

**Analysing Rhetoric in Speeches by
Winston Churchill and Barack Obama**

Ville Raivio
Master's Thesis
English Language and Literature
Faculty of Arts
University of Helsinki
05/2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Theoretical Framework.....	7
3. A Biography of Winston Churchill.....	10
2.1 Winston Churchill as a speaker.....	13
4. A Biography of Barack Obama.....	15
4.1 Barack Obama as a Speaker.....	16
5. Rhetorical Analysis.....	18
5.1 Winston Churchill’s Speech: The Cause of the Left-out Millions.....	18
5.2 Winston Churchill’s Speech: Be Ye Men of Valour!.....	23
5.3 Winston Churchill’s Speech: A ‘United States of Europe’.....	28
5.4 Barack Obama’s Speech: Keynote Speech at the Democratic National Convention.....	34
5.5 Barack Obama’s Speech: Yes, We Can.....	40
5.6 Barack Obama’s Speech: Remarks on Trayvon Martin.....	44
6. Conclusions.....	49
7. Works Cited.....	50
8. Appendix: The Speeches.....	i
8.1 The cause of the left-out millions.....	i
8.2 Be Ye Men of Valour.....	iii
8.3 A ‘United States of Europe’.....	v
8.4 The Audacity of Hope.....	viii
8.5 Yes, We Can.....	xiii
8.6 Remarks on Trayvon Martin.....	xvi

Tiedekunta – Fakultet – Faculty		Koulutusohjelma – Utbildningsprogram – Degree Programme	
Humanistinen tiedekunta		Englannin kielen ja kirjallisuuden maisteriohjelma	
Opintosuunta – Studieriktning – Study Track			
Englantilainen filologia			
Tekijä – Författare – Author			
Ville Raivio			
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title			
Analysing Rhetoric in Speeches by Winston Churchill and Barack Obama			
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level	Aika – Datum – Month and year	Sivumäärä – Sidoantal – Number of pages	
Pro gradu -tutkielma	05/2020	52 + xx	
Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract			
<p>Tämä englanninkielinen tutkielma analysoi retoriikkaa Winston Churchillin ja Barack Obaman poliittisissa puheissa. Tutkielma esittelee kahden poliitikon tavat kirjoittaa puheita ja heille ominaiset puhetyylin keinot, sekä analysoi kolme puhetta molemmilta. Tutkielma sisältää johdannon, teoreettisen kirjallisuuden esittelyn, Churchillin sekä Obaman lyhyet elämäkerrat, poliitikkojen puhetyylin ja puheiden kirjoitustapojen esittelyt, kolmen puheen analyysin molemmilta puhujilta sekä yhteenvedon. Tutkielman liitteinä on puheet, joita työssä analysoidaan. Tutkielma esittelee myös molempien poliitikkojen uskonnollisen taustan.</p> <p>Työn teoreettinen aineisto pohjautuu antiikin Kreikan aikaiseen Aristoteleen <i>Retoriikka</i>-teokseen sekä antiikin Rooman aikaiseen tuntemattoman kirjoittajan puheoppaseen <i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>. Nämä teokset ovat tärkeimmät retoriikasta laaditut oppaat, joiden teorioihin myöhempien aikakausien kirjat pohjautuvat. Muu aineisto koostuu teoksista, jotka esittelevät poliitikkojen elämäkertoja, heidän puhetapojaan sekä retoriikan termistöä. Puheiden analysoinnissa metodina on kirjallisuustutkimuksen määrittelemä lähiluku.</p> <p>Aineiston kautta selviää, että Winston Churchill ja Barack Obama kirjoittivat puheensa itse uransa alkuvaiheessa, mutta presidentin ja pääministerin asemassa heidän aikansa ei enää riittänyt tähän. Puheissaan Churchill personifioi maita ja hän viittasi Liittoutuneiden ja natsi-Saksan vastaiseen sotaan hyvän ja pahan taisteluna. Hänen puhetyylinsä oli pessimistinen ja pääministeri lupasi kärsimyksiä sekä tuhoa vuodesta toiseen. Barack Obaman puhetyyliin kuuluvat parafrasit, somaattiset fraasit sekä sananlaskut, hänen puheidensa yleinen teema on amerikkalainen unelma. Analyysin tuloksena selviää, että Churchill ja Obama pyrkivät vaikuttamaan kuulijan tunteisiin ennen kaikkea kristillisten kielikuvien ja viitteiden kautta.</p> <p>Tutkielman johtopäätöksenä on, että molemmat poliitikot ovat käyttäneet klassisen retoriikan metodeja puheissaan, lisäksi molemmat ovat käyttäneet kristinuskon sanastoa ja kuvastoa vaikuttaakseen kuulijoihin. Jokaisessa aineiston kuudesta puheesta on kristillisiä käsitteitä, jotka yhdistävät suurinta osaa Yhdysvaltojen ja Iso-Britannian kansalaisista. Jatkotutkimusta varten olisi hyödyllistä laajentaa Churchillin ja Obaman puheiden aineistoa ja lähilukua käyttäen tutkia, millä tavoin poliitikot ovat käyttäneet kristinuskon teemoja vaikuttaakseen kuulijoihinsa. Tämä selvittäisi uskon asemaa kahden vaikutusvaltaisen länsimaisen poliitikon retoriikassa ja osana yhteiskunnallista diskurssia.</p>			
Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords			
Retoriikka, politiikka, Winston Churchill, Barack Obama, Aristoteles, Platon, kristinuskko			
Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe – Where deposited			
E-thesis			
Muita tietoja – Övriga uppgifter – Additional information			

1. Introduction

It is infinitely better to be governed by words rather than the whip or the threat or the gun. Democracies have decreed that the three do not function, and thus it is words which bring about and enact democracy. It is beneficial to be interested in the power of speech as this skill can be used to change the perceptions of others. The famed philosopher and polymath Aristotle defined rhetoric as a *τέχνη*, transcribed as *tékhnē*, which means a practical skill. For him, speaking is not a concept that exists in some other dimension, not a gift from the gods, nor an entity in itself. For Aristotle, rhetoric was simply a method of speaking that could be learned from others and improved upon. It was man's creation for the business of men. While philosophy aimed to discover universal truths, the art of speaking was a tool, a means to reach an end. The aim of rhetoric has been to present an opinion in a favourable light, to raise emotions, to dissuade the arguments of opponents, and to convince the listener. For over a millennium, rhetoric was an important part of western education. Brian Vickers has stated (Vickers 256) that at least some two thousand books on rhetoric were published between 1400 to 1700. During those centuries reading was not a common skill and books were expensive, so these thousands of volumes show the value invested in speaking.

In this study, I will analyse three speeches by two politicians. I will describe each politician as a speaker, how they wrote their speeches, which stylistic choices they have favoured, and what expressions are close to them. I have chosen a speech from the beginning, the middle, and the later part of their careers. These will show how the rhetoric of each speaker has changed over the years. My study will employ the theories defined in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as well as *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, written by an unknown scholar, to prove that Winston Churchill and Barack Obama have used the Christian religion as a tool in politics, and framed their political goals with Christian concepts and register to convince the listener. Through close reading, I will show how they have done this and highlight the references and goals of the speeches. Similarities, differences, and individual choices within will also be shown.

Public speaking had been taught before Aristotle, but its precepts were defined and presented in his hallmark treatise *Rhetoric*. It was published during the third century BCE and students of speaking, as well as the politicians presented in this essay, have returned to Aristotle's findings ever since. During the 1900s, however, the formal study and teaching of rhetoric faded (Leith 39). It relied on the canon of western literary classics and was heavy with repetitive exercises, memorisation, and

antiquated examples with little connection to the times. The canon and literary restrictions were torn down as free verse, free style in novels, and experimentation took hold. Rhetoric was eventually replaced with subjects like Linguistics, Literary Criticism, and Comparative Literature. Today, in the 2020s, few universities keep classical theory of rhetoric part of mandatory studies.

Some of the oldest written words of distrust for public speeches are found from Aristophanes's play *The Clouds*, which was published around 420 BCE (Aristophanes 172). In this comedy, Socrates is lampooned heavily and two personified characters, Just Cause and Unjust Cause, are portrayed as his friends. Early in the play, the two hold a debate on the topic of superior education. Just Cause takes the side of the gods and offers a life of discipline as the correct answer. This is, after all, the old and tried way. Unjust Cause does not believe in justice, his answer is an easy and elegant life, the kind that is lived by all who can talk their way out of peril. Before the characters leave the play, the Unjust Cause asks several times on whose side do various public servants stand. The Just Cause concedes every time: all who have power also have no scruples — and the unjust forces win the debate.

A later and more important critique (Hamilton 28) of rhetoric comes from Plato, the famed philosopher and pupil of Socrates, who founded the first western institution of higher learning, the Academy. In Plato's *Gorgias*, a Socratic dialogue written around 380 BCE, the whole theme of the work is rhetoric, its definition, uses, and morality. The dialogue runs between Socrates, as written by Plato, and the sophists who taught the art of speaking in ancient Athens. Gorgias was among the first of them and he claimed to have brought the art of rhetoric from his native lands in Sicily to Attica in Greece. Plato's critique of oratory opens after some ten pages of dialogue: "SOCRATES: Now, Gorgias, I think that you have defined with great precision what you take the art of oratory to be, and, if I understand you aright, you are saying that oratory is productive of conviction, and that is the be-all and end-all of its whole activity... GORGIAS: No, Socrates; the definition which you have given seems to be quite adequate; that is the main point about oratory (Socrates, 12).

Throughout the work, Plato repeats that rhetoric is nothing more than false promises and deceit, used by men who vie for power over others, and who pleasure themselves by inciting mobs. Compared to the logic, clarity and universality of philosophy, rhetoric for Plato is unclear and only a tool for using others. Socrates, the teacher of Plato, was tried publicly and finally forced to drink poison by the rulers of Athens. Plato witnessed the people's anger toward his teacher first hand and this likely explains his stance against rhetoric. Perhaps the heaviest condemnation against rhetoric

by Plato still repeated by others in other ways, goes “SOCRATES: So when the orator is more convincing than the doctor, what happens is that the ignorant person is more convincing than the expert before an equally ignorant audience. Am I right? GORGIAS: That is what happens in that case, no doubt. SOCRATES: And the same will be true of the orator in relation to all other arts. The orator need have no knowledge of the truth about things; it is enough for him to have discovered a knack of convincing the ignorant that he knows more than the experts. GORGIAS: And isn’t it a great comfort, Socrates, to be able to meet specialists in all the other arts on equal terms without going to the trouble of acquiring more than this single one (Plato 38) [i.e. the specialty of speaking]?”

Indeed, Socrates means that the speaker does not even need to know the facts. Only the skill to convince other ignorant people of the speaker’s wisdom is enough, and this skill can be learned from teachers of rhetoric or bought from professional speech writers. American politics in the 2000s and the continued rise of populists all over spring to mind instantly after reading Plato’s words, put down over two thousand years ago. These are only some of the criticism that has been piled against rhetoric, but I share the above to show that this debate is as old as democracy. A concurrent example comes from the critic and journalist James Wood (New Yorker, 6.8.2008). He reminds us of the epithet, common at least in the American context, which declares that an opinion or its reasoning is poor because the speaker is “just using rhetoric” or concentrates on words instead of actions. Quarrelling about rhetoric is not likely to end but learning the art of speaking has many benefits, grandest among them influence. The techniques and tropes described in this essay have been effective for millennia, so there is nothing to lose by learning them. They will also help to recognise the ways a speaker is trying to move the opinions of others.

Finally, I have chosen speeches for the topic of my Master of Arts essay because I have a fascination with the English language, as well as a interest in charisma and in Communications. As a citizen of a western democracy, following politics is both a privilege and a duty. Analysing speeches feels like a wonderful combination of all above. Speeches from ancient eras, whether from BCE or a millennium afterwards, seem distant to me while those held within a century of my time have more reach. I have chosen Winston Churchill and Barack Obama as each has been hailed as a torchbearer of rhetoric during their time. They also span a century of democracy on two continents, and their words are studied, repeated, and revered widely. If I am to learn, I might as learn from the best.

2. Theoretical Framework

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is the single most important literary work on the art of speaking (Cooper I). It is foremost a practical guide on how to frame a speech, on the order of its parts, and about the proper sequence of phases that make the listener follow and accept the speaker's message (Cooper XVII). Plato had dismissed rhetoric heavily and impacted its stature with his writings, but Aristotle opposed Plato's views and his book acts as an antithesis to the platonic school of thought. According to Aristotle, speeches are judged according to their effect on the "jury." This was just his term for the listener. To put it solemnly: Aristotle holds that the speaker must recognise and understand the listener's soul and adjust his speech accordingly. Each speech should be judged according to its movement of the soul, of its effect on people.

Naturally, the speaker's aim is to convince others. While most sophists taught others how to speak effectively, Aristotle's difference lies in his aim to define which speeches had a greater impact. Through this study he also wanted to define humanity and understand humans better. Aristotle was the first to categorise the three main paths of rhetoric: deliberative, judicial, and epideictic (Cooper XVIII). He also defined three appeals to emotions within the art of speaking, *Ethos*, *Pathos*, and *Logos*. Through his work rhetoric received a definition and became a field of formal study. While the art of speaking was indeed a practical skill, for Aristotle the best of speeches could express virtue. This was the finest goal for men of stature.

Besides *Rhetoric*, my second theoretic framing comes from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Rhetoric For Herennius). It has been variously attributed to both Cicero and Cornificius, both influential politicians in their time, but its author is still unknown (Caplan ix). Besides the writer, the original name of the work is also unknown. The piece is, however, dedicated to Gaius Herennius and this is how the popular name was born (Caplan xv). The book is the oldest surviving Latin work on rhetoric, written sometime in the 80s BCE, and held the place of the most popular book on rhetoric during the Middle Ages into the Renaissance (Golden et al. 67). Over one hundred manuscripts have remained over the centuries, it was translated into many European languages and used as a standard schoolbook on rhetoric. *Rhetorica's* words on the style of speaking, termed *elocutio*, is the oldest surviving teaching of Latin style, and its example sentences depict contemporary Roman events (Caplan xvii). *Rhetorica ad Herennium* also has the first known description of the method of *loci*, a memory technique still used by mnemonists, as well as other tropes that help to memorise whole speeches (Caplan xx). *Rhetorica* also includes a long list of

definitions for rhetorical figures, such as antithesis, apostrophe, isocolon, which are still in use (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 275).

In my analysis of three speeches by Winston Churchill and Barack Obama, I use Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as well as *Rhetorica ad Herennium* for analysing their structure and parts. The first two books listed are classical works that form the basis on which later theories build on. Aristotle forms the foundation for the art of speaking and its analysis, *Rhetorica* has insight in which the views of ancient Greece combined with the style of ancient Rome. Mark Forsyth's *The Elements of Eloquence* as well as Sam Leith's *You Talkin' to Me?* are modern books with definitions of rhetorical devices. They help analyse the style within sentences using terms such as epizeuxis, anaphora, and ellipsis. For the analysis beginning on page 19, it is vital to repeat Aristotle's view of a good speech below.

