"Of all the talents bestowed upon men, none is so precious as the gift of oratory... Abandoned by his party betrayed by his friends, stripped of his offices, whoever can command this power is still formidable."

-Winston S. Churchill, 1897

Abstract:

This article examines Prime Minister Winston Churchill's role in creating a sense of national solidarity in wartime Britain and establishing an Anglocentric interpretation of World War II through his wartime speeches and publications. Churchill's speeches and addresses during 1940 as well as his memoirs released after the war were heard and read by an international audience. The personal and historical aspect of Churchill's The Second World War series is examined as well as its impact on his reelection as Prime Minister of Great Britain. Set in the background of war and its recovery, the author provides an analysis of Churchill's speeches and writings and their impact on the British public. It is divided into two sections examining Churchill's impact as an orator and Churchill as a historian.

Winston Churchill was an accomplished orator, an iconic politician and historian. Best remembered for his strong leadership as Prime Minister of Great Britain during the Second World War, his personal belief that he was destined for leadership brought Churchill to his political career, serving fifty-five years in the British Parliament in numerous capacities; Member of Parliament, President of the Board of Trade, Home Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Minister of Defence and, ultimately, Prime Minister. The skillful rhetoric of Winston Churchill had a lasting effect on the British morale, uniting citizens by instilling in them a sense of national solidarity. Churchill put himself at the center of Great Britain's pivotal wartime events, bestowing reverential words he had written himself with uncommon skill. With his wartime speeches and six volumes of memoirs, The Second World War, Churchill was able to create a shared collective national history for the British people, specifically creating an Anglocentric interpretation of world events. Churchill's interpretation of the war was read by millions around the world. Churchill used his memoirs to revise the Second World War, using them to justify his decisions and make sure he appeared favorably in history. Churchill accomplished with his memoirs what he had with his speeches; he delivered a remarkably well-written story, and gave meaning to the five-year struggle of war.

The First World War, having ended in 1918, left instability in its wake; the world had changed politically and culturally, only to be followed by a global economic depression in the 1930s. Memories of the Great War still resonated in people's minds. Fresh fears of invasion set in as Britain heard the news of Poland's invasion by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union on September 1, 1939. In 1940, the war became very real for the British and it would soon become a pivotal year for the country's new Prime Minister. The Battle of France, the evacuation at Dunkirk, The Battle of Britain and Churchill's most famous speeches all occurred during 1940, which one might call "the year of Churchill."

Churchill as Orator

Winston Churchill, a Conservative politician and Member of Parliament since 1900, would serve as Prime Minister of Great Britain during the Second World War. Churchill's forty years in Parliament had given him the experience of addressing the House of Commons and giving campaign speeches to his constituents. In his earlier life he fought in numerous wars and served as a war correspondent. His time as a journalist allowed him to develop his writing skills which would pay off as he became a career politician and historian.

As the Battle of France began on May 10th of 1940, the French and British were being driven out of Norway by German forces. Many questioned Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's ability to direct the war, and the Allied Norwegian Campaign against Nazi Germany was looking grim. In his private diary, a British commoner and salesman, Christopher Tomlin, expressed his skepticism of the leadership. "[T]he wrong men are at the helm," he wrote, "Chamberlain must go. We want a man of fury, devilish cunning and energy... Can't we find more men of Churchill's breed?" Exactly one month later, Mr. Tomlin's question was answered. Prime Minister Chamberlain resigned after failing to negotiate peace with Germany and for mishandling the Norwegian Campaign. He recommended to King George VI that Winston Churchill should craft the direction of the war.

Churchill was appointed Prime Minister, who then appointed himself the Minister of Defence and created a War Cabinet. Three days later, as he addressed the House of Commons, Churchill made his goals clear to Parliament; he was fully dedicated to an Allied victory in Europe. These words will forever be remembered in British society:

I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind.


Despite the fact that most British people had never heard the speech, it would later become synonymous in British memory. Churchill's blunt determination shines through his speech and gives hope to many that victory is actually possible. Churchill provides a dedicated sense of leadership for the British, although it is through his oratory rather than any substantial military strategy. That same night, 22-year-old Doris Melling describes it in her diary as "a wonderful speech, and even the BBC announcer got all her up about it." In another entry: "[t]he general opinion of the speech is that it was a good one, a fighting one. The ending where he said we would fight to the last, and never surrender, seems to have made the biggest impression." Churchill's words inspire the British people's belief that a German invasion could be stopped. James Reston, of The New York Times, applauded Churchill and his Minister of Information, Duff Cooper, for "telling the people straight what they are up against. ... The days of illusion are past."

