ This tendency may occur in art, such as literature, or speeches of wartime orators and politicians. As Hugh Lawson-Tancred states, war and peace, and the defence of the realm are along with revenue, legislation, and imports and exports the most important subjects of deliberative (political) speakers.⁶² These topics are the most important issues that political speakers discuss. Such issues are crucial as they directly affect the well-being, security, and functioning of the nation. Political leaders or speakers focus on these topics in their speeches to guide decisions and actions that shape the future of the country. S. R. Ben-Porath argues that wartime strengthens patriotism by making people feel more grateful for the

⁵⁹ Stephen J. A. Ward, "Patriotism and Journalism," in *Handbook of Patriotism*, ed. Mitja Sardoč (Springer, 2020), 351–352.

⁶⁰ Tuan, *Topophilia*, 101.

⁶¹ Ben-Porath, "Wartime Patriotism," 698.

⁶² Hugh Lawson-Tancred, Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*. Penguin Classics (London; New York: Penguin, 1992), 96.

protection the country provides against outside threats. It brings people together through mutual support, a shared sense of purpose, and a common goal of defending the nation and its values. During the war, the idea of protecting the country becomes more important, and citizens are encouraged to work together for the greater good.⁶³ The idea of defence becomes a priority, and citizens are encouraged to cooperate and contribute for the benefit of everyone.

An inseparable part of the protection and commitment to one's country during wartime is a willingness to fight and kill threatening invaders. Aleksandar Pavković refers to Horace's ode: *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*, which can be translated as "it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country." The rest of the ode makes it clear that the "sweet and glorious" death refers to dying in battle while fighting for one's country, and that true patriotic fighting involves a willingness to risk one's own life.⁶⁴ Furthermore, Ben-Porath adds that during wartime, the idea of "the citizen," is replaced by "the soldier." Citizens are called soldiers and valued mainly for supporting the war, while soldiers, who fight directly, are seen as more important and valued. This underlines the psychological appreciation of common citizens. The sentiment that "we are all in this together" connotes the patriotic expression of closeness and unity.⁶⁵ As previously mentioned, every war has a narrative. Ornatowski highlights that "not of the least importance, for the soldiers who actually do the fighting for the civilians on the 'home front,' the war narrative serves the purpose of morale building."⁶⁶ Wartime orators presenting the story or message about the war are important for enhancing the morale of soldiers who are fighting, as well as for civilians at home who support the war effort. The narrative helps to inspire courage, unity, and a sense of purpose among both soldiers and civilians, making them feel that they are part of a shared cause and encouraging them to keep going despite the hardships of war. Supported by Anthony D. Smith, "There is no denying the central role of warfare as a mobilizer of ethnic sentiments and national consciousness, a centralizing force in the life of the community and a provider of myths and memories for future generations."⁶⁷ To put it in other words, an appeal to emotional ties to a particular territory, meaning homeland and its landscape plays a crucial role in mobilizing people for unity, particularly during wartime.

Warfare strengthens national identity by uniting people through speeches appealing to emotions, and symbols, and through controlled media. "The appeal on masses with dispatch

⁶³ Ben-Porath, "Wartime Patriotism," 697.

⁶⁴ Aleksandar Pavković, "Killing and Dying for One's Country," in *Handbook of Patriotism*, ed. Mitja Sardoč (Springer, 2020) 652–653.

⁶⁵ Ben-Porath, "Wartime Patriotism," 698.

⁶⁶ Ornatowski, "Rhetoric Goes to War," 67.

⁶⁷ Smith, *National Identity*, 27.

during crisis,” in Smith’s words, “has undergone a progress in the post-colonial states through the state’s intended symbolism in the schools, press, radio and TV.”⁶⁸ The wartime rhetoric of persuasion often appeals to emotions like fear, pride, or anger, emphasizing themes of patriotism, sacrifice, and the moral justification for war. Nonetheless, during World War II, the rapid growth of broadcasting served as a whole new tool for influencing the masses. Gae Lyn Henderson and M. J. Braun cite Jayson Harsin in the book *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy*, who summarizes that propaganda is “a rhetorical strategy,” and the main strategy modern democracies use to manage and reduce the conflicts of capitalism through speech and communication.⁶⁹ In this book, Stefania Porcelli indicates that propaganda had already been considered “a crucial weapon in modern warfare,” and she names propaganda the “war of words.”⁷⁰ Thomas Huckin cites the 1982 definition from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, explaining that “propaganda is more the less systematic effort to manipulate other people’s beliefs, attitudes, or actions by means of symbols (words, gestures, banners, monuments, music, clothing, insignia, hairstyles, designs on coins and postage stamps, and so forth).”⁷¹ Subsequently, he provides more of contemporary definitions. For instance, the one declaring that propaganda is the “information or ideas, which are often false, that an organization prints or broadcasts to make people agree with what it is saying,” or being used “to promote a political cause or point of view.”⁷² Putting all the definitions together, Huckin creates the following explanation, saying that

[p]ropaganda is false or misleading information or ideas addressed to a mass audience by parties who thereby gain advantage. Propaganda is created and disseminated systematically and does not invite critical analysis or response.⁷³

To put it briefly, propaganda is the use of false or misleading information to gain support, justify actions, and portray the enemy in a negative light. It aims to control public perception and put an end to critical questioning to strengthen one side’s position. According to Porcelli, during wartime, writers frequently offered their skills to create propaganda. To give an example, during

⁶⁸ Smith, *National Identity*, 115.

⁶⁹ Gae Lyn Henderson, M. J. Braun, “Introduction,” in *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, ed. Gae Lyn Henderson, M.J. Braun (Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 2016), 16.

⁷⁰ Porcelli, “Elizabeth Bowen’s Wavering Attitude,” 96.

⁷¹ Thomas Huckin, “Propaganda Defined,” in *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, ed. Gae Lyn Henderson, M.J. Braun (Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 2016), 121.

⁷² Huckin, “Propaganda Defined,” 123–124.

⁷³ Huckin, “Propaganda Defined,” 126.

the First World War in 1914, a group of British authors managed to create a myth of “an innocent and just Britain versus a violent, inhuman Germany.”⁷⁴ By using literature, speeches, and radio broadcast, the authors emphasized Britain as a defender of moral values, peace, and justice. On the other hand, Germany was portrayed as aggressive, cruel, and uncivilized. This myth not only strengthened national pride but also invoked a clear “us vs. them” mentality, which was crucial for maintaining morale and unity during the conflict. Clyde R. Miller exposes the situation during the early 20th century. At that time, radio brought foreign propaganda directly into American homes. American broadcasting networks aired speeches by prominent leaders such as Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, and Winston Churchill, giving Americans the opportunity to hear the messages and rhetoric of foreign powers. These broadcasts exposed listeners to a range of perspectives and propaganda techniques, showcasing radio’s global reach and its role as a powerful tool for spreading political messages, particularly during wartime.⁷⁵ These leaders understood how powerful radio was for reaching people directly in their homes. In the United States, as Miller states, “Father Coughlin, Huey Long, and Franklin D. Roosevelt won great masses of followers because they knew how to use the radio.”⁷⁶ Franklin D. Roosevelt used his “Fireside Chats” to reassure the nation during tough times, building trust and unity. According to Suzanne M. Daughton, Roosevelt is often regarded as the first mass-media president, largely due to the iconic status of his Fireside Chats in American political rhetoric. Baskerville and Willett agree that radio provided FDR with a unique connection to the electorate. They note that by beginning his Fireside Chats with phrases such as “my friends” and using familiar, down-to-earth imagery, Roosevelt quickly proved himself to be a skilled communicator – one who fostered an “intimate” presidency. Daughton quotes Hayes observing that Roosevelt personalized both himself and his audience, and he directly engaged each listener in personal intimacy. The radio industry initially presented the Fireside Chats as non-political reports on the nation’s state, but Roosevelt saw them as something more. Since he favoured the format, he envisioned himself as a neighbour or father speaking candidly at home. Though Roosevelt didn’t invent the phrase, he embraced it, even joking about its use. Kathleen Hall Jamieson argues that he transformed traditional oratory into a more intimate, mass-media-friendly form of communication.⁷⁷ As pointed out by Daughton,

⁷⁴ Porcelli, “Elizabeth Bowen’s Wavering Attitude,” 98.

⁷⁵ Clyde R. Miller, “Radio And Propaganda,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 213, no. 1 (January 1941): 71–72.

⁷⁶ Miller, “Radio And Propaganda,” 70.

⁷⁷ Suzanne M. Daughton, “FDR as Family Doctor: Medical Metaphors and the Role of Physician in the Fireside Chats” in *A Rhetorical History of the United States: Significant Moments in American Public Discourse 7*, ed. Thomas W. Benson (Michigan State University Press, 2006), 37–39.

“in his first fireside chat, Roosevelt reached an approximate sixty million Americans in twenty million homes.”⁷⁸ They all knew how to use the radio to speak to people’s emotions and gain support. Jason Loviglio in his article *Radio in Wartime: The Politics of Propaganda, Race, and the American Way in the Second World War* highlights that radio was essential during wartime because it helped unite the country by addressing different ideas about what it meant to represent “the people.” Moreover, radio became the first mass medium that could reach people across the entire nation where millions of people, regardless of where they lived, their social class, race, or ethnicity, could hear and engage with political ideas. Radio also created a new type of public space. This ability to bring diverse groups together made radio a powerful tool for uniting the nation while still representing its many voices.⁷⁹ The leading example of usage of the broadcasting methods would be the Second World War. In the article *War by Radio*, John B. Whitton observes that prior to the war, “radio propaganda was peculiarly a weapon of totalitarian power politics.” On the home front, both the armed forces and the public were encouraged to remain united and motivated and to make sacrifices. Enemy soldiers and civilians were exposed to messages, facts, and allegations, formulated to weaken their morale. In Germany, however, listening to foreign broadcasts was forbidden. Later on, in England, such listening has been discouraged as “unpatriotic.”⁸⁰ As Whitton states, the German radio sought to divide the American people. In contrast to this, the aim of the British radio was to unite the opinion of the American public and to inspire confidence in support of Britain. American and British radio propaganda became dynamic and it stressed the inseparable destiny of both nations.⁸¹ Speaking of propaganda’s tool to divide public opinion and portraying each party, Whitton cites Reverend Pat McCormick’s statement on BBC, voicing that “Britain and all that Britain stands for can never die; she is bound to win the day in the end, because she stands for the right, the good, the true and the noble.”⁸² This sheds a light on portraying Britain as a hero, saviour, defender, and the noble figure. Geys and Konrad agree, that the propaganda “explicitly emphasized the bestiality of the Germans,” which in line with theories of in-group was strengthened by an enemy out-group.⁸³ During the World War II, propaganda was prominent

⁷⁸ Suzanne M. Daughton, “FDR as Family Doctor: Medical Metaphors and the Role of Physician in the Fireside Chats” in *A Rhetorical History of the United States: Significant Moments in American Public Discourse 7*, ed. Thomas W. Benson (Michigan State University Press, 2006), 43.

⁷⁹ Jason Loviglio, “Radio in Wartime: The Politics of Propaganda, Race, and the American Way in the Second World War,” *American Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (December 2004): 1080.

⁸⁰ John B. Whitton, “War by Radio,” *Foreign Affairs* 19, no. 3 (April 1941): 589.

⁸¹ Whitton, “War by Radio,” 594.

⁸² Whitton, “War by Radio,” 590.

⁸³ Benny Geys, Kai A. Konrad, “Patriotism and Taxation,” in *Handbook of Patriotism*, ed. Mitja Sardoč (Springer, 2020), 810.

everywhere. One well-known example of these activities is Henry Morgenthau Jr.'s decision to work with Walt Disney to create the film *The New Spirit*. The story portrays Donald Duck listening to the radio and learning about the enemy and the importance of defending his country. Filled with patriotic emotions hearing from the broadcast, he is devoted to participating and supporting his nation in facing the threat. The radio informs him that the best way to help is by reporting his income and paying his taxes, which he does right after.⁸⁴ During World War II, propaganda played a crucial role in influencing public opinion and encouraging support for the war effort. This film was designed to encourage American citizens to fulfil their financial responsibilities to support the war.

In conclusion, rhetoric, nationalism, and patriotism are deeply connected in shaping national identity, especially during war and crisis. Rhetoric, as Aristotle and Cicero emphasized, uses persuasive techniques like emotional appeals and symbolic language to influence public opinion and unify citizens. Politicians and orators have long used these strategies to inspire loyalty and reinforce national pride. Nationalism, as explored by Anthony Smith and John Breuilly, can unite or divide societies. Smith highlights historical myths and symbols in fostering belonging, while Breuilly views nationalism as a political construct for unifying diverse populations. Patriotism, often seen as a more inclusive force, fosters love for one's country, encouraging civic duty and sacrifice, particularly in wartime. Nonetheless, propaganda played a crucial role in wartime communication, using rhetoric to manipulate perceptions, justify actions, and boost morale. Media, including radio broadcasts, literature, and films, became essential tools in spreading nationalist and patriotic messages. Ultimately, rhetoric, nationalism, and patriotism are powerful forces that shape public consciousness, particularly in times of war. While these elements can foster unity, pride, and resilience, they can also be used to manipulate public perception, suppress dissent, and create divisions. The strategic use of rhetoric and propaganda in wartime highlights the enormous influence language and symbols have in mobilizing societies, reinforcing national identity, and guiding the course of history.

⁸⁴ Benny Geys, Kai A. Konrad, "Patriotism and Taxation," in *Handbook of Patriotism*, ed. Mitja Sardoč (Springer, 2020), 810.