All speeches, according to Aristotle, should begin with *Inventio*. In Latin this means coming by something but it is more convenient to speak of creation. Among the first decisions of the speaker is to choose the target audience. Aristotle lists different groups of people who speak, act, and react differently (Aristotle 132). A speech, then, should be adjusted to the language and temperament of farmers if the speaker aims to persuade them over others; for politicians if the speaker performs in formal space; for lay people if the speech is held in front a large audience whose makeup is varied. The young listen to different arguments than the old, the poor will believe words that the rich will never accept. A talented speaker will always keep in mind the wise words of Aristotle: what is convincing is what one can be convinced by (Winkler 52).

After planning the target audience, the speaker must choose and persuade the listeners through three separate stages. These are *Ethos*, *Logos*, and *Pathos*. The first means character and evoking it is essential so that the audience believes the words because of the speaker's authority or credibility (Aristotle 108). This stage should be reached as soon as possible as, naturally, people want to know who is speaking before they hear arguments. *Ethos* is easiest to evoke when the speaker has a positive reputation, suitable education, or experience of the subject. It is strengthened when the speaker uses correct terminology, clear examples, concrete evidence, or arrives on the stage presented by another who is trusted. Through *Ethos*, a teacher of English will convince others more readily than a lawyer when the subject touches on the English language. If possible, the speaker should create a feeling that the words come from one who is part of the audience.

Logos, the second phase, is the part of speech where one presents arguments in favour of the speaker's view. This should be the longest and most thorough part of any speech, yet it rests on the pillar that is *Ethos*. If the speaker forgoes a presentation or does not show credible authority on the subject, the audience will not trust the words well. The arguments should feel logical and appeal to the audience's souls, to use the term favoured by Aristotle. Commonplace proverbs and concrete, everyday examples will have the largest understanding. The speaker will, naturally, choose proofs and examples that will further the aims of the speech. It is advisable first to present a statement and then provide examples that point backward through inductive reasoning. If X, then likely, surely or reasonably also Y. Another method is to invoke mental images or share memories and point out commonalities between them through deduction. If X as well as Y, then of course Z. If the audience manages to follow the reasoning and even premeditate what the conclusion will be, Aristotle reminds us, they will feel pleasure with themselves for predicting the outcome and praise the speaker (Leith 58).

Pathos, the third content of a speech, consists of all the words and acts which appeal to emotions. Stories about one's family or tough times should be relatable, the imagery should be concrete and approachable for the full effect. Examples about the actions of the speaker's opposers should raise ire but not hate. Aggressive speakers will gain a negative reaction from more listeners than moderate ones. For Aristotle, a speech is about moving as many listeners as possible and gaining their trust which is particularly important in politics. It should be noted that *Pathos* is not third in order, appeals to emotions may be presented at any point of a speech. Emotive words are essential — few people will be won over only with mathematical graphs, dry statistics, or facts in order. The speaker's goal is to uplift positive emotions related to oneself and one's goals as well as negative emotions pertaining to the opposing party, clique, or person. These are the total of Aristotle's theories.

Rhetorica ad Herennium defines the tasks (*Rhetorica* 5) of the public speaker thus: "to discuss capably those matters which law and custom have fixed for the uses of citizenship, and to secure as far as possible the agreement of his hearers." The writer counsels that a speech should have six parts and these should follow a fixed order (*Rhetorica* 9). *Exordium* (Introduction) is the start where the speaker establishes credentials, gains attention, and first appeals to emotions. It is akin to a host that announces what will happen in a show. *Narratio* (Statement of Facts) comes next and entails presenting the facts of an argument and the topic of discussion. The unnamed author stresses that narration should be brief, clear, and plausible. For the author, the greatest success of a speaker is to

frame the facts in favourable light to one's own views. *Divisio* (Division) should come at the middle of a speech, it includes presenting the differing viewpoints of two parties as well as the points on which both agree on. Here the orator's challenge is to choose a maximum of three points, preferably things that the opposing side would not choose. Using expressions and examples that belittle the speaker is termed *humiliatio*. Its aim is to show that the speaker is humble and serves others instead of oneself.

Then follows *Confirmatio* (Proof) where only arguments that support the speaker are presented. The speaker should come up with shared assumptions that touch on the audience's life, and appeal to authorities to back the claims of the speech. This is the moment for finding common ground on a higher ground than average. *Refutatio* (Refutation) is the second last part where the speaker should refute the arguments of the opposing party. A common method is to quote a claim an opposing party has shared, then attack it. The opposer's witnesses or character can also be attacked, attention can be diverted to a point that is irrelevant to the larger topic, especially in legal defence. Finally, *Peroratio* (Conclusion) and a synopsis of what has been discussed, a repetition of one's strongest arguments, a conclusion, and a final call to the emotions of the audience. The speaker can end with a terse slogan that bears repeating, an emotional story, a thoughtful quotation from some wizened thinker. These are the stages that should be followed, despite the words and style.

Finally, for analysing the speeches, their type can be categorised in three. The author of *Rhetorica*, for example, gives the oldest extant presentation of them as the grand style, the middle style, and the simple style (*Rhetorica* 253). These are alternatively termed Asiatic, Attic, and Rhodian. The plain style is language that includes current idioms, the sentences are short, and the words common. The middle style steers clear of crass or very colloquial expressions, it includes clear word and sentence choices. The grand style is smooth and ornate, full of metaphors, elaborate patterns as well as foreign words. A talented speaker should have knowledge of each style and, more importantly, understanding of the right audiences for each. The speaker should also know how to mix the three according to the occasion.

3. A Biography of Winston Churchill

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill was born in 1874 at the family home of Blenheim Palace, the only home in the United Kingdom with a palatial name besides Buckingham Palace. He was the son

of Lord Randolph Churchill, an aristocrat politician from one of the country's grandest families, and socialite Lady Jennie Spencer-Churchill. At the age of seven, Churchill moved to board in St. George's School (Churchill 26), but ill health forced him to change to Brunswick School, and later he barely managed to pass the entrance exams to Harrow School in 1888. Five years later, after several failed attempts, he gained entrance into the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst, as cavalryman. After five years of military service around the world for the British Empire, Churchill quit the army for politics. It was indeed his original goal (Addison, *Churchill: The Unexpected Hero* 14) to take up the arms in order to leverage a way into politics and power. Despite his grand legacy, Churchill was not prepossessed of charisma or gravitas. He was a little under 170 cm high with hunched shoulders, a stooping walk, round face, and a rotund figure (Cannadine 2). He also had little understanding of the everyday life of commoners. As an aristocrat, Churchill spent his childhood in opulence, his youth in private schools, and his adulthood among the ranks of the political elite.

In 1900, Winston Churchill won the political seat for Oldham (Spencer-Churchill 373). At first, he represented the Conservative Party but defected to the Liberal Party four years later. This move, along with Churchill's quickly and strongly changing opinions, lead other politicians to regard him as an unstable persona (Cannadine 6). Churchill was handsomely rewarded for skipping bench as he was appointed President of the Board of Trade in 1908 at the young age of 34. In 1925, he re-joined the conservatives. Churchill was appointed the commander of the British navy in 1911 and made Chancellor of the Exchequer, the finance minister, in 1924 (Addison *Churchill: The Unexpected Hero* 112). Prior to the Second World War, Churchill gave a multitude of speeches on the need to rearm against the threat of Germany, but appeasement politics were favoured by the Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and his cabinet. Churchill was not listened to or approved of.

On the third of September 1939, Britain declared war on Germany and Churchill was appointed First Lord of the Admiralty, a position he first held at the beginning of the First World War. He also joined Chamberlain's small War Cabinet. Chamberlain lead Great Britain at the beginning of the war but resigned on the 10th of May 1940. Thus, Churchill became Prime Minister and his time was framed with historical speeches that inspired the British public. Among his peers, Churchill was derided as a selfish turncoat and he irritated dozens of politicians, but somehow managed to unite the Brits under the war effort. Perhaps through his speeches and war tactics were key. He was hailed as a hero of the nation during the war and after the Allied forces won.

Despite the fame, Churchill suffered defeat in the after-war elections of 1945. The British public did not believe in his policies for rebuilding the nation. After the setback, Churchill served as Leader of the Opposition for six years and became Prime Minister for the second time in 1951. He resigned four years later as he was plagued with ill health in his 80s. Finally, he left the parliament in 1964 at the age of 89 and died a year later. Besides his politics and wartime achievements, Winston Churchill is noted as one of the most talented political speakers on the 20th century and a scholarly writer of dozens of non-fiction works. He received the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1953, "for his mastery of historical and biographical description as well as for brilliant oratory in defending exalted human values" (Nobel Media AB).

Winston Churchill was Christened and belonged to the Church of England, but he was never anything more than a habitual believer, and his relationship with the Christian faith was doubtful at best (Haffner 32). In his early twenties, he went through "a violently anti-Christian phase" (Addison *The Political Beliefs of Winston Churchill* 29) but afterwards regarded himself an agnostic. In a letter to his cousin, Churchill called religion only "a delicious narcotic... [which] checks our growth and saps our strength" and said that he preferred Protestantism as he saw it "a step nearer Reason" (Gilbert 102). During these years, he believed that one day "Christianity will be put aside as a crutch which is no longer needed...till then, anyone who deprives us of our illusions...is a wicked man" (Reagles & Larsen 9).

Despite his resentment for Christianity on an intellectual and logical level, he regarded it essential as a moral guide (Reagles & Larsen 8). The Prime Minister also used the Bible's stories and religious vocabulary to justify his political goals. At one point he described his relations with the Church of England akin to a buttress – he "supported it from the outside." (Reagles & Larsen 8). Throughout his career, Churchill defended the western civilisation and ethics which were founded on Christian moral teachings. He also espoused missionary work throughout the British empire. He did not attend worship services and visited cathedrals only for state occasions and rites of passage. Yet religion remained mostly a tool for the Prime Minister, a unifying force for the empire and a philosophy for moral acculturation. His attitude in his own words was "If you are the recipient of a message which cheers your heart and fortifies your soul, what need is there to ask whether the imagery of the ancients is exactly, scientifically, feasible?" (Rose 31).

2.1 Winston Churchill as a speaker

Prime Minister Churchill was a prolific public speaker. His collected speeches span a total of more than 12,000 pages in some five million words and eight volumes, published under the title *Winston Churchill: The Complete Speeches 1987-1963* by Robert Rhodes James. As revealed by Churchill's grandson (Spencer-Churchill xxv), who was informed by Churchill's daughter, Mary Soames, the Prime Minister did not employ the services of a speechwriter. He only received notes and statistics from aides to support political claims. Furthermore, his private secretary John Colville is quoted on the same page that the wartime Prime Minister spent approximately one hour of preparation for each finished minute of speech. From the year 1900 onwards to 1955, Winston Churchill held at least one speech per week (Leith 159). Old age and ill health caught up with him during his second tenure as Prime Minister from 1951 onwards, and only then he accepted speech drafts that were pre-prepared (Cannadine 12).

Speaking with a slight lisp as well as a stammer, Churchill used the services of professional speech therapists as a young man (Cannadine *In Churchill's Shadow* 90). He also practiced his facial expressions and gestures for hours in front of mirrors (Cannadine 2). His numerous public speeches were the result of thorough work and effort, which began by memorising the texts by heart. After an embarrassing blackout in the House of Commons in April 1904, Churchill never again spoke without an array of notes (Addison *Churchill: The Unexpected Hero* 32). The diplomat Harold Nicolson regarded Churchill as a surprising speaker. He opined (Cannadine *In Churchill's Shadow* 91) that the politician had "great flights of oratory with sudden swoops into the intimate and conversational." This meant that the Prime Minister's habit of adding humour, small details, and conversational expressions into his otherwise grand style speeches. Regarding the overall composition of his speeches, Paul Addison holds that "Churchill would generally introduce one or two passages intended to capture the headlines, together with a touch a biting wit and a flight or two of verbal fancy. But for the most part a Churchill speech consisted of carefully organized exposition and argument, expressed with clarity and economy of phrase, and supported by facts and figures obtained from officials or other expert advisers...they were more durable because they read so well" (Addison *Churchill: The Unexpected Hero* 45).

Despite his patience for writing and presenting speeches, Churchill always regretted his lack of university education. In particular, he mentioned missing (Cannadine 2) small debating societies as those had a low threshold for young, inexperienced speakers to practice. With regards to inspiration, when Churchill decided to learn public speaking after his military years, he read the works of Oliver

Cromwell, William Pitt (the Earl of Chatham), William Pitt the Younger, Edmund Burke, Thomas Babington Macaulay, John Bright, Benjamin Disraeli, William Gladstone, Edward Gibbon, and William Bourke Cockran (Cannadine 2). He also read and memorised speeches his father held during his political years. David Cannadine holds that Churchill, at his greatest, was among the most talented orators of the 20th century.

He was known as a prodigious speaker during his time, but Churchill rarely won new supporters to his cause. The one-time leader of the Liberal Party, Herbert Samuel, said (Cannadine *In Churchill's Shadow* 94) that “The House always crowds in to hear him. It listens and admires. It laughs when he would have it laugh, and it trembles when he would have it tremble...but it remains unconvinced, and in the end it votes against him.” The Prime Minister Arthur Balfour once stated (Cannadine *In Churchill's Shadow* 95) that Churchill’s oratorical artillery was “powerful but not very mobile.” His speeches within The House of Commons were usually regarded as bombastic, grandiloquent, and rarely befitting the style of the discussions. His fellow politicians felt that he was too serious, reacted too heavily, and was keen to insult personally. The Prime Minister’s greatest weakness, however, was his love for his own words and his opinions: he rarely gave the impression that he had listened to others (Cannadine 8).

Finally, his speeches were usually gloomy, pessimistic, and promised suffering as well as destruction for the British people if action was not taken soon (Cannadine 6). Because he cried wolf! by habit, the parliament did not heed his warnings about Hitler and Nazi Germany. The politicians had heard the same too often. Thus, following Aristotle’s definition that rhetoric is foremost the art of convincing others, Churchill was not a talented speaker – at least in the domestic politics of Great Britain. For everyday debates he was too bombastic, too dramatic, too quarrelous, and too divisive. As far as wartime popularity goes, Churchill was an effective speaker. His style was suited to the end of times and the war that reached around the world.