Having proven that the British populace could handle hearing the truth and were inspired by Churchill's leadership, the government then tried to persuade the United States that the war was a just cause, and attempted to show the Americans that Great Britain was worthy of aid. Refusing to allow their neighboring France to admit defeat, Churchill continued sending British soldiers to France to show Reynaud that the war could still be fought; however, it would be futile. Member of Parliament Sir Cuthbert Headlam writes, "The trouble is that all this clique (Winston, Duff, F.O., etc.) have never realized the weakness of France, and still scarcely appreciate the truth." Churchill did not want to be

Broadcast over the radio for all to hear (unlike Churchill's inaugural address), this speech is inspiring. Churchill tells the British people that the war in France is not yet over and addresses the fear of a German invasion on British soil:

The British Empire and the French Republic ... will defend to the death their native soil ... 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 shall fight with growing confidence and 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. ... [O]ur 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.

Churchill's blunt determination shines through his speech and gives hope to many that victory is actually possible. Churchill provides a dedicated sense of leadership for the British, although it is through his oratory rather than any substantial military strategy. That same night, 22-year-old Doris Melling describes it in her diary as "a wonderful speech, and even the BBC announcer got all her up about it." In another entry: "[t]he general opinion of the speech is that it was a good one, a fighting one. The ending where he said we would fight to the last, and never surrender, seems to have made the biggest impression." Churchill's words inspire the British people's belief that a German invasion could be stopped. James Reston, of The New York Times, applauded Churchill and his Minister of Information, Duff Cooper, for "telling the people straight what they are up against. ... The days of illusion are past."

Having proven that the British populace could handle hearing the truth and were inspired by Churchill's leadership, the government then tried to persuade the United States that the war was a just cause, and attempted to show the Americans that Great Britain was worthy of aid. Refusing to allow their neighboring France to admit defeat, Churchill continued sending British soldiers to France to show Reynaud that the war could still be fought; however, it would be futile. Member of Parliament Sir Cuthbert Headlam writes, "The trouble is that all this clique (Winston, Duff, F.O., etc.) have never realized the weakness of France, and still scarcely appreciate the truth." Churchill did not want to be

9 Mr. Churchill Surveys the War," Times, June 5, 1940.
10 A Times of London correspondent in New York reported that there had been great admiration for Churchill's speech, reporting that people had been stopping each other in the streets of Manhattan to talk about it.
11 To "get all his/her up about it" is a British colloquialism indicating a passionate or emotional response.
responsible for the invasion of Britain and did all he could to prevent it. General Hastings "Pug" Ismay, Chief of Staff to the Minister of Defence, suggested that Churchill take considerable caution as to the speed of BEF troop deployment. "Certainly not," Churchill declined, "it would look very bad in history if we were to do any such thing."16

France's leadership sought, more than anything, an armistice for the protection of its people. Churchill was attempting to avoid a battle on the British home front, but by this point he had a very real sense that a French surrender was imminent.17 The Germans occupied Paris and Reynaud resigned. Marshall Pétain, soon to be recognized as a Nazi sympathizer, was the interim Prime Minister of France. It was suspected that Hitler had his sights set on Britain, which lay mere miles away across the channel from the convenient stepping-stone of France. Churchill prepared for the inevitable invasion of Britain.

On June 18, shortly after the surrender of France to Germany, Churchill delivers another stirring speech to the British people:

What General Weygand called the Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon 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. ... 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 ... Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, 'This was their finest hour.'18

Instead of serving as an indirect appeal for assistance, this speech takes on the form of propaganda by Churchill's own making, warning the U. S. of the possible consequences of continued American neutrality. Unlike most of his speeches, Churchill alludes to future generations and how they might look upon the sacrifices made on the British home front. Even frequent critic Sir Headlam appreciates Churchill's speech. "Winston made a very fine and courageous speech," he writes, "I am not one of his admirers ... but this does not imply that I do not admire his courage, his abilities, his quickness of uptake and his fervid patriotism. In many ways he is the right man for the present situation ..."19