2. Rhetoric during World War II

As previously mentioned in the theoretical part, the use of language plays a crucial role in speeches and influencing the public. The structure of language influences how ideas are communicated and perceived, which makes them a powerful tool in rhetoric. The choice of words and rhetorical techniques, such as repetition, metaphor, and strong imagery, can evoke emotional responses and national unity. Thus, the way language is structured directly impacts the effectiveness of rhetoric in shaping public opinion and reinforcing collective identity. Not only the language structure but also emphasizing and incorporating the national symbols and values into the speech make the speech effective. This chapter focuses on such techniques along with symbols of particular national identities in the speeches of Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The speeches analysed include Churchill's speech *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat* (May 13, 1940), *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (June 4, 1940), *Their Finest Hour* (June 18, 1940), and *The Gift of a Common Tongue* (1943), and Roosevelt's *The Four Freedoms* (January 6, 1941), *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* (Radio Broadcast, December 29, 1940), and *The Infamy Speech/Pearl Harbour Address* (December 8, 1941). By analysing their oratory style, this chapter shows how their speeches became powerful tools in the war effort, shaping national identity and inspiring resilience in a time of global crisis.

One of the most praised orators of all time is Sir Winston Churchill. Since the beginning of the Second World War, the English Prime Minister became one of the most quoted leaders in history. His rhetorical skill has been praised to this day. Churchill, as delivered by Richard Toye, had been chosen as "Greatest Briton" in the 2002 programme in a public vote. As Toye quotes, "He made war seem honourable and heroic, he made defeat seem impossible, he made every individual proud of the part they played in history."⁸⁵ Lori Maguire cites another appraisal by the American journalist Edward R. Murrow, saying that Churchill "mobilized the English language and sent it into battle."⁸⁶ Churchill used the power of words as a weapon and his words became a powerful tool in the fight for freedom. Through his speeches, he invoked hope, strength, and determination to fight against Nazi Germany. His words and rhetoric motivated both soldiers and civilians and united them in a common cause. Louis Foley in his analysis *Churchill's "Anglo-Saxon" Words* studies Churchill's oratory style. He quotes Churchill saying "[m]y method is simple. I like to use Anglo-Saxon words with the least number of syllables." This indicates Churchill's belief that words with Anglo-Saxon roots are more "truly" English

⁸⁵ Richard Toye, *The Roar of the Lion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 15.

⁸⁶ Lori Maguire, "We Shall Fight: A Rhetorical Analysis of Churchill's Famous Speech," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17, no. 2 (Summer 2014): 256.

and therefore more powerful. Despite Churchill's claim, Foley argues that many of Churchill's powerful words, such as "method, simple, use, number, syllables," were borrowed from French, and previously from Latin. Therefore, Churchill's effectiveness as a speaker came from his skill in choosing and arranging words, not just from using short or Anglo-Saxon words.⁸⁷ Moreover, Churchill's decision to avoid words of French or other foreign origin underlines the importance of using the mother tongue, especially in times of national crisis. This evoked a sense of national unity and boosted collective morale. Another appraisal is delivered by the British historian Robert Rhodes James, who says that Churchill "had the capacity to take very complex themes and topics, and reduce them not to simplicities and clichés but to terms that others could understand without being talked down to."⁸⁸ Churchill was great at explaining complicated ideas, keeping the meaning clear to be understood by the general public. This is in accordance with a previous claim by Richard Toye, stating that orators should avoid using neutral words and use strong ones.⁸⁹ Lori Maguire argues, that during the war, Churchill's use of strong visual elements and active verbs (hold, sweep, cut, sever, run, plod, defend, seek, build, expand) brings the battle to life, helping the audience picture the struggle. This powerful language not only tells a story but also grabs attention, inspires, and encourages people to get ready for the fight.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, Churchill was aware of the importance of rhetoric, especially sound. Maguire quotes Churchill's youth:

The great influence of sound on the human brain is well known. The sentences of the orator when he appeals to his art become long, rolling and sonorous. The peculiar balance of the phrases produces a cadence which resembles blank verse rather than prose.⁹¹

Churchill is saying that sound has a powerful effect on the human mind. When the orator uses their skill, their sentences become long, rhythmic, and almost musical. The way they structure their words creates a flow that sounds more like poetry (blank verse) than ordinary speech (prose). This rhythm helps make their message more persuasive and memorable.

Another significant figure during the Second World War was American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Mary E. Stuckey reports a widely accepted belief that Roosevelt

⁸⁷ Louis Foley, "Churchill's 'Anglo-Saxon' Words," *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts* 6, no. 4 (July 1966): 1.

⁸⁸ Lori Maguire, "We Shall Fight: A Rhetorical Analysis of Churchill's Famous Speech," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17, no. 2 (Summer 2014): 260.

⁸⁹ Richard Toye, *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 49.

⁹⁰ Maguire, "We Shall Fight," 261.

⁹¹ Maguire, "We Shall Fight," 261.

was not a deeply philosophical leader. While he had numerous plans, programs, and ideas, scholars often claim that these did not form a consistent ideological framework. Stuckey reveals that Roosevelt was neither an ideologue nor a systematic thinker. However, she argues that he did follow a clear set of guiding principles that shaped his domestic and international policies.⁹² Vanessa B. Beasley and Deborah Smith-Howell quote James W. Ceaser and his colleagues, who insist that Roosevelt was one of the rare modern presidents who employed rhetoric “both wisely and well.” They point out that he used rhetoric strategically, particularly in times of crisis, when strong public leadership was essential.⁹³ This might be supported by Roderick P. Hart, implying that “the voices in FDR’s speeches are consistent with the thematic patterns.” Hart also classified such themes “as those addressing ‘patriotic values, moral or spiritual attitudes towards problems of the day’ and systemic ones as dealing with ‘legal or technological solutions to human problems.’”⁹⁴ Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo Braden describe Roosevelt’s approach to the American people as that he “made them feel that they ‘knew Roosevelt, intimately and well.’” Roosevelt was considered a leader whose audience “could feel connected, with whom followers could feel connected, likely due to his consistent efforts to address them directly and in “their own language.”⁹⁵ Harold P. Zelko analysed Roosevelt’s speaking style, praising his exceptional ability to inspire audiences and unite them in support of democracy. Zelko applauded Roosevelt’s “splendid vocal quality” and “rare charm,” attributing these strengths to the rhythmic flow of his sentences and ideas. Roosevelt’s power to uplift the nation and motivate its citizens stemmed largely from his skilful use of emotional appeal and rhetorical strategies, relying more on emotions than on logical argumentation.⁹⁶ As stated by Vanessa B. Beasley and Deborah Smith-Howell, Roosevelt “had a gift, and he also seemed to be consistently gifted.”⁹⁷ Suzanne M. Daughton adds, that reviews of Roosevelt’s speech drafts reveal his distinct style, marked by his own edits, famous phrases, and consistent use of alliteration, anaphora, and nautical metaphors. One former speechwriter even noted that Roosevelt was “a better phrase maker than anyone he ever had around him.” As Labor Secretary Perkins outlines,

⁹² Mary E. Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of American Power* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2013) 15.

⁹³ Vanessa B. Beasley, and Deborah Smith-Howell, “No Ordinary Rhetorical President: FDR’s Speechmaking and Leadership, 1933–1945” in *A Rhetorical History of the United States: Significant Moments in American Public Discourse* 7, ed. Thomas W. Benson (Michigan State University Press, 2006), 6.

⁹⁴ Beasley and Smith-Howell, “No Ordinary Rhetorical President,” 21.

⁹⁵ Beasley and Smith-Howell, “No Ordinary Rhetorical President,” 5–6.

⁹⁶ Pat J. Gehrke, *The Ethics and Politics of Speech: Communication and Rhetoric in the Twentieth Century* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2009), 54–55.

⁹⁷ Beasley and Smith-Howell, “No Ordinary Rhetorical President,” 5.

[h]is voice and his facial expression as he spoke were those of an intimate friend. . . . I realized how unconscious he was of the twenty or thirty of us in that room and how clearly his mind was focused on the people listening at the other end. As he talked his head would nod and his hands would move in simple, natural, comfortable gestures. His face would smile and light up as though he were actually sitting on the front porch or in the parlor with them. People felt this, and it bound them to him in affection.⁹⁸

This statement emphasizes Roosevelt's ability to connect personally with his audience, making his speeches feel like intimate conversations rather than formal addresses. His voice and expressions conveyed warmth, sincerity, and familiarity, creating the impression that he was speaking directly to each listener rather than addressing a mass audience. The way he naturally nodded his head and moved his hands while speaking added to this effect, making his delivery feel effortless and genuine. Even in a room filled with staff, his focus remained entirely on the unseen audience at the other end of the radio, reinforcing the sense of personal connection. This approach made listeners feel as though Roosevelt was sitting with them on their front porch, fostering trust and affection at a time when the nation needed reassurance. Roosevelt's rhetoric was equally powerful as Churchill's, although their styles were different. It can be also argued, that Roosevelt's speeches were less poetic than the ones by Winston Churchill. Roosevelt's speeches focused on clarity, relatability, and calm reassurance, well-suited to the crises.

As reported by Zelko, Churchill's speeches were described as energetic and persuasive, mixing emotion with logic and appealing to values like patriotism, justice, and duty. His ability to connect with audiences was admired, and his emotional appeals were seen as ethical. Similarly, Roosevelt was praised for his voice, charm, and ability to inspire people, not for logical arguments or open discussions. Like Churchill, he used emotion and rhetorical strategies to rally support for democracy. The key difference in how these speakers were judged seemed to depend on their political goals rather than their use of emotion itself. In contrast to Churchill's poetic grandeur, Roosevelt's rhetoric was pragmatic, heartfelt, and accessible.⁹⁹ The different focus and purpose shaped the rhetorical style of both leaders. The purpose of Churchill's speeches was often to galvanize Britain for war and to strengthen people's confidence. On the

⁹⁸ Suzanne M. Daughton, "FDR as Family Doctor: Medical Metaphors and the Role of Physician in the Fireside Chats" in *A Rhetorical History of the United States: Significant Moments in American Public Discourse 7*, ed. Thomas W. Benson (Michigan State University Press, 2006), 42.

⁹⁹ Gehrke, *The Ethics and Politics of Speech*, 55–54.

other hand, Roosevelt's speeches aimed to reassure Americans and focused on stability. To conclude, both leaders used different rhetorical strategies to achieve their goals.

Regarding rhetorical strategies, both Churchill and Roosevelt used a number of literary devices usually associated with poetry. As previously mentioned in the theoretical part, Alina-Elena Onet underlines the power of linguistic devices in shaping and influencing decisions, for instance, the use of tone, emphasis, and vivid imagery.¹⁰⁰ Churchill recognized the poetic dimension of oratory. He clearly understood the importance of sound, expressing that

[t]he great influence of sound on the human brain is well known. The sentences of the orator when he appeals to his art become long, rolling and sonorous. The peculiar balance of the phrases produces a cadence which resembles blank verse rather than prose.¹⁰¹

To explain Churchill's statement, sound and rhythm have a powerful impact on oratory. Using long, and smooth sentences with a balanced musical flow makes the speech sound like poetry. The rhythm helps to make the speech more powerful and memorable. This aligns with Cicero's canon of memory about remembering and delivering a speech effectively.¹⁰² The prominent linguistic devices in wartime rhetoric examined by Onet are metaphors and imagery. In her words, metaphors and imagery play a key role in shaping stories of sacrifice and triumph. Orators use these devices to turn abstract ideas into relatable and vivid pictures. Metaphors link the known to the unknown, making complex ideas easier to understand. On the other hand, imagery paints clear pictures of victory.¹⁰³ Onet highlights the importance of sacrifice and triumph in wartime speeches. She compares sacrifice to "a flame that burns brightly, consuming everything in its path," "a heavy weight that must be carried on one's shoulders, or as a wound that never entirely heals." Triumph, on the other hand, is like "a rising sun, illuminating the darkness and bringing new hope" or "a soaring eagle, breaking through the chains of adversity and rising to new heights."¹⁰⁴ Using metaphors and imagery helps us connect with the ideas of sacrifice and victory, making these powerful stories easier to feel and understand.

Wartime speeches are rich in metaphors and imagery. *Blood, Toil, Sweat, and Tears* speech by Winston Churchill is one of them. In this speech, Churchill prepares the British

¹⁰⁰ Alina-Elena Onet, "Rhetoric in Times of Conflict: A Study of Famous War-Time Speeches," *"Nicolae Bălcescu" Land Forces Academy, Sibiu, Romania* 30, no. 2 (July 2024): 1–2.

¹⁰¹ Maguire, "We Shall Fight," 261.

¹⁰² Toye, *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*, 51.

¹⁰³ Onet, "Rhetoric in Times of Conflict," 2.

¹⁰⁴ Onet, "Rhetoric in Times of Conflict," 1.

people for the hardships ahead, acknowledging the struggle required to defeat Nazi Germany. By stating “I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat” he emphasizes the sacrifices that will be necessary for victory. “Victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory, however long and hard the road may be.” Here, the repetition of the word “victory” stresses the worth of all sacrifices, no matter how difficult. Another example of sacrifice can be seen in the statements “[w]e have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind,” and “[w]e have before us many, many long months of struggle and of suffering.” Here, Churchill acknowledges that the war will be a long and painful struggle. He prepares people for the fact that Britain would face extreme suffering and agony. The statement “[f]or without victory, there is no survival” portrays the existential struggle and justifies the sacrifices needed to secure victory. “The urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal,” and “[c]ome then, let us go forward together with our united strength” suggests that everyone must participate since Britain’s fight is part of a larger conflict.¹⁰⁵

Another speech rich in imagery and metaphors is *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. This speech was presented by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on June 4, 1940, after the evacuation of British and French troops from Dunkirk back to England. It expresses the willingness of British people to fight and highlights their sacrifices. Moreover, Churchill’s use of imagery captures the situation on the front. By using descriptive language, he creates a vivid picture in the audience’s mind.