It is an interesting fact that some of Churchill’s best-known speeches from the war year 1940, including one where he promises nothing but “blood, toil, tears, and sweat” and another where he vows that “we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds”, were only ever addressed to the House of Commons. These two speeches, and passages in particular, have lived on in countless media references, but the British people never heard the original words. Winston Churchill recorded the speeches only after the war (Addison *Churchill: The Unexpected Hero* 168). The Prime Minister held countless speeches but never improvised. This led his friend, politician

F.E. Smith, to opine (Manchester 32) that “Winston has spent the best years of his life writing impromptu speeches.” Churchill was regarded as a doomsday prophet, but this quality somehow became a virtue when the Second World War began. His style was then suited for the end of days that were surely around the corner. The Prime Minister’s speeches during the war served to spread news for the nation, to uplift its spirits, to unite bickering groups, to call for aid from friendly nations. His most common metaphor was to present countries or concepts as persons, as in heroic myths, and speak of Great Britain’s war effort as a force of good, rather than a group of people, against evil (Charteris-Black 54).

4. A Biography of Barack Obama

Barack Hussein Obama II was born in 1961 in Honolulu and spent his childhood in Hawaii. His father was a goatherd during his childhood in the village of Nyang'oma Kogelo in Kenya, but won an Economics scholarship to study in the University of Hawaii (Obama *Dreams from My Father* 9). After his first degree, he continued studies at Harvard University, and later in life became a Senior Economist for Kenya’s government. Obama’s mother, Ann Dunham, was American and met her husband at the University of Hawaii. She later worked as a field anthropologist in Indonesia. Barack Obama left Hawaii to attend Occidental College for two years, then continued to study Political Science at Columbia University, and finally Law at Harvard University. After graduating, he worked as a community organiser in Chicago (Obama *The Audacity of Hope* 43). He was elected to the Illinois State senate representing the Democratic Party in 1996 and served for eight years. In 2004, he was chosen by a record majority to the US Senate from Illinois and three years later announced his candidacy for president. After a close vote against Hillary Clinton, Obama defeated Senator John McCain in the elections to become the first Afro-American president of the United States.

In 2009, Obama was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize “for his extraordinary efforts to strengthen international diplomacy and cooperation between peoples” (Nobel Media AB). Likely the Nobel jury referred to Obama’s executive order that banned violent interrogations, the near emptying of the Guantánamo Bay prison, his call for a fresh start with Russian relations, and the important speech held in June 2009 in Cairo during which he reached out to the Muslim world. The largest reform during Obama’s tenure was The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in 2010, also known as Affordable Care Act (ACA), and nicknamed Obamacare. Its aim was to gain medical insurance coverage for more Americans and keep healthcare costs lower. Obama won a re-election

in 2012 and began his second term which was marked by endless struggles over policies with the Republican Party.

Obama left the presidency after two terms in 2017. He has remained politically in the background, as customary for former American presidents, and he has written his memoirs as well as raised money for the Obama Presidential Center in Chicago, Illinois. President Obama was not raised in a religious home but his anthropologist mother owned copies of the Bible, the Koran, the Bhagavad Gita, and several books on ancient mythologies (Obama *The Audacity of Hope* 203). She also took her son to visit Buddhist temples, Chinese New Year celebrations, Shinto shrines, and ancient Hawaiian burial sites. While not present, the religion of others was a background in Obama's youth. His work as a community organiser among Afro-American churches lead him closer to religion in his twenties. Barack Obama converted to Protestant Christianity in 1992 as an adult and was baptised at Trinity United Church of Christ in Chicago (Obama *The Audacity of Hope* 208).

In his rhetoric and politics, Obama is among the most religious modern American leaders: his political rallies often opened with a prayer and ended in invocations (Holmes 295). He often spoke in churches and his campaign staff handed out flyers with photos of him praying (Holmes 312). In his second book he opines: "But over the long haul, I think we make a mistake when we fail to acknowledge the power of faith in the lives of the American people... To begin with, it's bad politics. There are a whole lot of religious people in America, including the majority of Democrats. When we abandon the field of religious discourse...others will fill the vacuum" (Obama *The Audacity of Hope* 214). For him, the Christian faith is part of American culture and its removal would only lead to other ideologies filling the void. Obama has also stated that he prays every day and "the gospel of Jesus [is] a gospel on which I base my life" (Holmes 319).

4.1 Barack Obama as a Speaker

Barack Obama's speeches are characterised by a combination of formal oratorical style, which respects and contains all the hallmarks of classical composition, and everyday expressions and words. His earliest recollections of the power of speaking come from his father, who he only saw for a month while ten years old. In his memoirs, Obama recollects his father's animated hands and how the atmosphere in the room seemed to change when he livened up (Obama *Dreams from my Father* 64). These images came to him later in life while at the University of Los Angeles, when he agreed to introduce an anti-apartheid rally in a speech. Wolfgang Mieder, German language and

Folklore professor at the university of Vermont and proverb scholar, has analysed Obama's speeches extensively. He holds that proverbs and paraphrasing are an inseparable part of the president's speeches. Obama has used some 5.6 phrases in each of the 229 speeches, news conferences, radio addresses, and interviews that form the material of Mieder's analysis (Mieder 65). In the same, the professor also shares that Obama wrote his memoirs and older speeches by himself but changed to professional speechwriters in 2009, when political campaigning took up most of his time. Mieder's materials predate that year, so Obama's own wording and structure are most present in his analysis.

As their structure is so classical, Obama's speeches are easy to accuse of being self-indulgent, theatrical, and insincere. These adjectives are the same that can be found on historical records about the debates that raged among the Greeks and Romans. For inspiration, Obama's most important sources are the Bible and Abraham Lincoln, while he also paraphrases Frederick Douglass along with Martin Luther King Junior from time to time (Mieder 2). In an interview with 60 Minutes aired 16.10.2008, he told that "I've been spending a lot of time reading Lincoln. There's a wisdom there and a humility about his approach to government, even before he was president, that I just find very helpful" (Mieder 68). By drawing from the fountainhead of Lincoln, King, and Douglas, Barack Obama joins himself into a great chain of opposers of slavery and gains a portion of their repute. Like Winston Churchill, Obama usually speaks in a high style but surprises his audience with sudden swoops to folksy expressions and the everyday register, as will be shown in this essay's analysis section.

As for Obama's methods, in 2008 Time magazine's interviews revealed (How Obama Writes His Speeches) that "Obama takes an unusually hands-on approach to his speech writing, more so than most politicians. His best writing time comes late at night when he's all alone, scribbling on yellow legal pads. He then logs these thoughts into his laptop, editing as he goes along. These late-night sessions produced long, meandering texts that were then circulated to a close group of advisers, including [David] Axelrod and Obama's speechwriter Jon Favreau."

Apart from his call for change, which was the first leitmotif of Obama's 2008 presidential campaign, he has definite favourite proverbs. "To turn the page" appears in Mieder's collection of the president's speeches 64 times, and likely equates in Obama's mind with change. It also mirrors his background with the academia, both as a student who reached the doctoral level and a scholar who taught Constitutional Law for 12 years at the University of Chicago Law School. Two others

must be mentioned: “Let me be (adjective) clear” as well as “Make no mistake”. A call to action is the president’s famous “Yes, we can!” He used it for the first time in a speech in 2005 at the Herblock Foundation’s annual lecture. Later he returned to it and applied this fast and easy chant continuously in his presidential campaign in 2008. These five are Obama’s most common expressions (Mieder 86).

Like most political candidates, Obama aims to reach and talk to as many voters as possible. In the American context this means refraining from foreign languages, including proverbs in Latin, which could mark him looking down on the less educated, and those French words which have become common in English-speaking nations. They too could be perceived as snobbery. In American politics, the power and glory of America comes first and this shows in the proverb “Talk American!” In Mieder’s analysis, Obama refrains from classical metaphors but also from folk proverbs, such as “To have an ax to grind” or “To be baloney”. Instead of such categories, Barack Obama favours somatic phrases, that is, body parts which symbolise concepts. The head stands for thinking, the heart for emotions, the hand for action (Mieder 98).

As listed by Robert E. Terrill, several authors have remarked that Obama’s speeches are characterised by doubled tropes (Terrill 22). His common method is to gather extremes of political opinions, such as religion versus science, security of the many versus the rights of an individual, and thereby let his opponents know that he has read their opinions. Then, Obama presents his own thought and the arguments it rests on. His old colleagues have noted that the president already listened to both sides of an argument during his school years, regardless of which side he finally took. An important metaphor for Obama is the concept of journey, whether concrete or spiritual, it is the most applied one among his speeches (Charteris-Black 315). Finally, a key concept in Obama’s speeches is the American Dream: the promise that any hardworking American may attain wealth and security and happiness. Obama, born to poor parents and raised by a single mother, is the Dream personified (Charteris-Black 281). His speeches and policies, such as an extensive health care coverage, aimed to lessen the hardships of Americans so that they might focus on their largest goals.

5. Rhetorical Analysis

5.1 Winston Churchill’s Speech: The Cause of the Left-out Millions 11th October 1906

St Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, Scotland

Winston Churchill was born in a ducal palace into Britain's highest aristocracy, but in his younger years he was a liberal with a care for the country's poorest citizens. He was in favour of political causes which were held radical at the time, such as unemployment benefits, minimum wage, and improved working conditions, especially for miners (Spencer-Churchill 23). This speech was held at a famed concert hall which was also used for events, and the words aim to reassure the audience of the party's commitment to improving the lives of the working poor and destitute. *Inventio* cannot be analysed without information of the target audience of a speech. In this instance, there is no record of the audience in St Andrew's Hall. Churchill was 32 years old and a member of the Liberal Party at the time, working as the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies of Great Britain. His party finally succeeded as the Liberals created a prototype of a welfare model in Great Britain between 1906 to 1914 (Addison *Churchill on the Home Front, 1900–1955* 54).

For *Ethos* as well as *Exordium*, Churchill has chosen to remind the listener of his place as a member of the Liberal Party, and he uses the word we instead of I. This establishes the speaker's credentials as a Member of Parliament, an elected official with popular support, who voices the opinions of a political party. It also works as the *Exordium* according to *Rhetorica's* definitions. In the beginning of the speech, there are no kind words for the audience nor an introduction of any previous debate. The speech begins as if *in medias res*. The topic of the speech is established immediately with an effective isocolon (Forsyth 99), and the rest of the words are built on this framework: the Liberal cause is the cause of the poor. It is not only a political goal but a cause, a duty, and an honour. Churchill reminds the listener that a person cannot be separated from the group, the group cannot be separated from the individuals -- these are the Socialist's mistakes. Churchill will not make the same mistake, and thus he separates himself and his Party from socialism. This mirrors the Christian teaching where each man is connected to others, each man is his brother's keeper.

In the *Narratio* part of his speech, Churchill reminds his listeners that only co-operation guarantees an independent state and wellbeing for citizens. The beginning of the second paragraph is characterised by parataxis: "You cannot draw it either in theory or practice", "That is where the Socialist makes a mistake", "Let us not imitate that mistake" and this continues throughout the paragraph. Here Churchill aims to be as clear as possible with his political goals, and parataxis is as clear as the English language can be. The rest of the speech has longer clauses with conjunctions, featuring the hypotactic structure.

In the second paragraph, Churchill also uses groups of three in three groups, the tricolon: by co-operating the Brits have an army, a navy, a civil service -- as well as a post office, a police force, a government. The streets are lit, water is supplied, and communication is taken part in collectively. He reminds the listener of the achievements of the joined British people and contrasts them against a society of individuals who would have nothing of them. It is noteworthy that Churchill has written the army, navy, and civil service with capital letters. The letters will not be seen in speech form but they shows that he saw each as something higher than simple gears of a bureaucracy.

The speech is formal in tone so far and represents the grand style presented in *Rhetorica*, but suddenly Churchill switches into jocular imagery when he notes that “the Brits do not make love collectively”, that “the ladies don’t marry men collectively”. These are contrasted with the previous state organisations in a sudden turn. The speaker calls the human a “gregarious animal”, a secular term with connotations of belief in evolution instead of creation. Ultimately, the second paragraph opines that the human is both an individual and a group member. It finishes by reminding of the accidents and storms of life. Curiously, Churchill ends with an aposiopesis, even though it is only visible in text form. Likely this was a cue for himself to hold a pause for greater effect. Each person may face the ups and downs of life alone, and this thought is enough to make one melancholic.

In the fourth chapter, Winston Churchill states that he wants a debate on the minimum standard of life as well as its execution. Despite setting himself and his Party apart from the Socialists, he does note that these goals seem socialistic. He is in favour of state companies, but only if they function well. If they do not, private companies are an option and he would allow them profits. A surprising theme for this speech is “competitive selection”, a term likely inspired by eugenics and the findings of Charles Darwin about the evolution of species, the theory where the most well adapted organism is the most likely to survive. This concept is Churchill’s definition of the main driver of society, the spearpoint of his *Logos*, “the whole treasure” that past generations have been able to pass on to us.

He does not want to see an end to man’s competition against man, which is part of his strength and manhood. Instead he wants a net over the abyss for those who fail. This mental image is surprisingly poetic for a political speech. Winston Churchill proposes competition as the only option to barbarism, a black and white worldview. In the fourth chapter, the speaker also uses chiasmus, a favourite of political speakers of the modern era, when he espouses free competition upwards but not free competition downwards. This seemingly empathetic opinion still remains in

favour of an endless competition for occupations, offices, money, and status. Churchill seems to forget that being born into an aristocratic family would give a vast head-start in such a society, though a minimum standard of living would still be an improvement for millions.

Surprisingly, I find no *Divisio* in Churchill's speech. He does not refer to previous debates or the opinions of his opponents, he does not voice counter arguments to attack. Churchill's insistence on competition is surely his answer to opponents, who by habit attacked social security policies, claiming that they would only make the people lazy. Churchill writes of a Utopia, a reference to Sir Thomas More's fictional perfected dream land, which the working poor are looking forward to. In the speech, that Utopia can only be reached by competition. This is his *Confirmatio*, that the achievements listed at the beginning, such as the navy and police, were only reached in competition as well as co-operation. Liberalism is his answer to reaching the goal. This paragraph features anaphora where consecutive sentences begin with we. Churchill takes the liberty of speaking for his Party and its goals. There is no *Refutatio* nor *Peroratio* in the speech, perhaps because Churchill wrote it at the beginning of his political career and had less experience with speaking in public.

Churchill's main metaphor in the speech comes from his military training and war service. This reminder of his background also works to further *Ethos*, but it is curiously placed at the end part of the speech rather than the beginning. He compares humanity to a rear-guard, that force of the military which protects the main group in retreat. Without the guard, the main force would be an easy target as they move away with backs turned to the enemy. Military vocabulary is natural for a former officer of Great Britain and he depicts the struggle of life through it. Winston Churchill holds that the main force of people has won a war against the forces of nature, it has retreated to rest on easy grounds, but the rear-guard of the working poor and the ill are still under attack. The speaker contrasts man with nature, which wages war against us, yet talks of water springs and fertile grounds which the fortunate ones are already enjoying. Thus, nature is not all barbs and stings of "a pitiless enemy"—a land of plenty awaits the unfortunate. Churchill has tied nature vocabulary with the struggle of life but ends on a high note that reminds of the pleasures nature can offer.