Churchill's way with words was essential to his success as a leader in 1940, regardless of military failures. His belief that the decisions he made would later be analyzed played an important role in his decision-making and speech-writing processes. Churchill was meticulous with his choice of words. The Battle of Britain will always be associated with Churchill's remark that "[n]ever in the field of human conflict has so much been owed by so many to so few."20 This phrase is not unique to this time or this event. Between 1899 and 1910, these words were used by Churchill in "at least five of his speeches and writings."21 By the end of the year, the "Battle of Britain" speech and the "blood, toil, tears and sweat" speech were printed and circulated around the world. Historian John Lukacs says, "they were repeated, small jewels of the English language, on the threshold of entering dictionaries of quotations."22 By recycling his words, Churchill was able to ensure they could be would be remembered. Churchill knew how to make use of the words and phrases within his vocabulary. He shaped and finessed them throughout his career and later used them in his memoirs to make his phrases synonymous with particular events. The phrase "their finest hour" is powerful and memorable still to this day; it is immortalized as the title of the second volume of Churchill's memoir series. Churchill's use of dramatic, inspirational phrases helped cement the notion of wartime Britain as a proverbial Golden Age. Wartime Britain would come to define British resilience in a time of uncertainty.

Churchill's rhetoric moved the country, but as he himself was aware, "[r]hetoric was no guarantee for survival."23 However, it does look good in the history books. Historian Max Hastings writes, "Seldom has a great actor on the stage of human affairs been so mindful of the verdict of future ages, even as he played out his own part and delivered his lines."24 Crafting his own speeches and "delivering his lines," Churchill artfully employs his own loyalist brand of propaganda to elicit faith and confidence from the British people, even as they reluctantly prepare for an unwanted war.

Historian Mark Connelly writes, "The war itself did not have a simple, single story or explanation at the time."25 Churchill, however, played a significant role in creating a "simple, single story" that the public could understand. His speeches and rhetoric forged in the public consciousness a story which only he could deliver, told in magnificent prose. His speeches became rousing anecdotes of inspiration used to mobilize the country for war. The words that resonated with his listening public during the beginning of the war would also resonate with his reading audience years later as he proved himself to be a capable historian.

Churchill as Historian

Clement Attlee, to whom Winston Churchill lost the 1945 general election, once said, "[Churchill] was always, in effect, asking himself ... 'What must Britain do now so that the verdict of history will be favourable?' ... He was always looking around for 'finest hours,' and if one was not immediately available, his impulse was to manufacture one."26 One way for Churchill to ensure he would be seen in a favorable light was not only to be conscious of it, but to write that history himself. Following his defeat in 1945, the former Prime Minister embarked on a project

17 Ibid., 47.
18 Churchill, 314.
19 Headlam, 207.
20 Churchill, 348.
22 Lukacs, 114.
23 Lukacs, 115.
24 Hastings, 52.
26 Hastings, 102.
that would have him relive the course of Great Britain’s participation in the Second World War. His memoirs played a significant role in creating in the public’s mind a romantic sense of national pride and military prowess, which likely contributed to his re-election as Prime Minister in 1951.

Churchill’s memoirs were initially released in serialized form in *The New York Times, The Daily Telegraph, and Life,* and these installments ran from 1948 to 1954. When published in book form, the six volumes of *The Second World War* became an instant bestseller published in fifteen countries and translated into eleven languages. The widespread availability and popularity of his memoirs made Churchill’s perspective on the war—Churchill’s version of history—the prevailing reflection upon the events of World War II.

Churchill was the only national leader to publish memoirs immediately following the war and his role as an Allied Power leader during World War II generated strong readership. Dramatic phrases such as “their finest hour” adorned his written volumes and are recognizable still in modern popular culture. *The Second World War* series served as a reminder to the British people of what Churchill had done for them as a wartime leader. The writing of his memoirs served as a release-valve for Churchill. Losing the 1945 general election to Labour Party leader and prominent socialist, Clement Attlee, Churchill was insistent on bringing his name back to prominence and making a political comeback. The memoirs allowed him to relive his time in the spotlight, along the way shaping a story that treated himself as he saw fit.