“Behind this armoured and mechanised onslaught came a number of German divisions in lorries, and behind them again there plodded comparatively slowly the dull brute mass of the ordinary German Army.”¹⁰⁶

The use of words such as “plodded,” “dull,” “brute mass” and “armoured and mechanised onslaught” emphasize that even though these forces might be slower, they are still an immense threat, capable of massive destruction. The descriptive language can be also displayed in statements “the German eruption swept like a sharp scythe around the right and rear of the Armies of the north,” along with “I have said this armoured scythe-stroke almost reached Dunkirk-almost but not quite.” Here, Churchill uses the metaphor, comparing the German

¹⁰⁵ Winston Churchill, *Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat*, May 13, 1940, National Churchill Museum, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/blood-toil-tears-and-sweat.html>.

¹⁰⁶ Winston Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*, June 4, 1940, National Churchill Museum, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/we-shall-fight-on-the-beaches.html>.

attack to a “scythe-stroke.” Another metaphor has been used in “silence reigned over Calais, which marked the end of a memorable resistance.” Further examples of the use of such descriptive language might be demonstrated in the following passages:

This struggle was protracted and fierce. Suddenly the scene has cleared, the crash and thunder has for the moment-but only for the moment-died away. A miracle of deliverance, achieved by valor, by perseverance, by perfect discipline, by faultless service, by resource, by skill, by unconquerable fidelity, is manifest to us all.¹⁰⁷

Another description is provided in

The Royal Air Force engaged the main strength of the German Air Force, and inflicted upon them losses of at least four to one; and the Navy, using nearly 1,000 ships of all kinds, carried over 335,000 men, French and British, out of the jaws of death and shame, to their native land and to the tasks which lie immediately ahead.¹⁰⁸

Churchill also implies detailed descriptions in passages, such as “to ride out the storm of war, and to outlive the menace of tyranny, if necessary for years, if necessary alone.”¹⁰⁹

Winston Churchill’s rhetoric enhances descriptive language also in *Their Finest Hour* (1940) speech. This might be highlighted in the following passage.

Now, the Navy have never pretended to be able to prevent raids by bodies of 5,000 or 10,000 men flung suddenly across and thrown ashore at several points on the coast some dark night or foggy morning.¹¹⁰

Churchill describes the enemy as “crafty and cunning and full of novel treacheries and stratagems.” The use of metaphor can be displayed in

all our injured machines and their crews which get down safely-and, surprisingly, a very great many injured machines and men do get down safely in modern air fighting-all of these will fall, in an attack upon

¹⁰⁷ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁰⁸ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁰⁹ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹¹⁰ Winston Churchill, *Their Finest Hour*, June 18, 1940, National Churchill Museum, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/their-finest-hour.html>.

these Islands, on friendly soil and live to fight another day; whereas all the injured enemy machines and their complements will be total losses as far as the war is concerned.¹¹¹

Here, Churchill describes machines as injured, using a metaphor of personification primarily used for living beings, especially humans and animals. Another use of metaphors contains the passage “the winter will impose a strain upon the Nazi regime, with almost all Europe writhing and starving under its cruel heel, which, for all their ruthlessness, will run them very hard.” Additionally, Churchill utters that if the British can stand up to the Germans, “the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, [...] will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science.”¹¹² All of the speeches mentioned depict the sacrifices of human lives. His words conveyed that every person had a role to play, whether on the battlefield or at home. Churchill framed sacrifice as a duty, one that would be remembered with honour in history.

Shaping events in history, even though not directly fighting with their armed soldiers, American people were also making sacrifices even before the war started. The United States remained in the neutral isolationist status. According to Brooke L. Blower, historians frequently use the term “isolationism” as a key theme to frame the interwar period between 1919 and 1941 in the United States. This period is portrayed as a time when the U.S. avoided deep political commitments abroad since the country was struggling with the financial crisis and consequences of the First World War.¹¹³ Tom Streissguth and Lora Friedenthal explain escalating political tensions in Europe, with the U.S. Congress sougning to avoid another World War I scenario. Nonintervention was widely supported by both Republicans and Democrats, as well as the public. Despite President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s opposition, Congress passed a series of Neutrality Acts to keep the U.S. out of foreign conflicts, which he signed due to strong public sentiment.¹¹⁴ This was followed by increasing isolationist feelings, as the First World War reinforced many Americans’ perception of foreigners as a threat to their values. The slogan “America First!” gained particular popularity in the Midwest, where many believed that European nations were corrupt and that the war had only served to benefit wealthy industrialists,

¹¹¹ Churchill, *Their Finest Hour*. online.

¹¹² Churchill, *Their Finest Hour*. online.

¹¹³ Brooke L. Blower, “From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941,” *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 3 (April 2014): 345.

¹¹⁴ Tom Streissguth, and Lora Friedenthal, *Isolationism: Key Concepts in American History*, ed. Jennifer L. Weber (Chelsea House Pub, 2010), 10.

bankers, and arms manufacturers.¹¹⁵ Added by Ronald I. Rubin, some isolationists, particularly extreme nationalists, opposed foreign involvement due to deep distrust of outsiders. Anti-British sentiment was common, especially among Irish and German immigrants, who shared little beyond their dislike of England. This perspective influenced figures like Senator Robert La Follette, who opposed U.S. intervention in World War I. He portrayed Britain as

a hereditary monarchy. . . with a hereditary landed system, with a limited and restricted suffrage for one class and a multiplied suffrage power for another, and with grinding industrial conditions for all wage workers¹¹⁶

In the Interwar period due to First World War and colonial trauma, President Roosevelt faced a heavy task. He aimed to convince Congress and the American public that the war in Europe was also a threat to the United States, with Britain defending the common interests on the front line against Nazi Germany. Winston Churchill strongly urged the United States to abandon isolationism as he was aware of the fact that American involvement was crucial for defeating the enemy and securing global stability. For the American people, this would mean the sacrifice of giving up the status of isolationism focusing on domestic, economic, and social development. *The Four Freedoms* by President Roosevelt declared “[w]e oppose enforced isolation for ourselves or for any other part of the Americas.” This means that the US must give up the comfort of isolation and willingly engage in global struggles for the greater good. Roosevelt aimed to convince the American public, saying that “[t]he American people have unalterably set their faces against that tyranny,” making a sacrifice by fighting. Also, he metaphorically describes the sacrifice as they need “[t]o change a whole nation from a basis of peacetime production of implements of peace to a basis of wartime production of implements of war [...]” To put it differently, there is a need for national sacrifice as the country must transform its economy and industry to war-focused production. Roosevelt calls to action, by uttering that “the nation's hands must not be tied when the nation's life is in danger.” The metaphor is depicted in the “nation’s life.” Another metaphor Roosevelt delivers in the passage warning of the “selfish men who would clip the wings of the American eagle in order to feather their own nests,” using a symbol of the American eagle which symbolizes America. Moreover, Roosevelt himself discloses the speech saying “I have called for personal sacrifice, and I am assured of

¹¹⁵ Tom Streissguth, and Lora Friedenthal, *Isolationism: Key Concepts in American History*, ed. Jennifer L. Weber (Chelsea House Pub, 2010), 4.

¹¹⁶ Ronald I. Rubin, “The Persistence of American Isolationism,” *Pakistan Horizon* 19, no. 3 (Third Quarter 1966): 242–243.

the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.”¹¹⁷ This evokes the idea of moral responsibility and unity.

Examples of the expression of descriptive language can be displayed in *The Great Arsenal of Democracy*, delivered by President Roosevelt on December 29, 1940. The metaphorical title of the speech itself refers to the U.S. as the Arsenal. This represents the idea that the U.S. must produce weapons and supplies to defend democracy. Roosevelt says that “[i]f Great Britain goes down, the Axis powers will control the Continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, Austral-Asia, and the high seas.” This indicates the sacrifices made by Great Britain, holding the line fighting the Nazi enemy. Roosevelt uses a metaphor, declaring that “there will be no ‘bottlenecks’ in our determination to aid Great Britain.”

Another set of metaphors might be expressed in *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* by Roosevelt. In the statement

[n]o man can tame a tiger into a kitten by stroking it. There can be no appeasement with ruthlessness. There can be no reasoning with an incendiary bomb,

Roosevelt metaphorically compares Nazi Germany to a tiger and explosive bomb.¹¹⁸ As stated by Roosevelt, “[t]he fate of these nations tells us what it means to live at the point of a Nazi gun,” with “gun” symbolizing constant fear, military control, and brutality under Nazi rule. Consequently, the U.S. “must be the great arsenal of democracy,” and sacrifice their military resources and industry to arm and support democratic nations, concretely Britain. By stating “I call for that national effort,” Roosevelt implies the collective sacrifice of every citizen. More metaphors occur in “[l]et us no longer blind ourselves to the undeniable fact that the evil forces which have crushed and undermined and corrupted so many others are already within our own gates.” The phrase “already within our own gates” compares the nation to a fortified city, where gates symbolize defence or borders. By saying that “evil forces” are already inside, Roosevelt suggests that the threat is not just outside but has infiltrated the country.¹¹⁹ This creates a sense of urgency and danger, encouraging people to recognize the problem and take action before it’s too late. It draws on historical imagery of blockading warfare, where once an enemy is inside,

¹¹⁷ Franklin D. Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*, January 6, 1941, American Rhetoric, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrthefourfreedoms.htm>.

¹¹⁸ Franklin D. Roosevelt, *The Great Arsenal of Democracy*, December 29, 1940, American Rhetoric, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrarsenalofdemocracy.html>.

¹¹⁹ Roosevelt, *The Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

destruction is hard to prevent. Roosevelt likely used this metaphor to rally people to recognize the threat and take action before it was too late.

The Infamy Speech was delivered by Roosevelt on December 8, 1941 – the day after Japan attacked American Pearl Harbor. Roosevelt refers to December 7 as “a date which will live in infamy,” when “very many American lives have been lost.”¹²⁰ This demonstrates the biggest sacrifice, which is the loss of human life. He acknowledges the national sacrifice of soldiers and civilians who died in the attack. He declares,

“[n]o matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory, [...] with confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph—so help us God.”

In this passage, Roosevelt emphasizes the determination and unity of the American people, suggesting that victory will require great personal sacrifices. The phrase “so help us God” adds a moral and almost sacred dimension, reinforcing the idea that their struggle is just and necessary.

Further rhetoric methods of fostering unity and resilience Onet highlights are repetition and parallelism. These powerful rhetorical devices are used by speakers to emphasize important topics and values. It helps orators to stress the key ideas and make the speech memorable. Repetition and parallelism are common stylistic tools used in poetry, stories, songs, writing, and speeches. Repetition involves using the same words, phrases, ideas, or themes multiple times. Both methods are related but parallelism focuses on placing phrases with similar structures close together, often expressing the same idea with small variations. By repeating certain words or phrases, writers create rhythm and consistency, making the message feel more connected. This can be especially comforting during crises when people seek reassurance and stability. Parallelism, meanwhile, brings balance and symmetry, highlighting important ideas. Together, repetition and parallelism foster unity and resilience, giving people the clarity and strength to face and overcome challenges.¹²¹ The most significant examples of repetition occur in Churchill’s *We Shall Fight* speech:

¹²⁰ Franklin D. Roosevelt, *Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation*, December 8, 1941, American Rhetoric, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrpearlharbor.htm>.

¹²¹ Onet, “Rhetoric in Times of Conflict,” 3.

We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, [...].¹²²

The repetition of the phrase “[w]e shall fight” reinforces the unwavering commitment of Britain. It strengthens Churchill’s call to resilience and builds strength, determination, and unity. This repetitive structure gives people confidence and encourages them to stand together.

Analysing the oratory style of Franklin Roosevelt, there are notably fewer poetic devices. As already mentioned, Roosevelt’s speeches were powerful, but less poetic in comparison with the speeches of Winston Churchill. Roosevelt’s speeches focused on clarity and calm reassurance. This was achieved with the use of alliteration. Similarly to Churchill’s speeches, alliteration appears right in the name of *The Four Freedoms* speech by Roosevelt. The repetition of the letter “f” appears in the “Four Freedoms” along with “freedom from fear,” “faithful to the facts.” By the repetition of the letters “i,” “n,” and “p” in “immediate and immense,” “nation nourished by peace,” and “peaceful and permanent” Roosevelt stresses the meaning of those words. Other examples are the letter “s,” in words such as “simple, sincere,” “steady, sturdy stream,” “strength and security,” “save succeeding generations,” “serious sacrifice,” selfish and short-sighted men,” and “spirit of service.”¹²³ Orators in their speeches emphasize not only strong words but also those representing certain value. Emphasizing words such as “freedom,” faithfulness, strength, security, and peace evokes strong emotional responses in people by appealing to their beliefs and values. Those words and motifs they represent are used to unify, inspire, and persuade audiences. Similarly to Churchill, Roosevelt uses repetition to emphasize important values.