The speaker refers to the poor and the ill as "stragglers and weaklings", and these words call to mind eugenics. Yet the workings of military science and the best weapons and the trusted generals and the best soldiers should now be used to save the most unfortunate. This is Winston Churchill at his most patronising and yet solidary. This long metaphor that is the *Pathos* of the speech is filled

with images of battles, the win, a retreat, the wounded, rest, and promise of rest to come. Peace and plenty await. The rolling lines end with Churchill's climax and terse answer for the future: a call to work together under the leadership of the Liberal Party. What nature can offer and man can extract from it could be reached by more people. Yet it is disappointing that Churchill ends his strong chain of Pathos with the words "something". If people work together with the Liberal Party, "we will do something for its definite accomplishment." There is nothing concrete in the climax.

Finally, following Aristotle's and *Rhetorica's* views, it is essential to reflect if the speech is convincing and if it moves emotions. Churchill employs the most important parts of rhetoric, *Ethos*, *Pathos*, and *Logos* effectively. He presents his credentials and clearly states his goals both at the beginning and end parts of the speech. Listing grand achievements of Great Britain is a sure method of gaining the listener's ear and approval, while linking them as part of the speaker's proof is another. Without co-operation there would no such achievements, the speaker attests, and by working together for the party's goals they too can be reached. The candidate's insistence on competitive selection as a force of manliness and worth feels alien and cold. A society such as this would have little worth or time for the sick, the lame, and those who shun competition. This view likely cost Churchill some votes, but the speech was held in 1906 when western mores were different. Moreover, the speaker is in favour of a safety net and a minimum standard of living for each citizen.

The speaker's long military metaphor is effective as a reminder of his service for king and country, it also serves well as an instrument of *Pathos*. While Great Britain was not party to any wars in 1906, when the speech was held, the Russo-Japanese war and Russian revolution from the previous years reminded of potential conflicts. More than a million people had perished, and a tsar had been threatened. Poverty was widespread in the UK and most Brits surely saw examples of the effects each day. Thus, the metaphor is effective and enough to raise pity. The climax of the speech, however, leaves a bland impression as the MP calls for action so that people can "do something". In sum, the speech is structured well and functions well, it moves from section to section effectively, and it moves the feelings. The speech does not include Christian imagery or lexis, but its theme comes from the Gospel of Matthew (The Bible 25:40). In the passage, Jesus instructs his followers that all that is done to the least of his followers is through them done to him. Thus, the topic and aim of his speech are based on Christian moral teachings which called for social security among believers.

5.2 Winston Churchill's Speech: Be Ye Men of Valour! 19th May, 1940

The Netherlands had surrendered under German assault on the 15th of May, and the day before the French border was penetrated in the north-east, at Sedan (Cannadine 150). It was the second year of the Second World War and the Battle of France was raging. The French government was debating whether to surrender and most of Britain's Expeditionary Forces were serving in north France as well as Belgium. These British forces were also considering a fallback from the German border to Dunkirk. The former Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain urged Churchill to appeal to the nation for more hard work before the onslaught. The next day, Churchill had but three hours to compose the speech (Cannadine 150). The Second World War looked grim for the Allies. This was the background for Winston Churchill's first live radio speech as Prime Minister. It is important to note that the speech was broadcast on Trinity Sunday, a Principal Feast day for the Church of England.

Winston Churchill establishes his *Ethos* and *Exordium* as only the head of a nation can: by stating his occupation as Prime Minister. In the same, he also establishes his media reign by declaring this as his first speech for the nation. Thus, the words are meant to be interpreted as a sign of the future of Great Britain as well as a sign of his political style. This premise also shows the speaker's *Inventio*: the words were chosen for the whole British Empire as well as the colonies under French rule. The speech would reach ears as far away as the US and Australia, people from the most educated to the least knowledgeable. Against this backdrop, Churchill's *Inventio* is not impressive. A speech of this import, with a reach of this magnitude, should be as easy to understand and as undivisible as possible. This ensures that the words and meanings are followed by even the least knowledgeable listener, that the speaker convinces as many as possible. Such is not the case.

As far as *Inventio* goes, the first and second paragraphs are dark, with several conditionals and negative adjectives. These I analyse in more scope later. Only at the middle of the third paragraph, after many melancholic images, do we find the speaker's "invincible confidence" along with other words of assurance. Before this, the word choices and sentence structures are common and plain, but the fourth paragraph opens with a sentence that is interrupted after just three words. Thus the message at the beginning is lost under later information. The paragraph ends with a description of "the tap-root of German mechanised power". This belittles the strength and speed of blitzkrieg as mere horticultural nuisance. The fifth paragraph returns to fearmongering with a promise of a "hideous apparatus of aggression" that is headed toward Britain.

Continuing with *Inventio*, the eighth paragraph calls the coming war “the most awe-striking” time as well as “the most sublime” in the relations of France and Great Britain, hyperboles ill-suited to describe the sufferings of war. Finally, Churchill ends the speech with an obscure religious quotation that he has also altered, and he fails to mention its source. Surely the point of religious scriptures is that they have import in themselves and are shared unaltered. The text comes from the First Book of Maccabees, a scripture that’s not adhered to or shared by all denominations. In fact, the Church of England, the most influential denomination in Great Britain, has not viewed the books of Maccabees as doctrinal (Articles of Doctrine VI). All these considered, Churchill’s *Inventio* is not effective.

In his *Narratio*, Churchill lists together the country, the British empire, the allies, and freedom. Through them he shows that the fate of all is intertwined – and only these groups work for freedom. It is noteworthy to highlight that the speaker has written the words empire, allies, and freedom with capital letters. They will not be seen in a speech but show that these concepts are high on the list of solemn things for Churchill. It is disheartening that the Prime Minister calls Nazi air bombings and tanks “remarkable”, an adjective of praise. The Nazis are “ravaging” the open country in France, they have broken through, confusion and more troops follow. Only the “magnificent efforts” of the Royal Air Force seem promising, but they are merely assisting the French. Churchill’s first paragraph does nothing to lift the spirits of the public, it is all doom and gloom that was customary for the speaker in parliament well before the war. Still, the *Narratio* part is clear and straight to the point, it fills its function well.

An important aim for Churchill’s radio speeches was to spread information. The first chapter was dark news and the second one continues what the British government wants to let the public know. The Prime Minister calls for bravery in the face of troubles but has little talent in soothing nerves. The Nazis are behind lines, the French are facing them, but both parties are in “extremely dangerous” situations. Half of the second paragraph is one long periodic sentence full of doom. The speaker only gives a list of *ifs*: if the French and British remain as strong as they have been, if all fight as well as they may, Germany “might” be won – but the French are already in retreat and the fortifications of the Maginot Line are broken. This shows Churchill with the black dog of pessimism by his heels. As far as *Pathos* goes, the speech has plenty of emotion – nearly all of it disheartening.

In the third paragraph, the Prime Minister asks the nation not to lose heart or act foolish. Despite the previous if-words, the retreat, the extremely dangerous situation, Churchill assures that the situation will stabilise. Yet he offers no proof for this apart from his “invincible confidence”. The speaker again assures that only a portion of France has been invaded and the whole Nazi front force has already been deployed. Yet there are no numbers or reports to back these claims. The leader does not know for sure but still wants to encourage. Churchill speaks of a “spirit” of courage, as if the Holy Spirit, that must be found by the officers and main front alike yet calls on the soldiers not to hide behind obstacles or covers but to attack. The Prime Minister has capitalised High Command, perhaps as a sign that he holds it in greater worth than the rest of the war effort.

The fourth paragraph highlights the successes of British Air Forces. Even though the war effort is going well in the air, the style is matter of fact, like reading a piece of news instead of important war gains that will affect the result. Churchill seems on point but not enthused. There is no *Divisio* in the speech as it would require him to present some arguments of the Nazis. That would hardly work for his advantage – war is not a debate. *Be Ye Men of Valour!* is characterised by lengthy, rolling hypotactic sentences which seem too long for an ex tempore presentation. This is a literary speech, composed beforehand with great calculation, with an eye for posterity.

The fifth paragraph is dense with rhetorical devices and works as the main part of *Logos*. It promises more suffering for the Allied Forces, with the mention of a “hideous apparatus of aggression” that is sure to turn upon the forces in a few days. The speaker will answer that force with a tricolon: The Allies will face it, endure it, and retaliate against it. All war methods will be used according to unwritten rules. The speaker then turns back home to address directly the people of the home front. Churchill calls his soldiers lads, to remind the listeners that most of the fighting force is young and asks for God to bless them. The word duo of lads and God is surprising.

Another tricolon defines the fighting force more accurately: they are soldiers, sailors, airmen. The Prime Minister acknowledges the home front’s suffering again by noting how they draw a portion of the Nazi forces away from the main front, likely meaning the air bombings of Britain which drew Nazi planes away from the front. A rhetorical question asks the listeners, “Is this not the appointed time?” as if the Second World War was a biblical plague foretold and forewarned of. In the main *Logos* part, Churchill calls for the home front to increase their war efforts. If the British Empire wants to win, all subjects must do their utmost. The troops need more of munitions and supplies, more vehicles and weapons, more time and effort. I believe this is the reason why Churchill issues

several warnings and promises more suffering in the speech. He must raise the fears and loathing of the Brits to make them work harder on the home front and the front line. This is the crux of his *Logos*: his demand for more must be followed because defeat is inconceivable.

In the sixth paragraph, Churchill again promises more suffering and more work. The Allies are not only vying to win a battle but the war. After France, the whole nation must battle for Britain – not only in the physical sense but for “all that Britain means”. For him, that is the struggle, to uphold metaphysically everything that the Great Britain calls to mind and represents. A supreme emergency is sure to come and then the speaker will call on each British subject to give even more, even through drastic means. Churchill belittles the worth of property and working hours compared to life and honour and freedom. Thus, the battle of the Allied Forces against the Nazi forces is not a group of people against another: it is a war of the forces of good against the forces of evil. The Brits stand as one because, the speaker holds, all have taken a vow to fight, even if no such vow has been sworn by civilians.

Next, the speaker notes that the French work with the Brits in the war. “Most sacred pledges” have been given that the ally will fight until the end, and the end will be glorious, according to Churchill – but only if the allies press on. The sacred pledges give the pact an aura of a religious service. There is no *Refutatio* in the speech, that would again require the Prime Minister to present some arguments of the Nazis. The whole speech follows the grand style of speaking as defined in *Rhetorica*. The speaker avoids colloquial expressions, the mental images are serious and weighty. *Be Ye Men of Valour!* is a statesman’s speech for a united empire in momentous times.

In the eight paragraph, Churchill reaches the climax of his *Pathos*. He mentions the Majesty’s commission and a wartime administration made up of every party. All viewpoints and old rivals are gathered up, now they are one against a grander enemy. This again reminds that the listeners are united in the fight. He mentions the overseas territories of both countries to remind that all, no matter how far from the mainland and frontline, are one in this effort. The Brits and the French will, according to Churchill, save both Europe and mankind from forces which are hyperbolised as “the foulest” in history. The paragraph also works as a *Confirmatio*, though its place in the speech comes too late to follow *Rhetorica*’s advice. Churchill testifies that the leaders of Great Britain work together for the same goal, all strings are in their hands.

Churchill's grand, end-of-times expressions irritated his fellow Members of Parliament as he used them in everyday politics. Yet these words fit the times of the Second World War, too much was at stake to remain mundane. A Europe under the heel of the Nazis would have been a foul place. Only the shield that is France and Great Britain, unaided by other countries, stands between the Germanic death machine and mankind's total ruin. It is difficult to find an image more emotive than this: it reminds the audience of Armageddon, the biblical end of times war between the forces of Satan and God. What Churchill lacks in *Inventio*, he fills with *Pathos*. The speech was a success as Anthony Eden, the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, afterwards stated that Churchill had "never done anything as good or as great"; the *Evening Standard* magazine commended its "imperishable resolve"; and the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax said it was "worth a lot" (Cannadine 150).

Another list follows of countries that have already lost to Nazi forces. Barbarism and dark times await them all unless the Allied Forces prevail. The spearpoint of this paragraph is reached with a periodic sentence where meaning is resolved only at the end. It results in a tricolon: all is lost if the Allies do not win, as they must win, as they will win. There is no need for proof for this argument, the Brits and the French will win because the alternative does not bear contemplation. For Churchill, a star symbolises hope. This could allude to the Star of Bethlehem which lead the biblical Magi to Jesus, and it would strengthen the Christian themes of the speech. There is no *Peroratio* in the style that *Rhetorica* advises: Churchill does not revisit his prior examples or arguments, so the listeners must afterwards trust their judgements and feelings regarding the words.

Winston Churchill's finish is a call to action with a quotation from biblical apocrypha, but he changed the original wording from the First Book of Maccabees (The Bible 3:58-60). Many denominations do not view the apocrypha as part of the Bible or holy texts, so the Prime Minister took a calculated risk by using this quotation. The original text in a modern translation (Coogan et al. 1566) reads:

“⁵⁸ And Judas said, ‘Arm yourselves and be courageous. Be ready early in the morning to fight with these Gentiles who have assembled against us to destroy us and our sanctuary. ⁵⁹ It is better for us to die in battle than to see the misfortunes of our nation and of the sanctuary. ⁶⁰ But as his will in heaven may be, so shall he do.’”

Likely Churchill changed the wording to take advantage of the message rather than the form, and to use the importance of religion within Great Britain. After all, the Allied Forces were at war and they were the forces of good. Moreover, he states twice in the speech that his country will use all methods available and, evidently, misquoting scripture is among Churchill's methods. After the

Prime Minister has filled the listener's ears with *Pathos* that calls to mind Armageddon, the end of times, he finally justifies the British war effort with a religious call to arms. Once again, the Allies are the forces of mankind and good against absolute evil.

Finally, the question whether Churchill's speech was convincing for the audience of half of the world in the 1940s. The glum and pessimistic tone of the word choices and copious warnings, as well as the divisive religious text that was quoted in altered form, work against the speaker. The aim of the speech was likely to raise fear and anxiety in the British subjects so that they would put in more effort on the home front and the front line. The Dutch and others had recently fallen, the French would be next, then the British Isles. The forces of good and civility would be destroyed if the Allies lost. Thus, all must work harder because the alternative is not acceptable. This is the main message and it needs little rhetoric proof to gain backing. War is not a debate. To this end, Churchill's speech is convincing.