Churchill’s *The Second World War* received many more favorable reviews than negative over the course of its release. However, it was not long before individuals mentioned in his memoirs began to criticize his assessments of the war. Churchill’s first volume, *The Gathering Storm,* was immediately criticized by some for its bias and tendency to shine light on himself while condemning those who failed to respond to his warnings against German rearmament. W. N. Newer, of Chicago’s *Daily Herald,* said *The Gathering Storm* was “a passionate almost pathological endeavor by a haunted man to prove that for thirty-odd years he had always been right.” Churchill did, however, address the fact that his estimates about the buildup of German military aircraft prior to the war were exaggerated.

Other key players gradually emerged to protest Churchill’s account of history. In a letter to *The New York Times* dated September 26, 1948, Joseph Kennedy, American Ambassador to Britain, cautioned that *The Gathering Storm* was “replete with serious inaccuracies on the basis of which judgments are made that are unfair to individuals and events.” General Weygand and several French military officers attacked Churchill’s “inexact judgment and insinuations.” Even King Leopold of Belgium, among others, had allegedly been portrayed dishonorably in Churchill’s retelling. An unnamed “former U. S. diplomat” provided photostatic evidence to *The New York Times,* exonerating King Leopold from Churchill’s attacks.

Historian Geoffrey Best explains the complexity of Churchill’s memoirs, which he aptly describes as “Memoir-histories.” Best argues that Churchill’s personal experiences combined with the historical nature reflected in his memoirs “add to their overt charms but also to their hidden hazards ... [Churchill] was more concerned to describe what he had done ... not just to describe but positively to justify his actions.”

To help write his memoirs, Churchill was granted access to classified documents that would not be released by the government for years to come. Although this helps to uphold the factual accuracy of the series, his personal bias adds a dilemma to his memoirs. Churchill hired a team of young professionals which came to be known as the “Syndicate.” Including an Oxford professor and a handful of retired generals, the Syndicate did everything from researching to writing and/or dictating first drafts, playing an essential role in the production of the memoirs. Even with the help of this research team, the history of *The Second World War* contained many errors, and important wartime players challenged the accuracy of Churchill’s account. When writing *The Second World War,* Churchill tried to be careful about what he said about current political and military leaders, but sometimes he could not show restraint or maintain an appropriate level of objectivity.

Through his writing, Churchill played a significant role in establishing the negative connotations of the word “ appeasement.” In *The Gathering Storm,* he made “appeasement” synonymous with “weakness,” whereas before the 1930s and ’40s it was perceived as a positive and rational diplomatic approach. It has since been regarded as a weak diplomatic policy to be avoided by the international community, demonstrating the impact Churchill had on diplomatic policy. “On diplomacy, as on defense,” writes historian David Reynolds, “Churchill’s retrospective concentration on Germany (informed by the events of 1940) distorts the events of the 1930s and, at times his own part in them.” Geoffrey Best comments on the engaging style with which Churchill wrote *The Second World*
War,” saying, “[i]t reads so well, in fact, that the contented reader can be lulled into taking it for the standard history of *The Second World War* that its straightforward title leads him or her to expect.”

Churchill was still active in Parliament as the leader of the Conservative Party and used his memoirs to remind the British populace that he was still the great leader they had known in 1940. The success of *The Second World War*, despite attacks from those who challenged the factual integrity of the series, established Churchill as a capable historian. The impact of the memoirs likely contributed to Churchill’s re-election as Prime Minister in 1951, defeating the politician who had once defeated him, Clement Attlee.

Churchill garnered even more respect for his memoirs when he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1953. At year’s end, Churchill’s wife, Clementine, accepted the prize on his behalf and read his acceptance speech aloud to the Swedish Academy: “The roll on which my name has been inscribed represents much that is outstanding in the world’s literature of the twentieth century. The judgment of the Swedish Academy is accepted as impartial, authoritative, and sincere throughout the civilized world.”

Churchill cleverly highlights his importance in history with an “awestruck” pseudo-modesty—“I am proud but also, I must admit, awestruck at your decision to include me. I do hope you are right. I feel we are both running a considerable risk and that I do not deserve it. But I shall have no misgivings if you have none.”