Both politicians, Churchill and Roosevelt, emphasize similar principles, such as freedom, victory, and resistance, and they call for unity. To underscore those values effectively, they use various rhetorical and language tools. Each of the orators, however, approached a different audience. As indicated in the theoretical part, rhetoric helps speakers influence their audience through carefully chosen words, an appropriate speech style, and emotional

¹²² Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹²³ Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

connections. It often appeals to shared values, feelings, and symbols. The speaker must adjust such linguistic tools and choose the right form of speech to deliver the message effectively. To persuade the audience, orators must find common ground and consider the audience's nature. Winston Churchill motivates the British people, calling for courage and bravery. He stresses the defence of the British islands while emphasizing the strength of the British Empire. In 1897, according to Phillips Payson O'Brien, Winston Churchill strongly believed in his own future and the strength of the British Empire. Although he questioned some policies, he was sure that the empire should be powerful and that he was the right person to lead it. His upbringing taught him that serving the empire would also support his own success.¹²⁴ He also gives hope to the nation and attempts Americans to join the war. With Churchill's callings and the war approaching, Roosevelt argued that Americans needed to rethink their isolationist position due to the growing national threat. Roosevelt framed Americans as good neighbours and good Christians, who are mobilized not under a controlling government but as a disciplined force protecting their shared national community and values.¹²⁵

Franklin D. Roosevelt appeals to the core values of the American nation. As stated by Mary E. Stuckey, the values Roosevelt called upon were "faith, work, and social justice." The set of values included "the primacy of transcendent goods above material goods, the moral value of work, and a commitment to social justice."¹²⁶ His rhetoric revolved around the appropriate use of power, his concern for social order, the importance of work, the need for individuals and nations to exert social responsibility, and the importance of character for both individuals and nations." Also, religion was a unifying force of the nation which Roosevelt frequently demonstrated by references to Judeo-Christian teachings.¹²⁷ The most important value, however, was democracy. This in Roosevelt's politics required "a spirit of justice, a spirit of teamwork, a spirit of sacrifice, and, above all, a spirit of neighborliness."¹²⁸ Above all, Roosevelt's set of values with a spirit of neighbourliness can be represented by the metaphorical concept of the "good neighbour." During his first inaugural speech, he stated,

[i]n the field or world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy
of the good neighbor – the neighbor who resolutely respects himself

¹²⁴ Phillips Payson O'Brien, *The Strategists: Churchill, Stalin, Roosevelt, Mussolini, and Hitler--How War Made Them and How They Made War* (London: Penguin Random House UK, 2024), 25.

¹²⁵ O'Brien, *The Strategists*, 61.

¹²⁶ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 25.

¹²⁷ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 26.

¹²⁸ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 17.

and, because he does so, respects the rights of others – the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements and in with a world of neighbors.¹²⁹

This passage declares that a country should be a good neighbour by respecting itself, honouring its agreements, and treating other nations fairly. It emphasizes mutual respect, cooperation, and the importance of peaceful relationships in a world where all nations are connected. Another statement he delivered was that “[a] democracy, the right kind of democracy, is bound together by the ties of neighborliness.”¹³⁰ With neighbourliness representing cooperation, honour, respect, trust, understanding, and peace, this concept might be best outlined as political friendship.¹³¹ Roosevelt’s “good neighbor” metaphor promoted a democratic vision of the world and international relations, emphasizing equality and cooperation. He saw global relations as a neighbourhood where all nations had equal rights and voices. In contrast, Britain’s democracy was hierarchical, supporting a class system at home and colonialism abroad. Winston Churchill strongly believed in the honour and power of the British Empire, meanwhile, Roosevelt was “prominently, consistently, and clearly anticolonist,” and did not hide this fact from either Churchill or Stalin.¹³² Based on Michael Lind’s claim in *The American Way of Strategy* published in 2006, “the major external threats to both the American people and the American way of life are empire and anarchy.”¹³³ This highlights the ongoing attitude towards imperial powers. Even though both leaders differed in their view of democracy, they shared, fought for, and upheld the same values. Furthermore, their approach to the public featured different symbols, which were symbolic for the national audience.

Even though the rhetorical approaches to British and American audiences differ, language remains the most prominent uniting aspect. Not just the way language is used, but what it symbolizes. As mentioned in the theoretical part, speaking a common language is a key unifying symbol. *The Gift of a Common Tongue* speech was presented by Winston Churchill on September 6, 1943, at Harvard University. In this speech, Churchill, as the title suggests, acknowledges the importance of speaking the common tongue. It emphasizes the deep linguistics, cultural, and historical ties between the United States and Great Britain, particularly during the harsh times of World War II. Using the same language can serve as a uniting force

¹²⁹ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 16.

¹³⁰ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 25.

¹³¹ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 16.

¹³² Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 54.

¹³³ Michael Lind, *The American Way of Strategy: U.S. Foreign Policy and the American Way of Life* (Oxford University Press, 2008), 21.

between two nations. This makes communication and understanding easier and creates a strong bond between groups. Churchill recognizes its importance by referring to Otto von Bismarck, voicing that

[t]he great Bismarck – for there were once great men in Germany – is said to have observed towards the close of his life that the most potent factor in human society at the end of the nineteenth century was the fact that the British and American peoples spoke the same language. That was a pregnant saying. Certainly it has enabled us to wage war together with an intimacy and harmony never before achieved among allies. This gift of a common tongue is a priceless inheritance, and it may well some day become the foundation of a common citizenship.¹³⁴

Churchill highlights the shared English language as a powerful unifying force between Britain and the U.S., enabling close wartime cooperation. He suggests this linguistic bond could one day lead to even deeper unity, possibly a form of shared citizenship. He continues by

[I]aw, language, literature – these are considerable factors. Common conceptions of what is right and decent, a marked regard for fair play, especially to the weak and poor, a stern sentiment of impartial justice, and above all the love of personal freedom, or as Kipling put it: “Leave to live by no man’s leave underneath the law” – these are common conceptions on both-sides of the ocean among the English-speaking peoples.¹³⁵

Churchill emphasizes that the English-speaking nations share more than just a common language – they are united by deep cultural values, including respect for law, justice, and personal freedom. He sees these principles as fundamental to both British and American societies, reinforcing their strong alliance and shared vision for the world. Therefore, he highlights the cooperation between Britain and the United States by saying:

[t]hroughout all this ordeal and struggle which is characteristic of our age, you will find in the British Commonwealth and Empire good

¹³⁴ Winston Churchill, *The Gift of a Common Tongue*, September 6, 1943, International Churchill Society, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1941-1945-war-leader/the-gift-of-a-common-tongue/>.

¹³⁵ Churchill, *The Gift of a Common Tongue*. online.

comrades to whom you are united by other ties besides those of State policy and public need. To a large extent, they are the ties of blood and history.¹³⁶

In this passage, Churchill also stresses the “ties of blood and history,” referring to ethnic, cultural, and historical connections.

In all this, we march together. Not only do we march and strive shoulder to shoulder at this moment under the fire of the enemy on the fields of war or in the air, but also in those realms of thought which are consecrated to the rights and the dignity of man.¹³⁷

This follows the sentiment “we are all in this together” presented by Ornatowski.¹³⁸ One of the principal uniting themes of the speeches was a portrayal of the enemy that both countries faced together. Both speakers refer to Nazi Germany as “tyranny,” “evil,” using the metaphorical symbolism of “Satan” while referring to Adolf Hitler. The same enemy and the same language function as uniting symbols of both nations.

Another one of the national symbols, which was used by Churchill is an island representing the territory of Great Britain. He referred to Britain as “the Island” protected by the sea to emphasize its geographical and symbolic uniqueness. This phrase reinforced Britain’s distinct identity as a nation which is separated from continental Europe. By this, he highlights British isolation and resilience. By referring to Britain as “the Island” he painted a picture of the nation standing alone against Nazi Germany in 1940. By calling Britain “the Island,” Churchill strengthened the idea that the sea was the barrier and protection of the nation’s fight against the enemy. Churchill repeatedly refers to Britain as “the Island” in all of his speeches. This can be demonstrated in the *We Shall Fight* speech, indicating “defending the air above this Island against an overseas attack,” “the exertions which we make in this Island,” “the time being in this Island,” “defences in this Island,” to defend our Island home,” “we shall defend our Island,” and “this Island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving.”¹³⁹ Besides the symbolism of the island, Churchill also frequently mentions the Empire which he strongly

¹³⁶ Churchill, *The Gift of a Common Tongue*. online.

¹³⁷ Churchill, *The Gift of a Common Tongue*. online.

¹³⁸ Ornatowski, “Rhetoric Goes to War,” 67.

¹³⁹ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

believed in. The rich history of the Empire symbolizes continuity and perseverance which would also remain his great strategic goal. This can be demonstrated in a following passage:

Let that be realised; no survival for the British Empire, no survival for all that the British Empire has stood for, no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal.¹⁴⁰

He also depicts it as the symbol of continuity in

[u]pon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life, and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire.

Moreover, other symbols of monarchy are associated with the British Empire. For instance, “His Majesty,” “British Fleet,” and “Parliament.”

Franklin D. Roosevelt, in contrast, drew attention to transcendent values, rather than material. According to Mary E. Stuckey, Roosevelt emphasized that the nation’s true power did not come from its wealth or resources but from its faith. He distinguished between the country’s material and moral foundations, linking its strength to the moral ones. For him, national unity was rooted in shared spiritual values. This belief shaped Roosevelt’s rhetoric which lacked the use of material symbols in his speeches, such as the power of the Empire.¹⁴¹ However, besides his “good neighbour” policy including cooperation, unity, faith, and freedom, there were a number of symbols distinctive to the American identity. One of the examples is the eagle, the American national animal. Roosevelt metaphorically states, “[w]e must especially beware of that small group of selfish men who would clip the wings of the American eagle in order to feather their own nests.”¹⁴² Clipping the wings of the eagle conveys tearing down America’s strength to gain wealth and benefits at the country’s expense.

Another symbol of national identity is the historical past. Roosevelt’s speeches contain such references, for instance, “[n]ever before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now.”¹⁴³ The references to Jamestown and Plymouth Rock symbolize the very beginning of American civilization and English settlers.

¹⁴⁰ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁴¹ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 28.

¹⁴² Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

¹⁴³ Roosevelt, *The Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

Roosevelt hardly uses references to past conflicts, but only as a reminder of events during which the U.S. followed its isolationist status. It also accentuates the long path of the democratic way of life. This underlines the importance of democratic values to the American people. For instance, the passage from *The Four Freedoms* captures that

[w]hile the Napoleonic struggles did threaten interests of the United States because of the French foothold in the West Indies and Louisiana, and while we engaged in the War of 1812 to vindicate our right to peaceful trade, it is nevertheless clear that neither France nor Great Britain nor any other nation was aiming at domination of the whole world.¹⁴⁴

Here Roosevelt suggests that while the Napoleonic Wars and the War of 1812 threatened U.S. interests, they weren't about global domination – just regional power struggles.

Winston Churchill, in contrast, often used historical events and figures in his speeches to inspire and persuade his audience. He drew parallels between past conflicts and present struggles, showing how history shaped the current moment.

There never has been, I suppose, in all the world, in all the history of war, such an opportunity for youth. The Knights of the Round Table, the Crusaders, all fall back into the past-not only distant but prosaic; these young men, going forth every morn to guard their native land and all that we stand for, holding in their hands these instruments of colossal and shattering power, of whom it may be said that: Every morn brought forth a noble chance and every chance brought forth a noble knight, deserve our gratitude, as do all the brave men who, in so many ways and on so many occasions, are ready, and continue ready to give life and all for their native land.¹⁴⁵

Churchill compares young soldiers to legendary heroes such as the Knights of the Round Table and the Crusaders. Churchill most frequently refers to Napoleon, for instance:

[w]e are told that Herr Hitler has a plan for invading the British Isles. This has often been thought of before. When Napoleon lay at Boulogne

¹⁴⁴ Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

¹⁴⁵ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

for a year with his flat-bottomed boats and his Grand Army, he was told by someone. “There are bitter weeds in England.” There are certainly a great many more of them since the British Expeditionary Force returned.¹⁴⁶

In this passage, Churchill addresses the threat of a German invasion. He compares the threat to Napoleon’s failed attempt to invade Britain. He recalls how Napoleon gathered his forces but never succeeded, implying that Hitler’s plan may face the same fate. The phrase “bitter weeds in England” suggests strong resistance. Another reference to Napoleon occurs

[i]n the days of Napoleon the same wind which would have carried his transports across the Channel might have driven away the blockading fleet.¹⁴⁷

Here Churchill highlights how Napoleon and other past European rulers were tempted by the possibility of invading Britain. By referencing history, he warns that such ambitions are often foolish and doomed to fail, reinforcing Britain’s resilience against invasion. To create a sense of unity between Britain and the United States, Churchill made a reference to a key event in the American Revolution. He states, “[a]ll these are great possibilities, and I say: ‘Let us go into this together. Let us have another Boston Tea Party about it.’”¹⁴⁸ By mentioning the Boston Tea Party, Churchill evokes a feeling of shared history of resistance. He suggests that both nations should face future challenges together, emphasizing their common values and strong alliance.

Another unifying concept is religion. Faith in God is present in wartime speeches to signify hope. As examined by Stuckey, “[r]eligion was the glue that held the nation together and served as one of Roosevelt’s most prominent inventional and political resources.”¹⁴⁹ Roosevelt often used religious language in his speeches, viewing Judeo-Christian values as important for national unity. He believed that faith provided the foundation of a strong and healthy political community. By including religious references in his rhetoric, he helped create a sense of shared purpose among the people. For Roosevelt, religion was not just personal, but it was a tool to bring the nation together and strengthen its identity. His ability to connect politics with faith made his messages more powerful and inspiring.¹⁵⁰ Winston Churchill, in

¹⁴⁶ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁴⁷ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁴⁸ Churchill, *The Gift of a Common Tongue*. online.

¹⁴⁹ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 26.