The speech has three directly Christian references: the invoking of God to bless the British soldiers, the star of hope, and the altered quotation from the First Book of Maccabees. Most of the words are spent describing the Allied war effort in France and the perilous situation of the armies. Yet the unspoken elements compare the Second World War to Armageddon, the Allied forces to heavenly armies and the Nazis to Satan's forces. The apocryphal text in particular is noteworthy because Churchill ends his speech with it, and the words also form the climax of his *Pathos*. Through the words, he frames the war effort as a religious call to action. He also calls death more honourable than looking by while the nation, the home of the British subjects, and the altar, the nationalistic Church of England, are devastated. Thus, Great Britain and Christianity are the same and of equal worth in this speech.

5.3 Winston Churchill's Speech: A 'United States of Europe' 19th September, 1946

Zürich University, Switzerland

This speech is among the most important post-war addresses from Winston Churchill. Many WWII nations were debating how Nazi Germany should pay for its wartime atrocities, but Churchill was more interested in co-operation and re-building Europe. The speech is an influential attempt to map out a European-wide union similar to what The United States of America had (Spencer-Churchill 427). Unlike the former American as well as contemporary European Federalists, Churchill was in

favour of a union where each country kept its sovereignty. During this time, he was working in the opposition after having lost the elections and held the speech only as a Member of Parliament.

The speech opens with a clear definition of the topic: Europe is in crisis due to nationalism and ill will among peoples. The speaker endears himself to the audience by praising the lands and accomplishments of European cultures. His hyperboles speak of the most beautiful and cultivated places on Earth, and the continent is home to “parent races” which likely means the great western colonists. This recalls the mindset when the white man’s superiority was a natural right and the task of civilising non-western peoples a God-given burden. The MP indeed mentions the Christian religion in his praise for the continent. A surer sign of the speaker’s arrogance is the claim that most of the ancient and modern cultures are of European origin.

Churchill reminds the audience of an imagined Golden Age of Europe which reigned once and could reign again if its peoples forsook their quarrels. Yet no such era could be found up until the 1940s, when the speech was held, as the history of Europe is but a long history of wars. The speaker’s reasons for the current unhappy times is European nationalism and, more importantly, the Nazi alliance. The latter he calls “the Teutonic nations”, a peculiar word choice that refers to the Germanic tribe of Teutons who lived in Europe during Roman times. The tribe has little connection to Nazi Germany and by using it, likely the MP wanted to liken the Nazis to barbarians. A hyperbole in the speech states that by ruining Europe the Nazis destroyed the prospects of mankind. Thus, Churchill holds European civilisation as the hallmark of all humanity.

The second paragraph begins with a rhetorical question concerning Europe’s woes. These the PM lists in his doomsayer’s style with pitiful adjectives, to remind the listeners of acute post-war sufferings. The peoples have no human shape anymore, they have become more akin to Edvard Munch’s painting *The Scream*: quivering mass sandwiched between destroyed cityscapes. A tricolon of peril, tyranny, and terror await them. Churchill holds that the war’s winners bicker together in a “babel” of languages, the lost nations remain silent and wait for punishment. His reference to the biblical story of Babel, from Genesis 11:1–9, insinuates that the war’s winners are as proud as those who would build a tower that reaches Heaven. A divine punishment is likely in store for them as well. The PM hints that Europe’s woes are due to a babelisation that has happened to its languages and lack of co-operation caused by fervent nationalism. A long periodic sentence, a common rhetorical feature for Churchill, finishes the second paragraph. If not for the help of Europe's friends in the US, the war would have been lost. He writes of the Americans as a

capitalised Republic, to remind of their value and of their democracy. He also calls their aid “succor” and “guidance” as if American aid was biblical or providential. The Dark Ages – a period of plagues and endless wars and ignorance – would have returned without American help. Still, he characteristically reminds us, an age of darkness may still come.

The third paragraph shares Churchill’s solution to the tribulations he defined. He promises wellbeing and rhetorically asks, what would lead to it? He pledges the same level of freedom and happiness as Switzerland to all of Europe, if only the nations set up a United States of Europe. This is the only option for him. Yet he conveniently does not mention that Switzerland remained neutral during World War II and no battles took place within its borders. Thus, the Swiss avoided the expenses of waging a war, the time spent on rebuilding an infrastructure, and the suffering extolled by bullets, bombs, and fear. Naturally, setting Switzerland on a pedestal as a hallmark of prosperity won over the Swiss listening to his speech in Zürich. A tricolon of peace, safety, and freedom await. The MP capitalises a European Family, as if such a thing existed before. He frames the solution as if to a religious or moral question: The United States of Europe would be right, while the contrary would be wrong. The reward would be a “blessing” and the contrary would be a “curse”, again as if it was a religious decision.

The fourth paragraph mentions the work of Aristide Briand and Richard von Coudenhove-Kalergi. Through them Churchill shows that others have been working towards a European Union well before him. The League of Nations was another diplomatic entity that was born after the First World War, and the PM names its failure as the failure of individual nations. It was the members, not the organisation, that caused the Second World War. By presenting the League, the speaker reminds his audience that a United States of Europe could be built on its ruins, though the mistakes of the past are an expensive schooling. This paragraph features hypotactic structure and Churchill is sure of his conclusions. X led to Y because of Z, and this should be learned from.

The fifth paragraph continues persuasion by listing more backers for the pan-European project which Churchill supports. President Truman favours the project and a union of European countries wouldn’t compete with the United Nations that was founded a year before. A very long rhetorical question asks, why not a union of Europe? The speaker hopes it would extend the definition of patriotism so that Europeans would feel other Europeans closer. Churchill continues religious themes in this speech again by calling for an “act of faith” so that former enemies would work together for Europe.

In the sixth paragraph, Churchill appeals to the audience by stating the true cause to WWII. Germany was in the grips of a “vain passion” and, although he does not name it so, vanity is one of the seven deadly sins in Christianity. Each of them leads away from God’s will and towards punishment. The horrors of the Nazi regime bring to the speaker’s mind the Mongol invasions, an act of non-Christian savagery, and in his hyperbole it was the most evil war in human history. A similar tricolon as in the speech *Be Ye Men of Valour!* is used in “when all this has been done, as it will be done, as it is being done”, and it ties together the future, the current day, and the past. It also reminds the audience that those guilty to the war will not be forgotten on any era.

The MP continues with biblical vocabulary in his plea for an end to “retribution”, and he quotes the former Prime Minister William Gladstone who spoke of a “blessed act of oblivion” while espousing Irish self-determination in 1886. In Gladstone’s case, he referred to oblivion as an act of letting go of a negative tradition (Pollmann 156). For the Irish people, according to Gladstone, gaining freedom from English rule would be a blessing. Likely Churchill quoted this passage to say that letting go of hate would be a blessing for Europe’s progress. As is customary for Churchill, he warns of “final doom” if Europe doesn’t let go of old enmities in time. He calls for “faith” in good Christian manner and for “oblivion” from hatred. He envisions a family of European nations.

The seventh paragraph opens with a rhetorical question for the audience. Can Europe rise above aggression? Their spirits and souls depend on it, they need it to become ritually clean from terrible acts of war. This washing away the acts of the past calls to mind the crucifixion of Jesus so that the sins of his followers would be absolved. Again the speaker asks if we need more of the same? The wartime Prime Minister calls for the tricolon of justice, mercy, and freedom -- even for the Nazis. By this he means loving the enemy and turning the other cheek, a Christian moral teaching of Jesus found in Luke 6:27–31.

The eighth paragraph promises a surprise. France and Germany, both large countries and large belligerents in the war, must be the first to shake hands. This is the only way to peace according to Churchill. He also says that France formerly was the moral leader of Europe but doesn’t mention why or how the position was lost. Yet both countries must be “spiritually” revived, another religious reference. A United States of Europe would also prevent similar wars in the future. Germany was split after WWII and Churchill likely wished for the union of all its states, not only a half, to join a potential union of European countries. The MP has no plan, but he references the

freedoms that President Theodore Roosevelt mentioned in his famous State of the Union speech in 1941: freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. He also promises, as a reward for a complete union, the goals agreed on the Atlantic Charter in 1941. They were: The US or the UK would seek no territorial gains; territorial adjustments must be in accord with the wishes of the peoples concerned; all people had a right to self-determination; trade barriers would be lowered; global economic cooperation and advancement of social welfare; all states would work for a world free of want and fear; the states would work for freedom of the seas; disarmament of aggressor nations would take place, and a common disarmament would follow after the war.

The ninth paragraph changes from a passive speech tone into a direct address when the MP mentions “you”. In the same, the sentences change into short, commanding hypotactic ones as Churchill adapts his doomsayer’s stance. The war has ended. We have time to act. Yet the doom of Europe is just behind the corner if nothing is done for co-operation.

The tenth paragraph mentions an ultimate doom, the atomic bomb, which forced Japan to surrender and brought about an early peace in WWII. The speaker places great trust in the United States as the only owner of such bombs and equates the nation with the causes of right and freedom. Yet danger is ahead if other, aggressive nations develop such weapons, he opines, and that might bring about the end of the world.

The eleventh paragraph lists potential options which are, in fact, Churchill’s options only framed as Europe’s. Peculiarly, the MP references The United Nations as UNO. For the third time in this speech, the speaker mentions a European family. In religious tones, Churchill talks of “salvation” from tyranny and slavery through joined efforts. Even death would be preferred instead of succumbing to another great invasion, a similar tone as in his wartime speech *Be Ye Men of Valour!*. He mentions France and Germany together and states that the European project cannot progress without them. It seems as if Churchill plays down the import of the British Empire within Europe, and he completely ignores Italy which was a large state in league with the Nazis. The MP trusts the large western powers will sponsor a United States of Europe but remains unsure about Russia.

Finally, some words on whether the speech is convincing. Winston Churchill does open his speech and audience by praising the many virtues of Europe, though he equates the region as the peak of

civilisation and notes that The Second World War has destroyed the “prospects of all mankind”. The second remark highlights that the parties in WWII are mankind or, at least, the most important nations on Earth. These hyperboles and the pessimistic worldview were known to Churchill’s opponents and make this speech, as his others, easy to brush off as mere exaggeration. There is lots of *Pathos* in the speech and the speaker doesn’t play down Europe’s torn state in the 1940s. Few countries had remained undamaged, physically or mentally. This saddening part in the speech works as a lead to the speaker’s answer: Europe has suffered, as it suffers, as it will suffer, if Churchill’s advice is not heeded.

His answer is the United States of Europe. The whole speech is built on the *Ethos* of Winston Churchill. He gives little concrete steps for his goals and presents them as moral solutions or the only ones available. A speech of this kind will only function if the audience believes in the speaker and trusts that he knows more, or knows better. A wartime statesman who guaranteed a win for democracy and sovereignty has more *Ethos* than most. Because he believes a united political European entity would strengthen the world, the listener should do the same. The speech and the speaker take on Christian tones, apart from the ones analysed before, in the call for mercy. Germany should be punished but afterwards Europe should turn the other cheek and, if not forgive, at least forgo of hatred.

The speech is convincing but not through an obvious route. Most speeches convince through their arguments, but Churchill does not justify or rationalise his goals. They are presented as the opinions of a former Prime Minister and leader of the Allied forces to a Europe devastated by wars of unnatural scale. He is a believable and a trustworthy speaker with an *Ethos* unmatched by most later political leaders. The speech is more directly Christian than the two presented before. Instead of merely alluding to Christian concepts, here Churchill uses more words connected with sermons or biblical passages. Christianity is mentioned by name at the beginning of the speech, Europe’s current state is a veritable babel, but succour and guidance have come from America. The MP calls his answer, the United States of Europe, a miracle as if it was a religious organisation. Adopting it would be an act of faith that would lead to blessing instead of cursing. Man’s spirit and soul call for turning the other cheek to Germany’s follies. Either he truly found a religious call in re-establishing political relations within Europe or he merely decided to use religion more conspicuously. Thus, we Christian themes and words became more prevalent as Winston Churchill aged.

5.4 Barack Obama's Speech: Keynote Speech at the Democratic National Convention July 27, 2004

Boston, Massachusetts

Barack Obama was not a well-known political figure in the United States before his speech at the Democratic National Convention. He was 43 years old, he had been a state senator in Illinois for eight years, a candidate for the US Senate, and considered a young man in American politics. Obama has stated that he wrote the keynote speech himself. USA Today interviewed him (Rogak 98) after the event and quoted him: "I like writing my own stuff. So I made a rare intelligent decision to start writing immediately after I was asked to deliver the speech. And so I actually had a draft completed before it was publicly announced." Time Magazine reported (How Obama Writes His Speeches) that Obama spent months compiling ideas, taking notes, and combining his thoughts into a speech while working his regular post at the State Senate of Illinois.

The speech begins with a tricolon that sets the locus of the speech, the values, and the speaker. Barack Obama speaks on behalf of Illinois through his occupation as senator, he reminds the audience of the state's importance for American trade, and he positions his state as the land of all that Abraham Lincoln represents. He thanks the Democratic Party for the opportunity to speak and, through rhetorical *humiliatio*, belittles himself as an unlikely figure. All work as *Ethos* and bear the hallmarks of classical rhetoric. The speech is marked by very short paragraphs. This feature is not visible to the audience, it is far from a literary look, but likely helps the speaker keep focus while reading the speech from a teleprompter. Obama is known for favouring them instead of reading from papers or memorising speeches.

As the background of the speech is well known and documented, and its venue is clear, analysing Obama's *Inventio* is not a challenge. The target audience is the Democratic Party of America, all potential American voters and the political actors of the world. To this end, Obama's *Inventio* functions exceptionally well. The lexis consists of everyday English words, the stories and examples shared are relatable, anaphora gives an effective song-like quality to the end parts of the speech, and the overall structure follows the tenets of classical rhetoric. Short sentences help the listener to focus on each point. While the aim of speech is to attain support for John Kerry's presidential campaign, Obama also manages to make himself known and likeable. The style of the speech is the middle style, with touches of grand concepts. It is a statesman's speech that stays relatable and understandable even to the least educated. Great American political themes, such as

religion, armed service, personal responsibility, aversion to Socialism, the Founding Fathers, are included to reach the hearts of Americans.

Obama continues his *Ethos* by revealing his family background. His father was a poor Kenyan from a rural family, but his grandfather wanted more for his son. By mentioning America as a shining beacon even to people as far as Kenya, the speaker builds rapport with the audience. The United States is a nation of immigrants, of countless generations in search for a better life, and Obama links his family into this great chain. His mother was from a working-class family and both of her parents served in the Second World War. This continues building trust with the audience as the speaker's family is similar to other Americans, and both families had "hope" for their children. Obama calls his parents' love improbable as one was black, the other white, and they met during an era when mixed couples were shunned. This strengthens the *Ethos* still. He claims they had "faith" in America. His name, Barack, means blessed and his parents chose it as a name shouldn't be a barrier to success, he opines. We have no proof that Obama's name was chosen for the reason which he says, but even if this is his own interpretation most Democratic voters will agree with the reasoning.