Churchill deftly surrenders to the unimpeachable judgment of the Academy in its appreciation of *The Second World War*. At the awards ceremony, G. Liljestrand, a member of the Royal Academy of Sciences, said of Churchill, “His words, accompanied by corresponding deeds, have inspired hope and confidence in millions from all parts of the world during times of darkness. With a slight alteration we might use his own words: Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to one man.”

Churchill’s rhetoric had a powerful and lasting impact on the combined psyche of the citizenry, rekindling a sense of national pride even in hard times. In *Their Finest Hour* he writes of Great Britain, “but nothing surpasses 1940. By the end of that year this small and ancient island, with its devoted Commonwealth, Dominions and attachments under every sky, had proved itself capable of bearing the whole impact and weight of world destiny. . . . the soul of the British people and race had proved invincible.”

At the start of war in 1940, the nation needed to be reassured by a strong leader. It needed a rallying cry, and the echoes of Churchill’s rallying cry have carried on into the modern era. As evaluated by Max Hastings, “Churchill possessed the ability, through his oratory, to invest with majesty the deeds and even failures of mortal men. More than any other national leader in history . . . he caused words to become . . . acts of governance.”

Today, we have the phenomenon of the resurgence of an old war poster designed by the Ministry of Information, reading “Keep Calm and Carry On,” now hanging in businesses and homes all over the country. Since 2000, it has been reproduced and regained popularity, giving new life to the very British “stiff-upper-lip” stoicism. It is a left-over relic from Churchill, ever the Prime Minister, comforting the masses even in light of Britain’s present-day economic troubles.

On the significance of Churchill’s memoirs, John Ramsden declares the series to be “[o]ne of the best-selling book-series of all time, but also one that helped to fix a specifically Churchillian interpretation of the recent war in the popular consciousness.”

Winston Churchill’s speeches and memoirs were forged by his interpretations of the war, of which he saw (or placed) himself at the very center. For years, his war memoirs were the iconic account of the Second World War. Since the end of the war, historians have been trying to tweeze the myth from the truth of Great Britain’s role in the Second World War, but “[t]he real war and the mythical war will . . . always be intertwined.” This same concept could be applied to Churchill himself, quite possibly one of the most ambiguous and enigmatic characters of the twentieth century.
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Abstract:

*The Wife of Bath* and its *Prologue* is inarguably one of the most controversial of Geoffrey Chaucer’s corpus of literature. Its timelessness lends the work to the most pressing of contemporary arguments—woman’s place and her agency. While many literary critics argue that Chaucer is in support of the anti-feminist theology propagated by many medieval theologians, this literary analysis refutes those ideas, and instead, asserts that while Chaucer brings to bear the most prevalent accusations made against women, he does so in keeping with dialectical argumentation. This method of voicing oppositional arguments was widely practiced by St. Thomas Aquinas and others persuaded by Scholasticism. In other words, Chaucer proposes a position, and then undermines it with counter-logic.

Throughout recorded history, social change has been wrought only through opposition to the existing power structure and its leaders. The medieval period is no exception. The Church, during the Middle Ages, was responsible for generating anti-feminist theology, which perpetuated the subjugation of woman. Geoffrey Chaucer, in *The Wife of Bath’s Prologue*, marshals Scholasticism to interrogate these accusations by clerics. Undoubtedly, many contemporary scholars have pondered the puzzling “generic gymnastics” in the work; I propose that Chaucer constructs a dialectical argument wherein he not only presents both sides within the poem, but also engages in prescient oppositional advocacy as a means of social change. Daringly, he directs the message at officials of the Church by using their most honored means of discovery — Scholasticism. In his work, *The Worlds of Medieval Europe*, Clifford R. Backman explains, “Although the scholastics ... never devised a comprehensive syllabus or platform, they generally agreed ... about the nature of truth: that it was to be found through Argument ... recognized Authority, and that it was Additive” (Backman 306). While all three concepts, argument, authority, and additive, are evident within the text, for the purpose of this theoretical criticism, I will focus on argument and authority. Further, by briefly examining the historical context of Chaucer’s writings, and by noting both anti-feminist dogma and rhetorical stratagem, we will better understand the long lasting significance of *The Wife of Bath’s Tale Prologue* as a forerunner of pro-feminist literature.

*Generic gymnastics: term used to explain the discernible toggling between one literary genre and another within the same text or work— coined by Robert J. Meyer-Lee, Ph.D.*