¹⁵⁰ Stuckey, *The Good Neighbor*, 33.

contrast, had different views on religion. Explored by Andrew Roberts, Churchill's views on religion were largely secular and not rooted in Christianity. While he occasionally mentioned belief in a higher power, he did not acknowledge the divinity of Jesus Christ. Throughout his many speeches, he rarely used religious language, avoiding direct references to Jesus. Roberts states, that "of all the five million words he uttered in his speeches, he never said the word 'Jesus' and only said the word 'Christ' once, and then not in a context acknowledging him as Saviour." His perspective was shaped by historical readings, particularly works that suggested all religions were fundamentally similar. Rather than relying on faith, Churchill's moral outlook was influenced by history and a belief in progress.¹⁵¹ Both orators, however, make statements indicating the "help of God" and "God standing on their side."

In conclusion, the rhetoric of Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II played a vital role in shaping national identity, fostering unity, and mobilizing their respective nations for war. Churchill's speeches relied on powerful imagery, historical references, and poetic language to inspire resilience and emphasize Britain's imperial strength. He framed Britain as an island fortress and invoked past conflicts to highlight national perseverance. Roosevelt, on the other hand, focused on democratic values, social unity, and moral responsibility, using a more pragmatic and accessible rhetorical style. Both leaders used repetition, metaphors, and emotional appeals to reinforce shared values and rally support against tyranny. While Churchill emphasized Britain's imperial heritage and defensive strength, Roosevelt framed America's involvement as a moral duty to protect freedom. Their speeches served as powerful tools in wartime propaganda, ensuring their citizens remained committed to the war effort.

¹⁵¹ Andrew Roberts, *Churchill: Walking with Destiny* (New York: Viking, 2018), 32–33.

3. Patriotism and Nationalism in Speeches

As already mentioned, the purpose of wartime rhetoric is to create unity and a sense of national belonging. It draws on national identity, nationalism, and patriotism. This chapter analyses the use of these concepts in wartime speeches, delivered by the British Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill and the American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The analysis focuses on Churchill's *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat* (May 13, 1940), *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (June 4, 1940), *Their Finest Hour* (June 18, 1940), and *The Gift of a Common Tongue* (1943), and Roosevelt's *The Four Freedoms* (January 6, 1941), *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* (Radio Broadcast, December 29, 1940), and *The Infamy Speech/Pearl Harbour Address* (December 8, 1941). The concepts of nationalism and patriotism appeal to people's attachment to their nation and motivate their actions, encouraging unity and loyalty. This chapter explores the emotional ties invoked by these ideological concepts with regard to the nature of the audience.

During the Second World War, both British and American leaders had to consider the differences between the audiences they were speaking to. Winston Churchill urged people to strength and courage as they were directly involved in the war with Germany. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in contrast, called for unity, democracy, support, and freedom. As mentioned in the previous part, their rhetorical style differed and they both emphasized different national symbols, praising different values. Many of their goals were similar, such as the victory of the democratic world and the defeat of Nazi Germany. To fulfil that, both leaders had to motivate the people, motivate them and unite them. Leaders used features of nationalism and patriotism to create an emotional bond and a feeling of national belonging. During the time of war conflict, both leaders faced a challenging task to unite their nations to fight against Nazi Germany.

In accordance to the theoretical chapter, Krishan Kumar declares, that most nation-states include multiple nations but are based on the idea of "one nation, one state." However, this doesn't always mean forcing ethnic unity. Countries, such as France, the United States, and Britain follow the idea of a "political nation," allowing ethnic diversity while keeping national unity.¹⁵² Differently to say, both the British Empire and the United States of America do not share just one territory but are pluralistic and ethnically heterogenous. Thus, there are some concepts assuring national unity. As an example, the "melting pot" of the United States of America might be presented. The idea of the melting pot framed America as a blend of different cultures rather than a nation defined by a single ethnic or cultural identity. As explained by

¹⁵² Krishan Kumar, *Nation and Empire: English Literature and the Nineteenth-Century Colonial Experience* (London: Polity Press, 2000), 578.

Ethel M. Albert, “the idea of the melting-pot functioned as a safe-guard against the problem of basic cultural diversity.”¹⁵³ As stated by Heike Paul, the melting pot idea, represents a key part of the nation’s identity. This idea suggests that people from different backgrounds come together to form a united, society, shaping them into a single nation. It highlights the ongoing mix of cultures and the changing nature of American identity. Paul refers to Benedict Anderson’s concept of *Imagined Communities* which suggests that nations need both a shared history and a vision for the future. For the United States, a country of immigrants, the challenge has always been how to unite people from different origins. The melting pot became the main way to describe this process, reflecting the diverse and evolving nature of American society.¹⁵⁴

The idea of the uniting melting cup might be reflected in Roosevelt’s *Four Freedoms Speech*, for instance in the statement “[t]he second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.”¹⁵⁵ This phrase acknowledges America's religious diversity and reinforces the idea that people of different faiths – whether Christian, Jewish, Muslim, or other – are all part of the same nation, free to practice their beliefs. As David Fellman explains, American society is highly pluralistic and, as an independent nation, still relatively young. It has long been a melting pot. Unlike older nations such as France or Britain, the United States has yet to develop a fixed national character. So, what holds the country united? The key unifying force which holds the country together is a shared set of ideas and ideals, known as the American Creed. These principles are most clearly expressed in documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, state constitutions, and writings of influential leaders. No other country so continuously emphasizes concepts of justice, freedom, and democracy, spread by schools, legislatures, and the media. This focus on such principles transforms the diverse United States into a unified national community. The American Creed is the common bond that all citizens embrace, forming the foundation of their way of life.¹⁵⁶ Rogers M. Smith quotes Samuel P. Huntington, saying that American civic identity has been built on shared political ideas and loyalty to the “American Creed” of liberal democracy. Like many others, Huntington suggests that this is the ideal foundation for national unity. He argues that in times of deep division, the country’s democratic values help bring

¹⁵³ Ethel M. Albert, “Conflict and Change in American Values: A Culture-Historical Approach,” *Ethics* 74, no. 1 (October 1963): 24.

¹⁵⁴ Heike Paul, *The Myths That Made America: An Introduction to American Studies* (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2014), 258–259.

¹⁵⁵ Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

¹⁵⁶ David Fellman, “The American Creed,” *Prairie Schooner* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1947): 231.

people together more effectively than shared ancestry, language, or religion could.¹⁵⁷ In other words, the ideology of the American Creed can serve as a unifying force during times of crises, such as war, helping citizens stay connected despite challenges.

What connects Britain, in contrast, is the British Empire which has historically shaped its national identity and encouraged a sense of nationalism rooted in imperial pride and global influence. Krishan Kumar describes English nationalism as “a different kind of nationalism,” which is “peculiar mainly because of the high mixture of royalism and monarchy-worship in it.” It is the nationalism of an imperial state, shaped by its colonial past even after the empire’s decline. This could be called “imperial nationalism,” despite the seeming paradox. The paradox comes from combining nationalism, which focuses on a nation’s independence, with imperialism, which involves controlling other nations, making English nationalism strongly connected to its colonial history even after the empire ended. Traditionally, an empire is a system where a central ruler, such as an emperor, governs various territories through dynastic ties or allegiance. In Britain, national identity became closely linked to the Crown, Parliament, Protestantism, and the vast British Empire. Along with this, people might develop intense feelings of loyalty and emotional attachment to the empire, showing passionate patriotism toward either the ruling dynasty or its ideals, which will be discussed in this chapter later on. The English were an imperial nation in two ways. They built a land-based empire by expanding England into Great Britain and later the United Kingdom, uniting the islands off Europe’s northwestern coast. At the same time, they established an overseas empire – twice. The first was in North America and the Caribbean, and the second, after its loss, was in India and Southeast Asia. At its peak after World War I, this empire covered one-fifth of the world and governed a quarter of its population. Though the domestic and overseas empires functioned differently, they had a shared effect: both made it difficult for a distinct English national identity to develop.¹⁵⁸ However, during the war, Churchill mobilizes the Dominions to join the Britain in war. As Andrew Stewart explains, Dominions were “fully self-governing member states of the Empire,” including Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and Ireland.¹⁵⁹ In *The Finest Hour* speech, Churchill utters:

¹⁵⁷ Rogers M. Smith, “The ‘American Creed’ and American Identity: The Limits of Liberal Citizenship in the United States,” *The Western Political Quarterly* 41, no. 2 (June 1988): 225.

¹⁵⁸ Kumar, *Nation and Empire*, 577–589.

¹⁵⁹ Andrew Stewart, *Empire Lost: Britain, the Dominions and the Second World War* (London: A&C Black, 2008), 8.

We have fully informed and consulted all the self-governing Dominions, these great communities far beyond the oceans who have been built up on our laws and on our civilization, and who are absolutely free to choose their course, but are absolutely devoted to the ancient Motherland, and who feel themselves inspired by the same emotions which lead me to stake our all upon duty and honour.¹⁶⁰

He adds that “[w]e have also over here Dominions armies,” and these “very high-class forces from the Dominions will now take part in the defence of the Mother Country,” highlighting the “aeroplanes and pilots from the Dominions and across the oceans coming from regions which are beyond the reach of enemy bombers.”¹⁶¹ He mobilizes the Dominions to defence, portraying Britain as the motherland and mother country. This emphasizes the emotional attachment of patriotism to the centre of the Empire. This might be underlined by Phillips Payson O’Brien who argues that in 1897, Winston Churchill “believed in only two things with conviction: his own destiny, and that of the British Empire.” While he might have had doubts of some of the imperial policies, he was always committed to making the empire as powerful as possible and saw himself as the right person to lead it. His confidence was no accident—he was raised to serve the empire and believed it.¹⁶² What was already certain, however, was that Churchill’s main strategic goal was to preserve and strengthen the British Empire. This commitment was reflected in one of his favourite songs, which he loved to sing loudly along with his fellow officers with “a few drinks in his belly and a warm glow in his heart.” He sang,

Great White Mother, far across the sea,
Ruler of the Empire may she ever be.
Long may she reign, glorious and free,
In the Great White Motherland.¹⁶³

In conclusion, Churchill’s strong attachment to the idea of the British Empire is reflected in his persuading speeches to evoke feelings of stability, historical continuity, and strength.

However, Roosevelt’s principles of freedom and equality did not go hand in hand with such imperial politics of Churchill. Britain’s democracy was hierarchical, supporting the class system at home and colonialism abroad. Winston Churchill strongly believed in the honour and

¹⁶⁰ Churchill, *Their Finest Hour*. online.

¹⁶¹ Churchill, *Their Finest Hour*. online.

¹⁶² O’Brien, *The Strategists*, 25.

¹⁶³ O’Brien, *The Strategists*, 44.

power of the British Empire, meanwhile, Roosevelt was strongly an anti-colonist. Conservatism was represented in politics, speeches, and writings of Churchill, and liberalism was represented by Roosevelt.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, as reported by Michael Lind, the major external threats to both the American people and the American way of life are empire and anarchy. An imperial state conquers other states to add their populations, resources, and territories to its own or accomplishes the same goals by intimidation without conquest. Empire is a threat when certain states have too much illegitimate power. Anarchy is a threat when some states have too little legitimate power.¹⁶⁵ This demonstrates the different standing points and identities of both the United States and Britain. Despite their different politics, the United States became Britain's strongest ally. The aim of both leaders was to defeat Nazi Germany and maintain the independence of their countries. In this case, the defeat of the Nazis and liberating Europe from the tyranny might be considered as the greater good. They both were publicly positioning the conflict as a moral battle between freedom (the Allies) and tyranny (the Nazis). They framed the war as a moral battle between good and evil.

During the Second World War, Britain and her Allies were depicted as the good side, representing freedom, and fighting for a rightful victory. As Whitton cites Pat McCormick's statement, "Britain and all that Britain stands for can never die; she is bound to win the day in the end, because she stands for the right, the good, the true and the noble,"¹⁶⁶ which sheds a light on portraying Britain as a hero, saviour, defender, and the noble figure. This strongly influenced public opinion by reinforcing patriotic pride, moral superiority, and emotional investment in the war effort. It also increased hatred for the enemy while strengthening loyalty and unity among the British people. By painting Britain as good and Nazi Germany as evil, it made victory seem certain, encouraging people to fully support the war and be willing to sacrifice for their country. An example might be quoted from the theoretical part, revealing that during the first World War in 1914, a group of British authors managed to create a myth of "an innocent and just Britain versus a violent, inhuman Germany."¹⁶⁷ The British were portrayed as defenders of moral values, peace, and justice. On the other hand, Germany was portrayed as aggressive, cruel, and uncivilized. This portrayal strengthened people's love for Britain by making them feel proud, protective, and emotionally connected to their country. This myth not

¹⁶⁴ William Eckhardt, "War Propaganda, Welfare Values, and Political Ideologies," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 9, no. 3 (September 1965): 354.

¹⁶⁵ Michael Lind, *The American Way of Strategy: U.S. Foreign Policy and the American Way of Life* (Oxford University Press, 2008), 21.

¹⁶⁶ Whitton, "War by Radio," 590.