His parents had no great connections or wealth. Obama immediately combines this info with his opinion that, if American politics were generous, its citizens need not be rich to gain a good education for their children. His parents wanted such things but now they have passed. Obama believes both are proud of him, they "look down" on him – as if from Heaven. This establishes a religious tone to the speech which is important as the Christian religion is essential in American politics. The speaker mentions diversity, another value to Democratic voters, and Obama's children work as a link in a generational line. The dreams of his parents live on in his girls, and they also show him as a family man. Obama again mentions that he is part of something larger, a story of America, of dreams, of generations of people who arrive in search of better things. In his hyperbole, such a story is not even possible in any other country. Yet it has been true in the Nordic countries, for example, for decades. In short, sharing his humble background endears Obama to the listener as a man who has reached the American Dream with hard work and dedication. He understands what American life is like for divorce children, for poor families, for those whose dream is yet to come true. Apart from being the head of a nation, there is hardly a more effective way of establishing *Ethos*.

Next, Obama begins his paragraph with a sentence that resembles those favoured by ministers. He states "we gather to affirm", not to praise God but to praise The United States of America. He

appears like a minister in front of a nation on an altar for itself. In the same, Obama changes the locus of the speech from the speaker's view to encompass all. In a tricolon Obama mentions skyscrapers, the military, and the economy to remind the audience that their country is powerful and rich. Yet these are all material things and less important to him than the Declaration of Independence from 1776 and its bi-centennial heritage. He mentions and quotes the Declaration in grand style to show that it forms the values shared by all present. All Americans are equal in the eyes of the union and the law. Obama continues a religious style by using the words "faith" and "miracles" while speaking of the meaning of the Declaration in the everyday life of Americans. This is done with an anaphora of the words "that we can". These American values are what he wants to build his politics on.

The freedoms Americans enjoy are listed with antitheses to non-democratic countries where a wrong vote or a wrong public opinion will lead to an arrest. Such a patriotic style of praising America is popular in the country's political rhetoric, yet Obama ends the paragraph with a sudden critique of his country. Votes in the US are counted "most of the time", a reference to the legal case of *Bush v. Gore* which was a decision of the United States Supreme Court in re-counting votes in the scandalous presidential elections of 2000 (*Bush V. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98 [2000]). Likely Barack Obama mentioned this debacle to remind Americans of the importance of voting. The re-count led to George W. Bush, a Republican, becoming the president instead of the Democratic Al Gore. The point also adds a touch of humour to the speech, it wakes the audience with a sudden turn of words.

From the Democratic humiliation of 2000, Obama returns his locus to circle through eras. He talks about the current elections, the legacy of past generations, and the future of the young. He mentions the American values which he previously quoted from the Declaration of Independence and uses them to appeal to the audience. Those values he contrasts to the "hard reality" of the current government and asks rhetorically, have the Republicans followed American values? From the past, Obama returns to the current night and addresses all Americans despite their affiliation. "I say to you" is a biblical turn of words similar to what the gospels tell of how Jesus addressed his followers. The structure of the speech also turns from parataxis to hypotaxis as this paragraph is one rolling line. Again, he employs anaphora and uses the line "more to do" to show how all Americans are dependent on each other's help. In his examples, Barack Obama gathers *Pathos* from the struggling citizens he has met all around the country: factory workers losing their jobs, a father who cannot afford medicine for his child, and a woman who has the tricolon of grades, drive, and will – but not money for college.

While he is asking the audience for appreciation for Democratic goals, such as more American manufacturing or affordable insurance or cheaper schooling, he reminds all that he is not in favour of socialism. This is followed with the *Logos* of his speech. The people he mentioned, he interprets, have no wish for the government to fix all for them. This is another important distinction to make in American politics where socialism is a curse word. The people, according to Obama, also have no wish for more welfare services or military spending as exemplified by the Pentagon. He curries favour with another American favourite theme: personal responsibility. The government or more funds cannot make children learn if there is no motivation. The speaker has a long portion of *Confirmatio* where he only presents points which support his goals and policy.

In a sudden turn, Obama also shames slum culture and African American attitudes where high education and learning is just “acting white”. This thinking he met while working as a community organiser on Chicago’s streets. Folks, a casual favourite word of his, need to change for the better themselves and they know it already. Still, after this demanding turn he returns to the Democratic call for solidarity. He takes the liberty of talking for all by saying that, with only slight changes, an equality of opportunities would be possible. This is the American Dream. This is what his party promises. From himself and the state of American life, Obama now turns to the speech’s main goal, the electing of John Kerry for president. Surprisingly, the speaker espouses him with a hyperbole where he is the embodiment of all the best things America can offer. A kind of avatar of American values and achievements.

The anaphora with John Kerry’s name begins from this paragraph and continues, in various parts, to the end. The crux of Obama’s *Logos* is that choosing Kerry would be the smart thing to do. Kerry has the tricolon of community, faith, and service through his experiences as the 66th Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, a lifelong catholic, and a former lieutenant with a Silver Star Medal, a Bronze Star (with valour), and three Purple Hearts. Armed service, another great American political topic, is guaranteed to appeal. Barack Obama builds up the *Ethos* of Kerry by listing his services to the country and American culture in the next short paragraphs. The speaker again conjoins American life with John Kerry, both as an actor and a symbol. Hard work, an American theme, is met with a reward for a job well done. Kerry has served his country and wants to continue serving.

Next follow several antitheses. Companies taking jobs out of America are contrasted with those that create them in America. Politicians in Washington, D.C., with health insurances are contrasted with

those who have none. Foreign oil and energy dependence are contrasted with patriotic independence, a timeless theme of American rhetoric. The constitution of the United States and its freedoms are another. Obama calls his country the envy of the world. He ends listing the virtues of America, combined with Kerry's name, by reminding the audience of American military might. A continuing theme of American politics.

Obama then continues about the military. He paints a picture of an all-American young man, a perfect son who has joined the war effort and has immense trust in his country. The speaker contrasts the sacrifice, service, and death of nine hundred similar Americans in Iraq to the service they can expect from the Republican government. This is a call to *Pathos* that sets the emotions moving. Without saying so directly, Obama calls it shameful that the Republicans have sent the young to war in Iraq through lies. Saddam Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction like the Bush government claimed. The motives for war were wrong and America went to Iraq without the necessary resources. Despite this, Obama mentions that war remains an option for him and Lieutenant John Kerry because America has enemies. Now many more of them due to the Republicans. As Obama does not share any opinions from his opponents, there is no *Divisio* in the speech.

After mentioning individualism, a truly American theme, Barack Obama's next short paragraphs are constructed with anaphora, a favourite rhetorical structure of his, this time through "If there's [X]". The speaker confirms that all Americans are joined in their lives, a Christian theme from the Gospel of Matthew (25:40). In the scripture, Jesus instructs his followers that all which is done to the least of his followers is through them done to him. Thus, illiterate slum children, poor elderly Americans, the treatment of Arab-Americans – these examples show that their lives touch the life of Barack Obama. Through this choice, the speaker is like a minister tending to a congregation. In a surprising turn, the speech references the Book of Genesis (4:1-18) where God entreats Cain to be a keeper to his brother Abel, but Obama bids the audience to be keepers to their sisters too. The image is surprising and guaranteed to stay in memory. The rhetorical turn is exceptional.

Next, Obama turns away from the middle style of his speech to share a quotation in Latin. The Great Seal of the United States was first used in 1782. Its obverse side depicts the motto *E pluribus unum* (out of many, one) which is a reference to the first thirteen British colonies that were made one, into the United States of America. Obama follows the proverb immediately with its English translation to reach a larger audience who may not be familiar with the motto. By evoking the

words, he makes another shift in locus, now back in time to unite the past generations with the current one. Out of many different groups of Americans came a unified America. Without sharing names or direct quotations from his political opponents, Obama vaguely states that somewhere outside the convention there are enemies who would divide America.

Yet for him, there are no liberals and conservatives, no blacks and whites, no red states and blue states – simply united Americans. This reflects the biblical story of Jesus washing the feet of his disciples (John 13:14–17) and teaching them that a servant is not greater than his master or vice versa. All are equal in the eyes of God. The speaker evokes an “awesome God” and dislike for federal bureaucrats which are shared by most Americans. Human rights for minorities, an important theme for Democratic voters, is mentioned although Obama knew it would cost him some swing votes from conservative citizens. Children’s baseball is mentioned as another link in the great chain of American everyday life. Opposition to the occupation of Iraq was an important theme for Democrats and Obama reminds that not all opposers were liberals. The flag of America stands as a symbol of unity. Obama has evoked strong feelings and shared common examples of American culture, worthy of praise to all listeners, and next he arrives to the climax of his speech.

For him, there are but two options, this is the *Peroratio* of the speech. He frames Republican politics as cynicism and Democratic politics as hope, as if the former would never represent hope for conservative citizens. By first listing positive feats of American life and framing them as the achievements that only a United America could have gained, without saying so directly, he presents the US under Republican rule a divided and weak country. The only solution is the Democratic party and its nominees. Another list groups together slaves, immigrants, John Kerry along with his vice president, and Obama. These nominees are America and the future of the country. Religious themes return in the word hope which is also “God’s greatest gift to us” and an unsaid component in the American Dream. To reach the Dream, one must have hope for it, in things unseen. For the speaker, hope equals belief. In the next paragraphs, he repeats his belief in a similar way as Martin Luther King repeated his dream. For the future, Obama wants to offer more for the middle class and workers, jobs for the jobless and homes for the homeless. These he frames as righteous, as if religious, goals and the speaker believes in the judgement of the listeners.

At the end, Obama shifts from the convention and Democrats to address directly the whole America. He calls on them to action with the anaphora “If you feel” – yet these are only conditionals. If the audience accepts his goals, if they act, then good things will follow. Obama asks

the audience to believe in his goals as much as he believes in them. The locus changes from the convention to states across the US, then to John Kerry and his vice president John Edwards. Only through them the dark days of Republicans can be averted and a new day dawns. Barack Obama ends his speech as a minister would, with a “God bless you.”

Finally, the question of whether the speech is convincing. Obama’s Convention speech a masterful example of 21st century rhetoric. It uses all the hallmarks of classical rhetoric, the language is concrete and easy to follow, Obama stays in everyday examples of American culture, he lists important political themes, he adroitly combines American culture and achievements with John Kerry, and he manages to present himself as an example of the American Dream. The speech is neither pompous nor too casual. Barack Obama appeals to the emotions and judgement of the listeners, his background is similar to many American citizens despite an Ivy League doctorate, a professorship in Constitutional Law, and a Senator’s occupation. Obama has found and employed what has been found best in the theory of rhetoric and adapted it to the culture and language of the United States in the 2000s.

The speech is also full of Christian themes and concepts. Hope and faith are repeated throughout, the name Barack stands for “blessed”, Obama appears like a minister in front of Americans as “we gather to affirm”, his parents look down from Heaven, the Declaration of Rights has led to “miracles”, John Kerry’s faith is singled out, the Gospel of Matthew is referred to as well as the story of Cain and Abel from the Book of Genesis, the Gospel of John is alluded to, Obama evokes an “awesome God”, hope is mentioned as “God’s greatest gift to us”, the speaker asks for hope in things not seen, and the speech ends with a blessing. Thus, the style of this speech is among the most Christian ones from any postmodern American politician. The whole resembles a sermon for a congregation.

5.5 Barack Obama’s Speech: Yes, We Can New Hampshire Primary Concession Speech Nashua, New Hampshire, January 8, 2008

This speech was held during Barack Obama’s campaign to become the Democratic Party’s presidential nominee. New Hampshire, a small state in north-east, was the first one to organise primary elections and the results of its delegates had little effect on the outcome. Obama talked to

his supporters after having lost the state elections to Hillary Clinton and the speech was the first event where Obama presented his slogan “Yes, we can.” Despite losing in the number of votes, Obama and Clinton received the same number of delegates which decide the politician who wins an election in the American system. Obama frames the results as a success against the odds because Hillary Clinton was an established candidate who had already played a role in the White House through her husband.

The *Inventio* of the speech can be analysed through its venue. Obama speaks to his followers, potential voters, and the rest of America. To reach them and move their emotions, the candidate employs the same methods as in his speech four years before. The lexis is again a combination of everyday English words, the examples relatable, anaphora combines several paragraphs, and the structure is inspired by classical rhetoric. The sentences are paratactic to bring focus on Obama’s points. This time the goal of the speech is to gather support for Obama’s own campaign instead of another’s. The middle style of speaking is reflected in the words and structure. Obama’s slogan, repeated extensively, brings a positive note which is set to appeal to a sense of community. Only by working together, the people can.

The speech begins by building rapport with the audience. Obama thanks his supporters profusely and, despite the campaign’s defeat in the state, he has the energy to keep going. The speaker builds his *Ethos* by congratulating his opponent. This shows him as no sore loser and he even asks for applause for Clinton. The speaker evokes a sense of community by reminding how the campaign staff has succeeded against the odds. Yet not only the team but also the voters have done well, and Obama praises their judgement and decisions. He talks about the political power of the people: they choose a candidate to an office and only they form a democracy. This is an effective *humiliatio*. Barack Obama only serves and enacts the people’s will. He doesn’t merely talk about a change in politics, he frames the results of the primary elections as a change in America. This is also the *Narratio*: the topic is this change in America, its reasons and repercussions. Yet the speech lacks personal stories or remarks of achievements that would build up Obama’s *Ethos*. In this stage of Barack Obama’s political career, his background and persona were already so well known that he had no need for building a reputation. He had become, like a head of state, his own *Ethos*.

Like his National Convention speech in 2004, Obama shifts the locus of the speech several times through areas and eras. Across America, people have voted despite the weather. The anaphora “there is something happening” marks out his observations about the changes in the United States:

the young have become politically active, voting out of habit has lessened, a change is happening. Obama's official campaign slogan in 2008 was "Change we can believe in" but the strength of this speech's anaphora dwarfed it. The Christian concept of unity among believers, symbolised by the unity of the States, is reflected in this speech as well. In Barack Obama's America, there exists no division. All are ready to take the country to a new course away from Republican darkness. He again evokes a community by calling his campaign staff as the new majority who can lead that change.

In his longest paragraph, Obama addresses all voters and calls the Republican leadership "clouded". He uses chiasmus to note that Americans can disagree without being disagreeable. The current leaders of America are contrasted as being swayed by money and influence, but a unified America can oppose them for a positive change. If all join hands, there are no obstacles. Obama talks about a "destiny" as if people were pre-destined to rise up in these elections. A new America, comprised of the majority's force, can make health care a right for all. The industries of medicine and insurance are contrasted as corrupted by money. Their treatments are needed but not their corruption. As Obama has now envisioned and given a name to a "new majority", he addresses the community directly in the following anaphoric paragraphs and throughout the rest of the speech as "we".