¹⁶⁷ Porcelli, "Elizabeth Bowen's Wavering Attitude," 98.

only strengthened national pride and emotional attachment towards their country but also invoked a clear “us vs. them” mentality, which was crucial for maintaining morale and unity during the conflict. To provide an example, in *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat* speech Churchill states:

You ask, what is our policy? I can say: It is to wage war, by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us; to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime.¹⁶⁸

Here Churchill describes the Nazis as one of the worst evils in history. He calls the rule a “monstrous tyranny” and their actions unmatched in cruelty and crime. He makes it clear that defeating them is not just a military goal but a moral duty, showing that Nazi Germany is not just another enemy but a unique threat to humanity. In *The Gift of a Common Tongue* Churchill voices:

We do not war primarily with races as such. Tyranny is our foe, whatever trappings or disguise it wears, whatever language it speaks, be it external or internal, we must forever be on our guard, ever mobilised, ever vigilant, always ready to spring at its throat.¹⁶⁹

In this statement, Churchill is saying that the war is not against a specific race or nation, but against tyranny in any form. He warns that oppression can come from anywhere, so people must always stay alert and ready to fight against it. The phrase “spring at its throat” means taking immediate action to stop tyranny whenever it appears. Another statement delivered by Churchill in *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* delivers that “Even though large tracts of Europe and many old and famous States have fallen or may fall into the grip of the Gestapo and all the odious apparatus of Nazi rule, we shall not flag or fail.”¹⁷⁰ The “odious apparatus” refers to the hateful and oppressive system that the Nazis used to control and terrorize people. This includes the Gestapo (secret police), concentration camps, propaganda, mass executions, and strict laws that suppressed freedom and enforced Nazi rule.

Similarly to Churchill, Roosevelt also recognized the Nazi Germany as the enemy. Due to the urgency of the incoming threat, as previously indicated, the United States partly gave up

¹⁶⁸ Churchill, *Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat*. online.

¹⁶⁹ Churchill, *The Gift of a Common Tongue*. online.

¹⁷⁰ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

its isolationist status to intervene in the Second World War and later on to secure global stability. Roosevelt calls for unity, strength, and global responsibility in defending freedom worldwide. He voices the rising threat of dictatorship and aggression. He declares, that

[t]he Nazi masters of Germany have made it clear that they intend not only to dominate all life and thought in their own country, but also to enslave the whole of Europe, and then to use the resources of Europe to dominate the rest of the world.¹⁷¹

Roosevelt utters that the aim of the Nazis is not just power in Germany but the whole world. By using the word “enslave,” he shows that Nazi rule would mean losing freedom and living under strict oppression. By using this term, Roosevelt appeals to Americans’ fears, which are loss of freedom and tyranny. As previously mentioned, such circumstances are a direct threat to American values. To put it differently, the term “enslaved” carries a powerful emotional weight, reminding Americans of the country's history of fighting for independence and democracy. Another similar reference to Nazis by Roosevelt appears in his speech called *On U.S. Involvement in the War in Europe* (March 15, 1941). He voices:

We know that although Prussian autocracy was bad enough in the first war, Nazism is far worse in this. Nazi forces are not seeking mere modifications in colonial maps or in minor European boundaries. They openly seek the destruction of all elective systems of government on every continent, including our own. They seek to establish systems of government based on the regimentation of all human beings by a handful of individual rulers who seize power by force.¹⁷²

Here, Roosevelt portrays the Nazis as a huge threat, not just to Europe but to the United States and democracy everywhere. He explains that unlike past wars, where countries fought over borders, the Nazis want total control over people’s lives. He warns that if they win, a small group of dictators will take away freedom and the right to vote. This makes the war feel urgent and personal, showing Americans that they must fight to protect their own way of life. Another utterance made by Roosevelt conveys that “The Nazis have justified such actions by various pious frauds.”¹⁷³ In this statement, Roosevelt declares that the Nazis try to excuse their terrible

¹⁷¹ Roosevelt, *The Great Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

¹⁷² Franklin D. Roosevelt, *On U.S. Involvement in the War in Europe*, March 15, 1941, American Rhetoric, accessed March 27, 2025, <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrwarineurope.htm>.

¹⁷³ Roosevelt, *The Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

actions by using false, noble-sounding excuses. The phrase “pious frauds” means lies that pretend to be noble or moral. This suggests that the Nazis claim to act for a good cause, such as protecting their country or restoring order. However, they are just covering up their cruelty and aggression. Roosevelt highlights this to show that the Nazis cannot be trusted and their justifications are purely manipulative.

To conclude, both Churchill and Roosevelt describe Nazi Germany as a brutal threat to democracy, freedom, and civilization. They stress that Nazism is not just about conquering land but about controlling lives, destroying democratic values, and enslaving nations. Churchill presents Britain as fighting against tyranny. He uses strong words to inspire resistance and draws on the Imperial continuity to mobilize people. Roosevelt, in contrast, warns Americans that a Nazi victory would put freedom in danger not just in the United States, but everywhere in the world. Both leaders frame the war as a fight between good and evil, portraying the Nazis as evil tyrants to justify the war and mobilize their people to defend democracy and their values. This myth of the innocent Allies, meaning Britain and the United States, is evident in the speeches of both leaders. Besides this idea of good versus evil, the emotional bond can be emphasized by particular historical events, victories, or memories.¹⁷⁴ This might be applied in the speech *Their Finest Hour*, where Churchill states:

If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be freed and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science.¹⁷⁵

Churchill compares Nazi rule with a “new Dark Age.” By using this term, Churchill refers to a time of oppression and tyranny similar to the historical period of the Dark Ages during the medieval time. By mentioning the United States, Churchill signals that America’s fate also depends on the outcome of the war, reinforcing the idea of a global struggle. With the U.S. being a younger nation, as stated by Fellman,¹⁷⁶ there are only a few historical references in Roosevelt’s speeches. In *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* Roosevelt is voicing that “[n]ever

¹⁷⁴ Anthony D. Smith, *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach* (London: Routledge, 2009), 62–63.

¹⁷⁵ Churchill, *Their Finest Hour*. online.

¹⁷⁶ David Fellman, “The American Creed,” *Prairie Schooner* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1947): 231.

before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now.”¹⁷⁷ The references to Jamestown and Plymouth Rock symbolize the very beginning of American civilization and English settlers. Another example is

[t]hat determination of ours, extending over all these years, was proved, for example, in the early days during the quarter century of wars following the French Revolution. While the Napoleonic struggles did threaten interests of the United States because of the French foothold in the West Indies and Louisiana, and while we engaged in the War of 1812 to vindicate our right to peaceful trade, it is nevertheless clear that neither France nor Great Britain nor any other nation was aiming at domination of the whole world.

Winston Churchill, in contrast, often used historical events and figures in his speeches to inspire and persuade his audience. He drew parallels between past conflicts and present struggles, which could be demonstrated in *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*:

We are told that Herr Hitler has a plan for invading the British Isles. This has often been thought of before. When Napoleon lay at Boulogne for a year with his flat-bottomed boats and his Grand Army, he was told by someone. “There are bitter weeds in England.” There are certainly a great many more of them since the British Expeditionary Force returned.¹⁷⁸

In this passage, Churchill addresses the threat of a German invasion. He compares the threat to Napoleon’s failed attempt to invade Britain. The phrase “bitter weeds in England” suggests strong resistance of the British people. Churchill used this historical example of the Napoleonic Wars to boost morale, reminding the British people that they had resisted powerful enemies before and survived.

In the days of Napoleon the same wind which would have carried his transports across the Channel might have driven away the blockading fleet. There was always the chance, and it is that chance which has

¹⁷⁷ Roosevelt, *The Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

¹⁷⁸ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

excited and befooled the imaginations of many Continental tyrants.
Many are the tales that are told.¹⁷⁹

Here, Churchill uses another reference to Napoleon. He highlights how Napoleon and other past European rulers were tempted by the possibility of invading Britain. He declares, that dictators often fall, which gives hope to the British people that Hitler, too, would eventually be defeated.

There never has been, I suppose, in all the world, in all the history of war, such an opportunity for youth. The Knights of the Round Table, the Crusaders, all fall back into the past-not only distant but prosaic; these young men, going forth every morn to guard their native land and all that we stand for, holding in their hands these instruments of colossal and shattering power, of whom it may be said that: Every morn brought forth a noble chance and every chance brought forth a noble knight, deserve our gratitude, as do all the brave men who, in so many ways and on so many occasions, are ready, and continue ready to give life and all for their native land.¹⁸⁰

In this passage, Churchill compares young soldiers to legendary heroes such as the Knights of the Round Table and the Crusaders. He is praising the bravery and importance of young soldiers fighting in World War II. By this passage, Churchill aims to inspire gratitude and admiration for those risking their lives for their country. He creates an image of soldiers as heroes, which aligns with Smith's nationalist theory.¹⁸¹ He continues with the patriotic and heroic willingness to protect and die for a country has been ultimately linked with patriotism in a sense of loyalty and sacrifice, as previously mentioned in the theoretical chapter.¹⁸² In *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* Churchill also declares that

[e]ven though large tracts of Europe and many old and famous States have fallen or may fall into the grip of the Gestapo and all the odious apparatus of Nazi rule, we shall not flag or fail. We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we

¹⁷⁹ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁸⁰ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁸¹ Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991), 77.

¹⁸² Aleksandar Pavković, "Killing and Dying for One's Country," in *Handbook of Patriotism*, ed. Mitja Sardoč (Springer, 2020) 652-653.

shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this Island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old.¹⁸³

In this speech, Churchill frequently repeats the phrase “we shall fight,” which indicates a willingness to sacrifice for a defence of Britain. The phrase “whatever the cost may be” includes the cost of human lives to protect the nation. Additionally, “we shall never surrender” underlines the dedication to sacrifice.

You ask, what is our policy? I can say: It is to wage war, by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us; to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. That is our policy. You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: It is victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival. Let that be realised; no survival for the British Empire, no survival for all that the British Empire has stood for, no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal.¹⁸⁴

In this excerpt, the willingness to die for one's country is strongly implied. Churchill's speech emphasizes absolute resistance against Nazi Germany, no matter the circumstances or the cost. Phrases such as “we shall not flag or fail,” “we shall go on to the end,” and “we shall never surrender” represent a determination to fight at all costs. The line “we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be” suggests that Britain was prepared to sacrifice everything, to protect the country, including human lives.

¹⁸³ Churchill, *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. online.

¹⁸⁴ Churchill, *Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat*. online.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, in contrast to Winston Churchill, hardly ever expressed the readiness to fight by willingness to die for a country. Instead, he emphasized values such as duty, freedom, togetherness, cooperation, and perseverance rather than glorifying death. Contrarily, Roosevelt assured people that he would not send American soldiers to join the war but arms, supplies, and financial aid. This can be displayed in *The Great Arsenal of Democracy*:

The people of Europe who are defending themselves do not ask us to do their fighting. They ask us for the implements of war, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters which will enable them to fight for their liberty and for our security. Emphatically, we must get these weapons to them, get them to them in sufficient volume and quickly enough so that we and our children will be saved the agony and suffering of war which others have had to endure.¹⁸⁵

By reason of the U.S. joining the war later, Roosevelt called for transforming the nation's industry into a powerful force for military production.

As planes and ships and guns and shells are produced, your government, with its defense experts, can then determine how best to use them to defend this hemisphere. The decision as to how much shall be sent abroad and how much shall remain at home must be made on the basis of our overall military necessities. We must be the great arsenal of democracy.¹⁸⁶

The United States take the position of the main supplier of weapons and war materials to countries fighting against Nazi Germany. As Roosevelt states, “Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights and keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose.”¹⁸⁷ He assures the nation that this task of increasing armament production is a collective sacrifice and a duty towards defending democracy and American allies. He declares that

[a]s President of the United States, I call for that national effort. I call for it in the name of this nation which we love and honor and which we

¹⁸⁵ Roosevelt, *The Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

¹⁸⁶ Roosevelt, *The Arsenal of Democracy*. online.

¹⁸⁷ Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

are privileged and proud to serve. I call upon our people with absolute confidence that our common cause will greatly succeed.¹⁸⁸

The solidarity and cooperation might be displayed in

[t]aking counsel of expert military and naval authorities, considering what is best for our own security, we are free to decide how much should be kept here and how much should be sent abroad to our friends who, by their determined and heroic resistance, are giving us time in which to make ready our own defense.¹⁸⁹

Roosevelt's use of the term "friends" emphasizes the unity between the United States and Britain. He also describes British resistance as "heroic," admiring their bravery. This statement also summarizes the need to support Britain fighting in the first line to get time for the U.S. to prepare for the war themselves. Nonetheless, Roosevelt praises not only the British resilience but also the great leadership of Winston Churchill. He proclaims that

[t]he British peoples are braced for invasion, whenever such attempt may come – tomorrow, next week, next month. In this historic crisis, Britain is blessed with a brilliant and great leader in Winston Churchill. But, knowing him, no one knows better than Mr. Churchill himself that it is not alone his stirring words and valiant deeds that give the British their support of morale. The essence of that morale is in the masses of plain people who are completely clear in their minds about the one essential fact that they would rather die as free men than live as slaves. These plain people, civilians as well as soldiers, and sailors, and airmen; women and girls, as well as men and boys; they are fighting in the front line of civilization at this moment, and they are holding that line with a fortitude that will forever be the pride and the inspiration of all free men on every continent, on every isle of the sea.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

¹⁸⁹ Roosevelt, *The Four Freedoms*. online.

¹⁹⁰ Roosevelt, *On U.S. Involvement in the War in Europe*. online.

Roosevelt highlights Britain's resilience, appraising its people, including Churchill, for their defence of freedom. He describes their fight as necessary to civilization. He continues saying that

[t]he British people and their Grecian allies need ships; from America they will get ships. They need planes; from America they will get planes. Yes, from America they need food, and from America they will get food. They need tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds; from America they will get tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds.

In this part Roosevelt promises the U.S. support to Britain and Greece, guaranteeing to provide ships, planes, food, weapons, and supplies essential for their fight against tyranny. This part of the speech has a strong emotional impact.