Next follows Obama's *Divisio* where he lays out the largest differences between him and the Republicans. Tax breaks for corporations are contrasted with the needs of the middle-class. Ill-equipped schools are contrasted with the needs of children. Praising teachers with words are contrasted with their low wages. The manual work of farmers is joined with the theoretical work of scientists, citizens with businessmen, to illustrate again how people need each other. Obama calls for an end to the age of oil and pollution, to the occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan – goals which can only be achieved when he is president. Without saying so directly, he accuses the Republican government of needless wars, abusing the World Trade Center attacks for political gains, failing the treatment of veterans, and ruining the reputation of America. This is the *Logos* of his speech: the current leaders are handling the country poorly, so it would be smart to replace them with a man who has other, better values. In a surprising turn, Obama praises his opponents in the Democratic nominee elections. Yet Obama's campaign and its staff are framed as different from them.

Obama uses *humiliatio* again to lessen his importance as a candidate and potential president. Through another surprising turn, he frames the election as a decision not about him but about the change in the American people. The concession night and the delegate gains are not Obama's but

belong to those who worked in the campaign. The imagined “new majority” that he has called forth will be strong if they remain united and demand change. This is the *Confirmatio* of the speech. Obama must be correct about his analysis about this change in American culture because of the amount of support he has gained. These re-framings are masterful rhetoric because they downplay the importance of one man and flatter the audience. Yet the political office and all presidential rights would be held by Obama, not the people. Without naming anyone, Obama mentions the criticism of his campaign and some claims of the opponents.

The speaker equates America with hope and, through his campaign slogan, also with him in another masterful framing. Obama talks about the past generations of American immigrants who have prevailed through sheer willpower. He calls this their “creed” and “spirit” as if they were religious statements of faith – not towards God but America. Then he names this creed in an epizeuxis as *Yes, we can*. By giving it a name that is part of his political speech, by association Obama gives himself an aura of a religious leader. Through him, the American people can state their belief in America. This is followed by a powerful *Peroratio* in which the creed of America, which is also the creed for Barack Obama, is repeated as if in a sermon. Not amen but Yes, we can. His ending imagery is extremely emotional and sums up 232 years of American history and achievements, it works as the *Peroratio* of the speech.

For Obama, the creed of America was part of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, it was part of the abolition movement that led to the Emancipation Proclamation in 1862, it was the chord of immigrants and pioneers, it was the first labour unions after the legal case of *Commonwealth v. Hunt* (45 Mass. 111) in 1842, the creed followed the voting rights of American women in 1920, president Eisenhower’s Apollo space program in 1960, and Martin Luther King Jr.’s dream about equality during the 1960s. When mentioning King, Obama says that he took America to the mountaintop and to the promised land. This references the biblical Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5, 6, and 7), the longest and most influential teachings of Jesus, as well as the land of milk and honey (Genesis 15:18-21) which God promised to the descendants of Abraham. Thus, Obama compares Martin Luther King, Jr., to Jesus. Barack Obama asks his audience to accept his creed and candidacy – with each repetition the emotions are raised higher. The speech ends but the work continues because Americans all over the country suffer, and Obama reminds his listeners that a change is already underway.

Yet nothing has truly changed so far, Obama only frames the success of his campaign in these first primary elections as a sign of a larger change in the society of the United States. This is another talented turn of words. Together, Americans can bring about a great change. While the speaker does list several key differences between him and Republican opponents, he does not go into detail on why the opponents are wrong. Thus, there is no *Refutatio* in the speech. The speaker recalls his National Convention theme by stating that “we are one people, we are one nation” and mirrors the Christian teachings from the Gospel of Matthew (25:40). Whatever is done to the least of Americans, touches the lives of others. Barack Obama ends his speech by quoting the lyrics of *America the Beautiful*, one of the most popular American patriotic songs. Through the song, he calls to mind its lyrics and combines them with his creed, his person, and his campaign. In the lyrics, God’s blessing is asked to grace the country.

Finally, the question of persuasion. The speech feels extremely moving and emotional but it lacks rationale. Obama calls for change and voices lofty goals for his campaign, but there are no details on how he would finance them, how he would gain enough support in the Congress to craft them into laws, how he would implement them in dozens of states across the continent. Thus, *Logos* is weak in his speech while *Pathos* is heightened. Yet considering the locale for the speech and the goal of the speech, it does manage to convince his campaign staff and voters that things in America are changing for the better. Through crafty use of framing and listing things which are currently wrong in America, Obama manages to make positive statements and promises of better things to come. The listeners attuned to Obama’s political goals and persona will be left with a strong feeling. This is the hallmark of an effective speech.

The speech is less religious than Obama’s National Convention address, but Christian themes and concepts are manifold. The optimism and hard work of previous immigrant generations is framed as the “creed” and “spirit” of America, the work of Martin Luther King, Jr., is compared to the stories in the Gospel of Matthew and the book of Genesis, the Gospel of Matthew is referenced when talking about American unity, and the religious lyrics of *America the Beautiful* are referenced at the end. The style of the speech again recalls a minister giving a sermon and the United States of America is worshipped as much as God.

5.6 Barack Obama’s Speech: Remarks on Trayvon Martin
Washington, D.C., July 19, 2013

Instead of a common White House daily briefing given by its Press Secretary, in July 2013 Barack Obama talked about the contemporary national news about the shooting of Trayvon Martin. Because of this sudden decision, American media especially noted the speech and made its views part of their main headlines. The shooting of the unarmed black teenager Martin culminated in a trial in which the defendant was found not guilty six days before the president's speech. The words were also of interest for the media as Obama rarely commented on American ethnic relations before this event.

The president begins by noting not himself or Trayvon Martin but Jay Carney, the White House Press Secretary. This is a form of *humiliatio* as Barack Obama plays down his importance by noting that he is taking time away from the Press Secretary. Carney's regular meeting with the media will take place after the president, he announces, as if the Secretary was the main interest of the media. Obama takes note of, and caters to, the importance of the press with a promise of another conference later. Yet these are his secondary reasons for attending the conference, the main one is the trial and acquittal which were headline news in America. In this speech, there is no need to establish *Ethos* because Obama arrives to meet the press as the president of the United States.

For analysing *Inventio*, the venue is essential. By holding his speech during a daily White House briefing, the speech attracts attention by an uncommon arrangement. The briefings are set up for the needs of American media, so Obama is speaking for the whole country on a national topic. His tone throughout is conciliatory, but he calls for a debate on the laws which make verdicts such as this exoneration possible. The speech is paratactic and the paragraphs of average length. The style of this speech is mostly the middle style but Obama uses much more vernacular expressions than in his other speeches, and at times his expressions are repetitive like an ad lib speech. Whether the piece was written for this style or the president is emotional, the effect is the same.

His remarks on the Trayvon Martin case do not feel lofty but grounded, the lexis does not reach for philosophical heights but remains common. The speech is not without cultural or religious references but they are common enough to reach most Americans. In this instance, Obama does not speak only as a candidate or the president but also as an Afro-American man. Martin, he notes, could have been his son or him some 35 years ago. This framing highlights how personal the speech is. Obama taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago Law School from 1992 to 2004, so his comments are also those of a legal scholar.

The president had commented on the case before but decided to hold a speech as well as it would be “useful”. There is little expression of emotions in this choice of word and the speech so far. This tone changes when another *humiliatio* follows: Obama takes note of the family of Martin and mentions the First Lady, Michelle, while sending his best wishes and praising the Martins for weathering the events. Despite his opinions, the president will not interfere with the verdict although it could be possible given his many rights as head of state. An example of Obama’s vernacular style is calling media commentators “talking heads”. He notes laconically that the trial is over, it was handled according to law, and the decision was the jury’s own. Yet he still wants to talk about the context, to interpret and voice the emotions of the American public.

Barack Obama personifies and espouses Trayvon Martin, a previously unknown teenager, by comparing the victim to himself or his imaginary son. This image is very strong in *Pathos* due to the wide popular acceptance of Obama. The speaker forces the audience to see Martin as Obama. Then he speaks on behalf of all Afro-Americans, a rare act during his presidency, and frames the debate according to their viewpoint – through the racism and history of slavery in American culture. These “won’t go away”. The president again personifies the treatment of Martin and all black Americans through his personal experiences. He has been followed by guards, he has been feared on the streets, women have imagined him as a sexual predator. What happened to Martin is seen through such shared experiences. Black Americans also get longer prison sentences, he notes. Thus, the speech grows from the treatment of a teenager to the treatment of the president to the treatment of a national minority. Obama, the first Afro-American president, is the leader of this community as much, if not more, as he leads the nation.

The president does not merely blame the law enforcement or judicial system but also a portion of his own peer group. A similar turn happened in his National Convention speech, likely designed to appeal to white voters who could blame Obama for favouring a minority. While black Americans are more violent in some areas, the reasons for this, according to Obama, are racism and slavery. This history should always be noted. Surprisingly, he mentions that “there are these statistics” as if to belittle them or to express a dry fact in a colloquial way. He asks the nation not to judge the whole for a part, not to blame all blacks for the crimes of some. Additionally, through the force of *Pathos*, he frames them as “sons” instead of just males. Obama repeats the word “statistically”, a colloquial doubling that highlights the criminal backgrounds of black men. He uses “folks”, another everyday expression, for a similar effect. While the crime rates are true, Obama calls Americans to keep in mind the history of slavery and racism.

The president uses another colloquialism by doubling “I think” and evokes an image of a white youth facing the same violence as Trayvon Martin, asking if his shooter would be acquitted as well. Obama repeats “folks” in a rhetorical question as to what next, while the following sentence repeats the same questions differently. This is another turn toward simple style as defined in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. A tricolon of demonstrations, vigils, and protests is the response of the public, it is their “stuff”. This word choice is among the most everyday ones. Obama calls on America to remain nonviolent in their protests by evoking the memory of Martin and his family’s feelings. These lead him to present solutions for the debate.

Barack Obama mentions Eric Holder, the Attorney General of the United States in his cabinet, and informs the public that Holder is reviewing the trial which happened “down there”, in Florida. A very casual expression. The issues are repeated as state and local questions, not something that the federal union commonly solves. Yet each American can do something, there are some solutions which the president is already “bouncing around” with his workers, very casually. There is no federal plan “rolling out”. For solutions, the tricolon of Justice department, governors, mayors should first train the law enforcement to avoid harsher treatment of Afro-Americans. This is what the speaker had previously done in the Illinois through new laws, with good results. Through common style, Obama doubles “I think” in his following paragraphs. The president hesitates and changes a form from “if it” to “if they”.

The tricolon of peace, security, and order is at stake, he opines, if the so-called stand your ground laws are evoked more often. According to such laws, an American citizen need not retreat when threatened with violence. Instead, the threat can be met with violence and the law evoked in legal defence afterwards. Secondly, Obama asks the American public to debate such laws because, through them, Trayvon Martin could have shot his assailant and expected exoneration. His third proposition is to boost the life management skills of African American teens, something which he has talked about with his First Lady. A tricolon in a rhetorical question asks for care, valuing, and investment for such young men. Colloquially, Obama repeats “that” right after its first use and expresses mistrust for a federal solution to the Martin case.

He mentions his occupation as president as a sign of import in the debate. In a long periodic sentence, which differs from the rest of his speech, he lists together leaders of companies, bureaucrats, religious leaders, celebrities, and athletes to say that, if America can gather them up to

find solutions for black youths, then Trayvon Martin will not have died in vain. The government, he promises, will work with and think about ways to help boys like Martin. He asks America to search their consciences because politicians cannot solve all. He contrasts the politicised, self-serving racial debates by politicians as meek means, and praises the solutions that can be found in the tricolon of families, churches, and workplaces. It is there, he says, that people are “more honest”. This means he, a politician, feels politicians are less honest than others. Rhetorically, he asks the people if they are all biased. He repeats the question by paraphrasing Martin Luther King, Jr., whose dream was that his children would not be judged by the colour of their skin but by the content of their characters. This, Obama thinks, would be one solution.

At the end of his speech, the president turns his topic away from potential solutions and grim statistics to remind America that things have, on the whole, improved much. The future is better. While the United States has not been able to leave the concept of race behind, the country’s attitudes have improved. Barack Obama mentions his daughters by first names only because through the media they are already known, and there is no need to establish *Ethos* for each. Through another *humiliatio*, Obama opines that his daughters and their friends, American teens of 2013, treat others with less racism than their parents’ generation. The president has seen this in all communities throughout the country. For the future, America needs to forgo racism. This is the main message of the speech.

Barack Obama asks Americans to “encourage the better angels of our nature”. This seems like a religious reference at first but through this expression, Obama references a book published in 2011. In *The Better Angels of Our Nature*, the influential Professor Steven Pinker gathers evidence to prove that violence has become rarer in the world, both historically and during the last decades. This reference is likely obscure for most Americans as the book is academic. Obama asks that American authorities should encourage citizens to give up on violence as a solution, to avoid using cases such as Trayvon Martin’s to raise tensions. The president again contrasts his children’s generation with his own and those of his grandparents’, noting that racism has lessened and life has improved. While the union of the states and people is not perfect, it is becoming more perfect. Life is getting better. Thus, he ends the speech by referencing the Preamble to the United States Constitution. The text begins “We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union” and it works as an introduction to the goals of America’s Founding Fathers. Obama says that the American people is following the tenets of its founders as each generation is less violent, less racist than before. The president ends the speech with a very casual “thank you, guys.”

Barack Obama's speech regarding Trayvon Martin's fate is convincing. Simply by holding the speech at an uncommon venue, the president marks the topic out as highly important. The style of his words is much more colloquial than before and whether this is by design or through haste, the effect is similar. It seems as if the leader of the United States is at his most honest, most vulnerable, and most saddened. While Obama's books *Dreams from My Father* and *The Audacity of Hope* shared intimate painful memories of his childhood and youth, neither was critical of law enforcement nor held racism as a main theme. The examples he shares in this speech, however, remind the listeners of his past on the mean streets of Chicago. By showing vulnerability and framing Martin as himself or as his son, the speech gains high *Pathos*. Such words had never been heard from the president as all past leaders of America were Caucasian. Obama calling Martin as himself or his son is a strong image guaranteed to remain in memory.

The speech is much less religious than Obama's prior ones. The president mentions his "thoughts and prayers" to the Martin family while praising their "grace" throughout the process, the clergy and churches are mentioned as possible solutions on a community level, the president asks Americans to do "soul-searching" to avoid further conflict. There are no references to the Bible or biblical stories, no grand calls to action, there is little emotion. The speech feels like an improvised chat, whether through design or ill preparation. This is not a leader of a nation addressing his citizens and the annals of history, not a religious leader addressing God and country, this speech is more like a disappointed teacher chatting up his class with pessimistic eyes.