In conclusion, Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt used patriotism and nationalism in their wartime speeches to foster unity and solidarity during World War II. Churchill emphasized imperial nationalism, rallying Britain and its Dominions by invoking shared history, loyalty to the empire, and the collective duty to defend civilization. Roosevelt, in contrast, promoted democratic unity, framing the U.S. as the "Arsenal of Democracy" and appealing to shared values of freedom and justice to unite Americans and their allies. Despite their ideological differences, both leaders used shared historical ties and emotional attachments to bridge divides, strengthen national identity, and create a common purpose, ensuring their people remained committed to the war effort as a unified front against tyranny.

Conclusion

This thesis dealt with the portrayal of different national symbols and the use of concepts of national identity, nationalism, and patriotism in wartime speeches of the British Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill and the American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The reason for examining such concepts was to gain insight into the different national identities of the two countries and highlight the different rhetoric of both leaders. The thesis was divided into several chapters, the theoretical one and the two analytical parts bearing on the hypotheses presented.

The main aim of the theoretical part of the thesis was to introduce the term rhetoric with its various meanings and usage in different fields. The theoretical part delivers a number of theories, starting in the times of Plato in the ancient era till modern times. It delivers several definitions of rhetoric by different thinkers who agree on describing rhetoric as an art of persuasion with language. However, it is not only the language. Cicero divides rhetoric into five canons, such as invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Hence not only words, but also considering the nature of the audience, organization of a speech, the right choice of words, the ability to withhold the speech, accent, posture, gestures, and tone of voice make an impact on how the speech is perceived and how influential it is. Nonetheless, scholars agree that the main aim of rhetoric is to inform the mind, engage the imagination, evoke emotions, and influence decisions. This might be crucial in times of crisis, especially during the war. Wartime leaders were aware of the importance of such acts. In accordance with this, the concepts of national identity, nationalism, and patriotism were introduced. National identity refers to the shared sense of belonging to a nation, based on common history, culture, language, or values. It is not just a political or geographical association but a deep sense of collective identity that unites people under a common national narrative. Nationalism, on the other hand, is a more political concept. It can be understood as the belief that a nation should be self-governing and independent, often emphasizing cultural or ethnic unity. Nationalism can serve as a unifying force, strengthening a country's unity during times of conflict, but it can also be exclusionary. Patriotism is closely related to nationalism but is generally seen as a more positive and emotional attachment towards one's country. While nationalism often focuses on asserting power or superiority, patriotism emphasizes loyalty, pride, and devotion to the nation, often expressed through acts of service, sacrifice, or civic duty. In wartime, patriotism becomes especially powerful, as it is used by leaders to inspire unity, encourage resilience, and justify national struggles. The closing of this part puts concepts mentioned in comparison to propaganda – the intentional use of false or misleading information to gain support, justify

actions, and control public perception to strengthen one side's position. Thinkers, such as Stefania Porcelli, highlighted the creation of a myth of "an innocent Britain versus a violent and inhuman Germany." This viewpoint was presented during the First and Second World Wars by using literature, speeches, and radio broadcast. This chapter, consequently, delivered the importance of the use of radio broadcasting propaganda with radio being a powerful tool in spreading information.

The analytical part was divided into two chapters with the purpose of applying the theories on the selected speeches by Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt. To be more concrete, the theories were applied in *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat* (May 13, 1940), *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (4 June, 1940), *Their Finest Hour* (June 18, 1940), and *The Gift of a Common Tongue* (1943), by Winston Churchill and *The Four Freedoms* (6 January, 1941), *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* (Radio Broadcast, 29 December, 1940), and *The Infamy Speech/Pearl Harbour Address* (8 December, 1941) by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The first chapter of the analytical part focused on the way Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt structured their speeches. It draws on several analyses by a number of scholars, examining leaders' oratory style. Richard Toyne, for instance, stated that Winston Churchill was chosen the Greatest Briton by the public in 2002, making war seem honourable and heroic, where everyone would feel proud to take part in history. Edward R. Murrow assumed that Churchill "mobilized the English language and sent it into battle."¹⁹¹ Louis Foley analysed Churchill's oratory style, focusing on the use of words of Anglo-Saxon origin, whose roots seem more truly English and powerful. He was praised for his rhetorical skills, using strong visual elements which helped him to bring the battle to life and to help the audience picture the struggle. Harold P. Zelko, on the other hand, praised American President Franklin D. Roosevelt for his splendid vocal quality and rare charm. According to Zelko, Roosevelt was able to uplift the nation thanks to his use of emotions. As stated by Vanessa B. Beasley and Deborah Smith-Howell, Roosevelt "had a gift, and he also seemed to be consistently gifted."¹⁹² His rhetoric was equally powerful as Churchill's, although it was less poetic. Roosevelt's speeches focused on clarity, relatability, and calm reassurance, well-suited to the crises. Churchill's speeches were powerful and persuasive, blending emotion with logic while emphasizing values like patriotism, justice, and duty. His ability to emotionally engage audiences was considered ethical and effective. Roosevelt, on the other hand, was admired for

¹⁹¹ Maguire, "We Shall Fight," 256.

¹⁹² Beasley and Smith-Howell, "No Ordinary Rhetorical President," 5.

his voice, charm, and ability to inspire rather than for logical reasoning or debate. Both leaders relied on emotional appeals and rhetoric to promote democracy, but their styles differed. Churchill's speeches were grand and poetic, designed to rally Britain for war and boost morale, while Roosevelt's rhetoric was more pragmatic and reassuring, aimed at maintaining stability in the U.S. Despite their differences, both effectively used rhetoric to serve their political goals.

The second chapter of the analytical part detailed further elements of national unity and patriotism, creating an emotional attachment towards a country. The emphasis was placed on different values and ideas which both countries shared. This chapter presented the fact that in terms of nationalism, both Britain and the United States do not share just one territory but are pluralistic, ethnically heterogeneous, and are not based on the idea of one nation, one state. This means that both countries are political nations, allowing ethnic diversity while keeping national unity. Such nations had been based on universal principles, such as equality and human rights, with no ethnic or historical connection. Thus, there are some concepts assuring national unity and additional emotional attachments. For instance, the United States shares the idea of the melting pot which represents the country as a blend of different cultures. This concept functions as a unifying force representing a nation's identity. Another set of shared principles presented was the American Creed. The shared values known as the American Creed include fundamental principles such as justice, freedom, equality, democracy, and individual rights. Samuel P. Huntington argued that American civic identity is built on political ideals rather than ancestry, language, or religion. During times of crisis, such as war, the American Creed serves as a powerful unifying force, helping citizens remain connected through their shared democratic values. In contrast, British nationalism and patriotic attitude are rooted in imperial pride and global influence. At its peak, the British Empire covered one-fifth of the world and governed a quarter of its population. In WWII speeches, Churchill mobilized the Dominions, the semi-independent colonies of the empire, to join the war. He was portraying Britain as the motherland and mother country. This emphasizes the emotional attachment of patriotism to the centre of the Empire. Based on the excerpts analysed, both Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt used patriotism and nationalism in their wartime speeches to foster unity and solidarity during World War II. Churchill emphasized imperial nationalism, rallying Britain and its Dominions by invoking shared history, loyalty to the empire, and the collective duty to defend civilization. Roosevelt, in contrast, promoted democratic unity, framing the U.S. as the "Arsenal of Democracy" and appealing to shared values of freedom and justice to unite Americans and their allies. Despite their ideological differences, both leaders used shared historical ties and

emotional attachments to bridge divides, strengthen national identity, and create a common purpose, ensuring their people remained committed to the war effort as a unified front against tyranny.

The main findings of this thesis reveal that Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt employed distinct rhetorical strategies that reflected their national identities and political traditions during World War II. Churchill's speeches emphasized Britain's imperial legacy, portraying the British Empire as a source of strength, unity, and continuity. His patriotic rhetoric evoked strong emotional attachments to Britain's history, monarchy, and moral duty, rallying both the British people and the Dominions to defend the "Motherland." He often framed Britain as an undefeatable island nation, standing resilient against tyranny just as it had in previous centuries, such as during the Napoleonic Wars. In his speech *Their Finest Hour* (1940), he depicted Britain as the last bastion of freedom in Europe, highlighting historical continuity and imperial pride. Similarly, his speech *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (1940) underscored perseverance and determination in the face of the enemy, reflecting his belief that enduring hardship was essential to protecting freedom. Churchill's rhetoric was deeply rooted in British history and occasionally reflected elitism due to his aristocratic background, emphasizing national greatness over social equality. In contrast, Roosevelt framed American identity around democratic values, freedom, and unity, reinforcing the idea of the United States as the "Arsenal of Democracy." His rhetoric was more pragmatic and accessible, aimed at unifying a diverse democratic society through shared ideals, civic duty, and collective sacrifice. Roosevelt's *Four Freedoms Speech* (1941) framed the war as a global fight for fundamental human rights, including freedom from want, reflecting a stronger focus on social justice and the well-being of ordinary citizens. Additionally, Roosevelt often invoked religious language to inspire moral responsibility, urging Americans to defend not only their own nation but also global democracy. In his *Pearl Harbor Address* (1941), he presented the conflict as a battle between good and evil, galvanizing national unity. While Churchill's nationalism was rooted in imperial pride and loyalty to tradition, Roosevelt's patriotism centred on progress, equality, and global responsibility. Churchill focused on defending the empire, whereas Roosevelt sought to spread democracy worldwide. Churchill emphasized unity based on historical resilience and tradition, while Roosevelt championed unity grounded in equality and solidarity. Despite these differences, both leaders used powerful rhetoric, emotional appeals, and historical references to reinforce national purpose, justify the war as a moral struggle between freedom and tyranny,

and inspire their people. Their speeches not only solidified their countries' wartime commitment but also shaped the global order beyond the war.

Resumé

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá vyobrazováním národních symbolů a využitím konceptů národní identity, nacionalismu a patriotismu ve válečných projevech britského premiéra Winstona Churchilla a amerického prezidenta Franklina D. Roosevelta. Hlavním cílem této práce je detailně analyzovat odlišné rétorické strategie těchto dvou významných lídrů a ukázat, jakým způsobem se jejich specifické přístupy odrážejí v projevech během druhé světové války. Diplomová práce se zaměřuje na to, jak tyto rozdílné rétorické techniky vycházejí nejen z osobního stylu jednotlivých řečníků, ale také z hluboce zakořeněných národních identit Velké Británie a Spojených států amerických. Analýza sleduje, jak historické, kulturní a politické faktory formovaly jejich jazyk, obraznost a emocionální apely s cílem ovlivnit veřejné mínění a posílit odhodlání národů během válečného konfliktu. Práce je rozdělena na tři kapitoly: teoretickou a dvě analytické.

Teoretická část práce představuje koncept rétoriky jako umění přesvědčování a sleduje její vývoj od antiky až po moderní dobu. Rétorika není jen výběrem slov, ale zahrnuje i strukturu projevu, způsob jeho přednesu a schopnost přednášejícího ovlivnit posluchače. Práce se opírá o teorie několika myslitelů, například Cicera, který definuje pět základních pilířů rétoriky: invenci, uspořádání, styl, paměť a přednes. Tyto aspekty sehrávají klíčovou roli ve veřejném projevu, zejména ve válečných dobách, kdy lídři potřebují posílit morálku občanů a sjednotit národ. Práce vychází především ze zjištění Anthonyho D. Smithe, který společně s ostatními odborníky definuje koncepty nacionalismu, patriotismu a národní identity. Národní identita, jak ji dále definuje tato práce, není jen politickou nebo geografickou příslušností, ale hlubokým pocitem sounáležitosti založeným na společné historii, kultuře a hodnotách. Nacionalismus a patriotismus jsou dva klíčové pojmy, které oba lídři využívají, avšak s odlišným důrazem. Nacionalismus se často zaměřuje na politickou a kulturní jednotu národa a může být jak sjednocující, tak vylučující. Patriotismus je spíše emocionální vztah k vlasti, projevovaný loajalitou, hrdostí a obětavostí.

Analytická část je rozdělena do dvou kapitol, kdy každá kapitola zkoumá válečné projevy britského premiéra Winstona Churchilla, především *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat* (13. květen, 1940), *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (4. červen, 1940), *Their Finest Hour* (18. červen, 1940), a *The Gift of a Common Tongue* (1943), a projevy amerického prezidenta Franklina D. Roosevelta, *The Four Freedoms* (6. leden, 1941), *The Great Arsenal of Democracy* (29. prosinec, 1940), a *The Infamy Speech/Pearl Harbour Address* (8. prosinec, 1941).

vychází z teoretických poznatků představených v předchozí teoretické části a demonstruje její užití na konkrétních projevech z doby druhé světové války.

První kapitola analytické části se zabývá rétorikou a vyobrazením národních symbolů ve válečných projevech. Tato kapitola zkoumá rozdílné národní symboly obou národů, konkrétně Británie a Spojených států. Všechny tyto projevy byly předneseny za druhé světové války s cílem ochránit obě země před nepřátelskou silou nacistického Německa. Ačkoli je účel těchto projevů téměř identický, přednes obou politiků se značně liší. Winston Churchill se ve svých projevech opírá o silné obrazné vyjadřování, historické odkazy a poetický jazyk tak, aby zdůrazňovaly imperiální sílu Británie. Vyobrazoval Británii jako ostrovní pevnost a její nedobytnost a vytrvalost podtrhoval odkazy na historické konflikty. Naproti tomu Roosevelt kladl důraz na demokratické hodnoty, sjednocenost a morální odpovědnost vůči celému demokratickému světu. Oproti Churchillovi, který používal barvitě výrazy a literární jazykové prostředky, Roosevelt upřednostňoval pragmatičtější rétorický styl. Často také využíval náboženské odkazy ke sjednocení Američanů, kdy vykresloval Spojené státy jako „arsenál demokracie.“ Z analýzy vyplývá, že rétorika Winstona Churchilla je emotivnější a založená na tradici, zatímco Roosevelt klade důraz na racionální argumentaci a participaci. Churchill využívá dramatické obrazy a silná slova, aby povzbudil bojového ducha Britů, zatímco Roosevelt se snaží uklidnit a motivovat americké občany prostřednictvím srozumitelných a optimistických sdělení. Oba politici ve svých projevech používali opakování, metafory a emocionální apely k posílení sdílených hodnot. Zatímco Churchill zdůrazňoval imperiální dědictví a obrannou sílu Británie, Roosevelt prezentoval americkou účast ve válce jako oběť a morální povinnost chránit svobodu nejen Američanů, ale po celém světě. Jejich projevy sloužily jako mocné nástroje válečné propagandy a nacionalismu, díky kterým zůstali občané obou národů oddáni válečnému úsilí.

Druhá kapitola analytické části věnuje více pozornosti nehmotným symbolům posilování národní identity a pospolitosti, zejména historickému kontextu, kolektivnímu postoji a hodnotám obou národů. Nastiňuje například silné imperiální kořeny Británie, kdy je důraz na tuto imperiální velikost opakovaně demonstrován v Churchillových projevech. Na druhé straně, kapitola představuje soubor amerických hodnot, jako například americký „melting pot,“ American Creed, nebo Rooseveltovu politiku „dobrého souseda.“ Soubor těchto ideálů napomáhá k porozumění americké národní identity, mentality a postoji ve druhé světové válce. Dále tato kapitola zkoumá emocionální vazby zachyceny ve válečných projevech, jako je

například věrnost své rodné zemi, zodpovědnost vůči celému světu a ochrana svobody a demokracie.

Výsledkem této analýzy je souhrn aspektů, charakteristických pro britskou a americkou národní identitu, které je možno nalézt ve všech zkoumaných projevech této práce. Ta zkoumá typické rysy obou politiků při slovních válečných projevech, jako je např. využití literárních prostředků, jako jsou metafory a opakování, ke zdůraznění důležitých hodnot a poselství. Vedle národních symbolů a jazykového hlediska jsou zde uvedeny i jiné, nehmotné symboly, jako např. politické hodnoty, kořeny, historie a ideologie. Analýza již zmíněných proslovů dochází k závěru, že ačkoli byl postoj obou zemí a lídrů stejný, jejich přístup promlouvání ke svému národu se značně lišil. Rozdíly je možno shledat, například, v zakomponování odlišných symbolů, způsobu přednesu a zdůrazňování hodnot. Přes všechny tyto rozdíly typické pro každou zemi lze ovšem také potvrdit, že oba politici, ve snaze posílit národní identity, ve svých dílech vyzdvihovali stejné hodnoty, jako například demokracii, svobodu, jednotu a spolupráci v boji proti společnému nepříteli.

Churchillovy projevy zdůrazňovaly britské imperiální dědictví, vykreslující Britské impérium jako zdroj síly, jednoty a kontinuity. Jeho vlastenecká rétorika vyvolávala silné emocionální vazby na britskou historii, monarchii a morální povinnost, čímž mobilizovala britský lid a dominia k obraně „Matky vlasti“. Často zobrazoval Británii jako neporazitelný ostrovní národ, který se postavil tyranii, stejně jako tomu bylo v minulých stoletích, například během napoleonských válek. V projevu *Their Finest Hour* (1940) popisoval Británii jako poslední baštu svobody v Evropě, zdůrazňujíc historickou kontinuitu a imperiální hrdost. Podobně jeho projev *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (1940) kladl důraz na vytrvalost a odhodlání tváří v tvář nepříteli, což odráželo jeho víru, že snášení útrap je nezbytné k ochraně svobody. Churchillova rétorika byla hluboce zakořeněná v britské historii a občas obsahovala prvky elitářství, které vyplývaly z jeho aristokratického původu, přičemž kladl důraz na národní velikost spíše než na sociální rovnost. Naproti tomu Roosevelt zobrazoval americkou identitu prostřednictvím demokratických hodnot, svobody a jednoty, čímž posiloval představu Spojených států jako „Arzenál demokracie“. Jeho rétorika byla pragmatictější a přístupnější, zaměřená na sjednocení různorodé demokratické společnosti na základě společných ideálů, občanské povinnosti a kolektivní oběti. Jeho projev *Four Freedoms* (1941) vykresloval válku jako globální boj za základní lidská práva, včetně svobody od nouze, což odráželo větší důraz na sociální spravedlnost a blaho běžných občanů. Kromě toho Roosevelt často používal náboženský jazyk k vyjádření morální odpovědnosti, vyzývajíc Američany, aby bránili nejen

svou vlastní zemi, ale i globální demokracii. V projevu *Pearl Harbor Address* (1941) představil konflikt jako boj mezi dobrem a zlem, čímž vyburcoval národní jednotu. Zatímco Churchillův nacionalismus byl založen na imperiální hrdosti a lojalitě k tradici, Rooseveltův patriotismus byl zaměřen na pokrok, rovnost a globální odpovědnost. Churchill se soustředil na obranu impéria, zatímco Roosevelt usiloval o šíření demokracie po celém světě. Churchill kladl důraz na jednotu založenou na historické vytrvalosti a tradici, zatímco Roosevelt prosazoval jednotu založenou na rovnosti a solidaritě. I přes tyto rozdíly oba vůdce používali silnou rétoriku, emocionální apelování a historické odkazy k posílení národního účelu, zdůvodnění války jako morálního boje mezi svobodou a tyraníí a inspiraci svých národů. Jejich projevy nejen upevnily válečné odhodlání jejich zemí, ale také formovaly globální řád i po válce.

Bibliography

- Albert, Ethel M. "Conflict and Change in American Values: A Culture-Historical Approach." *Ethics* 74, no. 1 (October 1963): 19–33.
- Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London; New York: Verso, 1991.
- Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by Hugh Lawson-Tancred. Penguin Classics. London; New York: Penguin, 1992.
- Beasley, Vanessa B., and Deborah Smith-Howell. "No Ordinary Rhetorical President: FDR's Speechmaking and Leadership, 1933–1945." in *A Rhetorical History of the United States: Significant Moments in American Public Discourse*, vol. 7, edited by Thomas W. Benson, 1–32. Michigan State University Press, 2006.
- Ben-Porath, Sigal R. "Wartime Patriotism." In *Handbook of Patriotism*, edited by Mitja Sardoč, 693–706. Springer, 2020.
- Blower, Brooke L. "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941." *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 3 (April 2014): 345–376.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Churchill, Winston. *Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat*. May 13, 1940. National Churchill Museum. Accessed March 27, 2025.
<https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/blood-toil-tears-and-sweat.html>.
- Churchill, Winston. *The Gift of a Common Tongue*. September 6, 1943. International Churchill Society. Accessed March 27, 2025.
<https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1941-1945-war-leader/the-gift-of-a-common-tongue/>.
- Churchill, Winston. *Their Finest Hour*. June 18, 1940. National Churchill Museum. Accessed March 27, 2025.
<https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/their-finest-hour.html>.
- Churchill, Winston. *We Shall Fight on the Beaches*. June 4, 1940. National Churchill Museum. Accessed March 27, 2025.
<https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/we-shall-fight-on-the-beaches.html>.
- Daughton, Suzanne M. "FDR as Family Doctor: Medical Metaphors and the Role of Physician in the Fireside Chats." in *A Rhetorical History of the United States: Significant Moments in American Public Discourse*, vol. 7, edited by Thomas W. Benson, 33–82. Michigan State University Press, 2006.

- Eckhardt, William. "War Propaganda, Welfare Values, and Political Ideologies." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 9, no. 3 (September 1965): 345–358.
- Ederson, Tim. *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Eley, Geoff. "Nationalism and the State by John Breuilly." *Social History* 9, no. 3 (October 1984): 396–400.
- Etherington, John. "Nationalism, Territoriality and National Territorial Belonging." *Papers: Revista de Sociologia* 95, no. 2 (February 2010): 321–339.
- Fellman, David. "The American Creed." *Prairie Schooner* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1947): 231–243.
- Foley, Louis. "Churchill's 'Anglo-Saxon' Words." *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts* 6, no. 4 (July 1966): 142–146.
- Gehrke, Pat J. *The Ethics and Politics of Speech: Communication and Rhetoric in the Twentieth Century*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2009.
- Geys, Benny, and Kai A. Konrad. "Patriotism and Taxation." In *Handbook of Patriotism*, edited by Mitja Sardoč, 810. Springer, 2020.
- Greene, Robert. *The 33 Strategies of War*. New York: Viking, 2006.
- Henderson, Gae Lyn, and M. J. Braun. "Introduction." In *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, edited by Gae Lyn Henderson and M. J. Braun, 1–25. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016.
- Huckin, Thomas. "Propaganda Defined." In *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, edited by Gae Lyn Henderson and M. J. Braun, 118–136. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016.
- Huddy, Leonie. "National Identity, Patriotism, and Nationalism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, edited by Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, Jack S. Levy, and Jennifer Jerit, 769–803. Online: Oxford University Press, 2023.
- Kumar, Krishan. *Nation and Empire: English Literature and the Nineteenth-Century Colonial Experience*. London: Polity Press, 2000.
- Lawson-Tancred, Hugh, Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric. Penguin Classics*. London; New York: Penguin, 1992.
- Lind, Michael. *The American Way of Strategy: U.S. Foreign Policy and the American Way of Life*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Loviglio, Jason. "Radio in Wartime: The Politics of Propaganda, Race, and the American Way in the Second World War." *American Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (December 2004): 1079–1087.

- Maguire, Lori. "We Shall Fight: A Rhetorical Analysis of Churchill's Famous Speech." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17, no. 2 (Summer 2014): 255–286.
- Miller, Clyde R. "Radio and Propaganda." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 213, no. 1 (January 1941): 69–74.
- O'Brien, Phillips Payson. *The Strategists: Churchill, Stalin, Roosevelt, Mussolini, and Hitler--How War Made Them and How They Made War*. London: Penguin Random House UK, 2024.
- Olwig, Kenneth R. "'Natural' Landscapes in the Representation of National Identity." in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, edited by Brian Graham and Peter Howard, 73–88. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. Co., 2008.
- Onet, Alina-Elena. "Rhetoric in Times of Conflict: A Study of Famous War-Time Speeches." "*Nicolae Bălcescu*" *Land Forces Academy, Sibiu, Romania* 30, no. 2 (July 2024): 1–7.
- Ornatowski, Cezar M. "Rhetoric Goes to War: The Evolution of the United States of America's Narrative of the 'War On Terror'." in *African Yearbook of Rhetoric*, edited by Philippe-Joseph Salazar, 65–74. South Africa: University of Cape Town, 2012.
- Paul, Heike. *The Myths That Made America: An Introduction to American Studies*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2014.
- Pavković, Aleksandar. "Killing and Dying for One's Country." In *Handbook of Patriotism*, edited by Mitja Sardoč, 651–670. Springer, 2020.
- Porcelli, Stefania. "Elizabeth Bowen's Wavering Attitude toward World War II Propaganda." in *Propaganda and Rhetoric in Democracy: History, Theory, Analysis*, edited by Gae Lyn Henderson and M.J. Braun, 96–117. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016.
- Ramos, Isabel L., Fátima Bernardo, Sónia C. Riberio, and Veerle Van Eetvelde. "Landscape identity: Implications for policy making." *Land Use Policy* 53 (May 2016): 36–43.
- Roberts, Andrew. *Churchill: Walking with Destiny*. New York: Viking, 2018.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. *On U.S. Involvement in the War in Europe*. March 15, 1941. American Rhetoric. Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrwarineurope.htm>.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. *Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation*. December 8, 1941. American Rhetoric. Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrpearlharbor.htm>.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. *The Four Freedoms*. January 6, 1941. American Rhetoric. Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrthefourfreedoms.htm>.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. *The Great Arsenal of Democracy*. December 29, 1940. American Rhetoric. Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrarsenalofdemocracy.html>.

- Rubin, Ronald I. "The Persistence of American Isolationism." *Pakistan Horizon* 19, no. 3 (Third Quarter 1966): 241–248.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Smith, Rogers M. "The 'American Creed' and American Identity: The Limits of Liberal Citizenship in the United States." *The Western Political Quarterly* 41, no. 2 (June 1988): 225–251.
- Stewart, Andrew. *Empire Lost: Britain, the Dominions and the Second World War*. London: A&C Black, 2008.
- Streissguth, Tom, and Lora Friedenthal. *Isolationism: Key Concepts in American History*. Edited by Jennifer L. Weber. Chelsea House Pub, 2010.
- Stuckey, Mary E. *The Good Neighbor: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of American Power*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2013.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Civil Society*, edited by Jose Harris, translated by Jose Harris and Margaret Hollis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Toye, Richard. *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Toye, Richard. *The Roar of the Lion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Whitton, John B. "War by Radio." *Foreign Affairs* 19, no. 3 (April 1941): 584–596.
- Wirth, Louis. "Types of Nationalism." *American Journal of Sociology* 41, no. 1 (1936): 723–737.
- Zahra, Tara. "Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis." *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 93–119.

Statement:

During the preparation of this thesis, I used ChatGPT 4 to enhance readability and clarity by refining cited information and improving phrasing. Additionally, I utilized ChatGPT 4 to summarize both my ideas and quoted material, ensuring coherence and cohesion in the introductory and concluding chapters. After using these, I reviewed and edited the content as needed. I take full responsibility for the content of the thesis.