6. Conclusions

In this essay, I have presented the theory of classical rhetoric as defined in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as well as *Rhetorica ad Herennium* by an unknown scholar. I have presented short biographies of Winston Churchill and Barack Obama, described the style of speaking each favoured, how they worked while writing their speeches, their religious backgrounds, their scholarly influences, and analysed three speeches from each. Through their life stories and religious backgrounds, we can reach a more thorough understanding while analysing the speeches of these famed politicians. It is also optional to disregard reading the speeches through life stories, and simply concentrate on the word choices and references in each piece.

In this essay, I have proved that Churchill and Obama used the Christian religion in their political speeches to influence people. I have also shown how both have employed words, references or mental images particularly associated with Christian religious concepts. Such words are, for

example, succour, faith, and God (with a capital letter). A religious reference from Churchill is his altered quotation from the First Book of Maccabees (3:58-60) when he bids the Brits to arm themselves and be men of valour. In Obama's case, an example is his reference to the Book of Genesis (4:1-18) where God has tasked Cain to be a keeper to his brother Abel, but Obama bids his listeners be keepers to their sisters too. Examples of their mental images are, in Obama's case, when he mentions his deceased parents who "look down on me with great pride" as if from Heaven; in Churchill's case, when he talks about a divided Europe after the Second World War as "a babel of jarring voices".

Despite their commonalities, Churchill and Obama have had differing convictions. The former was a lifelong agnostic who used religion when it suited his goals, the latter was christened as an adult and has reaffirmed his belief in a supernatural truth time and again. For Churchill, Christianity was useful in teaching ethics and morality and the western culture. For Obama, there is no salvation nor eternal life without Jesus Christ. Both have reached their most important political goals, such as The Affordable Care Act or winning the Second World War. For a politician, convincing as many followers is essential. In western democracies, such goals are not reached with the whip or the threat or the gun – power is enacted only through speaking. A suggestion for further research on the topic is to analyse more speeches from each politician and search for Christian references and concepts.

7. Works Cited

- Addison, Paul. *Churchill: The unexpected hero*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.
- . "The Political Beliefs of Winston Churchill." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 30, 1980, pp. 23–47., doi:10.2307/3679001.
- . *Churchill on the Home Front, 1900–1955*. London: Faber&Faber, 2013. Print.
- . *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream*. New York: Crown

- Publishing Group. 2006. Print.
- Aristotle. *Gorgias*. Hamilton, Walter, editor. London: Unwin Brothers Limited, 1960. Print.
- Aristotle. *Gorgias*. Emlyn-Jones, Chris, editor, and Walter Hamilton, translator. London: Penguin Classics, 2004. Print.
- Aristophanes. *Aristophanes: The Complete Plays*. Roche, Paul, translator. New York: New American Library, 2005. Print.
- The Bible*. Carroll, Robert P. and Stephen Prickett, editors. Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2008. Print.
- Cannadine, David. *Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat: Winston Churchill's Famous Speeches*. Great Britain: Cassell Publishers Limited, 1989. Print.
- Cannadine, David. *In Churchill's Shadow: Confronting the Past in Modern Britain*. Great Britain: Penguin Publishers, 2013. Print.
- Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Caplan, Harry, translator. Great Britain: William Heinemann Ltd, 1968. Print.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Churchill, Winston. *My Early Life: A Roving Commission*. London: Thornton Butterworth, 1934. Print.
- Coogan, Michael D., editor. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- Cooper, Lane, translator. *The Rhetoric of Aristotle: An Expanded Translation*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960. Print.
- Forsyth, Mark. *The Elements of Eloquence: How to Turn the Perfect English phrase*. London: Faber and Faber. 2013. Print.
- Gilbert, Martin. *Churchill: A Life*. London: Heinemann. 1991. Print.
- Haffner, Sebastian. *Churchill*. London: Haus. 2003. Print.
- Holmes, David L. *The Faiths of the Postwar Presidents : From Truman to Obama*, University of Georgia Press, 2014. Print.
- Leith, Sam. *You Talkin' to Me? Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. London: Profile Books LTD, 2011. Print.
- Manchester, William. *The Last Lion: Winston Spencer Churchill: Visions of Glory, 1874-1932*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1983. Print.
- Mieder, Wolfgang. *Yes We Can: Barack Obama's Proverbial Rhetoric*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009. Print.
- Newton-Small, Jay. "How Obama Writes His Speeches." *TIME*, 28 Aug. 2008,

- www.content.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1837368,00.html.
- Nobel Media AB. Barack H. Obama – Facts. *NobelPrize.org*. 6 Apr. 2020, www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2009/obama/facts/.
- Nobel Media AB. The Nobel Prize in Literature 1953. *NobelPrize.org*. 6 Apr. 2020, www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1953/summary/.
- Obama, Barack. *Dreams from My Father: A Story of Race and Inheritance*. New York: Crown, 2004. Print.
- Pollman, Judith. *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Print.
- Reagles, David, and Timothy Larsen. “Winston Churchill and Almighty God”. *Historically Speaking*, vol. 14 no. 5, 2013, p. 8-10. Project MUSE, doi:10.1353/hsp.2013.0056.
- Rogak, Lisa. *Barack Obama in His Own Words*. Cornwall: MPG Books, 2009. Print.
- Rose, Jonathan. *The Literary Churchill: Author, Reader, Actor*. Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2014. Print.
- Spencer-Churchill, Winston. *Winston Churchill’s Speeches – Never Give In!* London: Pimlico, 2006. Print.
- Terrill, Robert E. *Double-Consciousness and the Rhetoric of Barack Obama*. South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 2015. Print.
- The Church of England. “Articles of Doctrine”. *churchofengland.org*. 6 Apr. 2020, www.churchofengland.org/prayer-and-worship/worship-texts-and-resources/book-common-prayer/articles-religion#VI.
- The Supreme Court of the United States of America. “Bush V. Gore, 531 U.s. 98 (2000)”. *supreme.justia.com*. Mon. 6 Apr 2020, www.supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/531/98/.
- Vickers, Brian. *In Defence of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988. Print.
- Winkler, Martin M., editor. *Classical Myth and Culture in the Cinema*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- Wood, Michael. “The Republican war on words.” *New Yorker*, 6 Oct. 2008, www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/10/13/verbage/.

8. Appendix: The Speeches

8.1 The cause of the left-out millions

St Andrew's Hall, Glasgow

11th October 1906

The cause of the Liberal Party is the cause of the left-out millions; and because we believe that there is in all the world no other instrument of equal potency and efficacy available at the present time for the purposes of social amelioration, we are bound in duty and in honour to guard it from all attacks, whether they arise from violence or from reaction.

There is no necessity tonight to plunge into a discussion of the philophical divergencies between Socialism and Liberalism. It is not possible to draw a hard-and-fast line between individualism and collectivism. You cannot draw it either in theory or in practice. That is where the Socialist makes a mistake. Let us not imitate that mistake. No man can be a collectivist alone or an individualist alone. He must be both an individualist and a collectivist. The nature of man is a dual nature. The character of the organisation of human society is dual. Man is at once a unique being and a gregarious animal. For some purposes he must be collectivist, for others he is, and he will for all time remain, an individualist. Collectively we have an Army and a Navy and a Civil Service; collectively we have a Post Office, and a police, and a government; collectively we indulge increasingly in all the necessities of communication. But we do not make love collectively, and the ladies do not marry us collectively, and we do not eat collectively, and we do not die collectively, and it is not collectively that we face the sorrows and the hopes, the winnings and the losings of this world of accident and storm...

I look forward to the universal establishment of minimum standards of life and labour, and their progressive elevation as the increasing energies of production may permit. I do not think that Liberalism in any circumstances can cut itself off from this fertile field of social effort, and I would recommend you not to be scared in discussing any of these proposals, just because some old woman comes along and tells you they are Socialistic. If you take my advice, you will judge each case on its merits. Where you find that State enterprise is likely to be ineffective, then utilise private enterprises, and do not grudge them their profits.

The existing organisation of society is driven by one mainspring – competitive selection. It may be a very imperfect organisation of society, but it is all we have got between us and barbarism. It is all we have been able to create through unnumbered centuries of effort and sacrifice. It is the whole treasure which past generations have been able to secure, and which they have been able to

bequeath; and great and numerous as are the evils of the existing condition of society in the country, the advantages and achievements of the social system are greater still. Moreover, that system is one which offers an almost indefinite capacity for improvement. We may progressively eliminate the evils; we may progressively augment the goods which it contains. I do not want to see impaired the vigour of competition, but we can do much to mitigate the consequences of failure. We want to draw a line below which we will not allow persons to live and labour, yet above which they may compete with all the strength of their manhood. We want to have free competition upwards; we decline to allow free competition to run downwards. We do not want to pull down the structures of science and civilisation: but to spread a net over the abyss; and I am sure that if the vision of a fair Utopia which cheers the hearts and lights the imagination of the toiling multitudes should ever break into reality it will be by developments through, and modifications in, and by improvements out of, the existing competitive organisation of society; and I believe that Liberalism mobilised, and active as it is today, will be a principal and indispensable factor in that noble evolution.

I have been for nearly six years, in rather a short life, trained as a soldier, and I will use a military metaphor. There is no operation in war more dangerous or more important than the conduct of a rear-guard action and the extrication of a rear-guard from difficult and broken ground. In the long war which humanity wages with the elements of nature the main body of the army has won its victory. It has moved out into the open plain, into a pleasant camping ground by the water springs and in the sunshine, amid fair cities and fertile fields. But the rear-guard is entangled in the defiles, the rear-guard is still struggling in mountainous country, attacked and assailed on every side by the onslaughts of a pitiless enemy. The rear-guard is encumbered with wounded, obstructed by all the broken vehicles that have fallen back from the main line of the march, with all the stragglers and weaklings that have fallen by the way and can struggle forward no farther. It is to the rear-guard of the army that attention should be directed. There is the place for the bravest soldiers and the most trusted generals. It is there that all the resources of military science and its heaviest artillery should be employed to extricate the rear-guard – not to bring the main army back from good positions which occupies, not to throw away the victory which it has won over the brute forces of nature – but to bring the rear-guard in, to bring them into the level plain, so that they too may dwell in a land of peace and plenty.

That is the aim of the Liberal Party, and if we work together we will do something for its definite accomplishment (Spencer-Churchill 23-25).

8.2 Be Ye Men of Valour
Radio Broadcast, London
19th May, 1940

I speak to you for the first time as Prime Minister in a solemn hour for the life of our country, of our Empire, of our Allies, and, above all, of the cause of Freedom. A tremendous battle is raging in France and Flanders. The Germans, by a remarkable combination of air bombing and heavily armoured tanks, have broken through the French defences north of the Maginot Line, and strong columns of their armoured vehicles are ravaging the open country, which for the first day or two was without defenders. They have penetrated deeply and spread alarm and confusion in their track. Behind them there are now appearing infantry in lorries, and behind them, again, the large masses are moving forward. The re-groupment of the French armies to make head against, and also to strike at, this intruding wedge has been proceeding for several days, largely assisted by the magnificent efforts of the Royal Air Force.

We must not allow ourselves to be intimidated by the presence of these armoured vehicles in unexpected places behind our lines. If they are behind our Front, the French are also at many points fighting actively behind theirs. Both sides are therefore in an extremely dangerous position. And if the French Army, and our own Army, are well handled, as I believe they will be; if the French retain that genius for recovery and counter-attack for which they have so long been famous; and if the British Army shows the dogged endurance and solid fighting power of which there have been so many examples in the past — then a sudden transformation of the scene might spring into being.

It would be foolish, however, to disguise the gravity of the hour. It would be still more foolish to lose heart and courage or to suppose that well-trained, well-equipped armies numbering three or four millions of men can be overcome in the space of a few weeks, or even months, by a scoop, or raid of mechanised vehicles, however formidable. We may look with confidence to the stabilisation of the Front in France, and to the general engagement of the masses, which will enable the qualities of the French and British soldiers to be matched squarely against those of their adversaries. For myself, I have invincible confidence in the French Army and its leaders. Only a very small part of that splendid Army has yet been heavily engaged; and only a very small part of France has yet been invaded. There is a good evidence to show that practically the whole of the specialized and mechanized forces of the enemy have been already thrown into the battle; and we know that very heavy losses have been inflicted upon them. No officer or man, no brigade or division, which grapples at close quarters with the enemy, wherever encountered, can fail to make a worthy contribution to the general result. The Armies must cast away the idea of resisting behind concrete lines or natural obstacles, and must realize that mastery can only be regained by furious

and unrelenting assault. And this spirit must not only animate the High Command, but must inspire every fighting man.

In the air — often at serious odds, often at odds hitherto thought overwhelming — we have been clawing down three or four to one of our enemies; and the relative balance of the British and German Air Forces is now considerably more favourable to us than at the beginning of the battle. In cutting down the German bombers, we are fighting our own battle as well as that of France. May confidence in our ability to fight it out to the finish with the German Air Force has been strengthened by the fierce encounters which have taken place and are taking place. At the same time, our heavy bombers are striking nightly at the tap-root of German mechanized power, and have already inflicted serious damage upon the oil refineries on which the Nazi effort to dominate the world directly depends.

We must expect that as soon as stability is reached on the Western Front, the bulk of that hideous apparatus of aggression which gashed Holland into ruin and slavery in a few days will be turned upon us. I am sure I speak for all when I say we are ready to face it; to endure it; and to retaliate against it — to any extent that the unwritten laws of war permit. There will be many men and many women in the Island who when the ordeal comes upon them, as come it will, will feel comfort, and even a pride, that they are sharing the perils of our lads at the Front — soldiers, sailors and airmen, God bless them — and are drawing away from them a part at least of the onslaught they have to bear. Is not this the appointed time for all to make the utmost exertions in their power? If the battle is to be won, we must provide our men with ever-increasing quantities of the weapons and ammunition they need. We must have, and have quickly, more aeroplanes, more tanks, more shells, more guns. there is imperious need for these vital munitions. They increase our strength against the powerfully armed enemy. They replace the wastage of the obstinate struggle; and the knowledge that wastage will speedily be replaced enables us to draw more readily upon our reserves and throw them in now that everything counts so much.

Our task is not only to win the battle — but to win the war. After this battle in France abates its force, there will come the battle for our Island — for all that Britain is, and all the Britain means. That will be the struggle. In that supreme emergency we shall not hesitate to take every step, even the most drastic, to call forth from our people the last ounce and the last inch of effort of which they are capable. The interests of property, the hours of labour, are nothing compared with the struggle of life and honour, for right and freedom, to which we have vowed ourselves.

I have received from the Chiefs of the French Republic, and in particular from its indomitable Prime Minister, M. Reynaud, the most sacred pledges that whatever happens they will fight to the end, be it bitter or be it glorious. Nay, if we fight to the end, it can only be glorious.

Having received His Majesty's commission, I have formed an Administration of men and women of every Party and of almost every point of view. We have differed and quarrelled in the past; but now one bond unites us all — to wage war until victory is won, and never to surrender ourselves to servitude and shame, whatever the cost and the agony may be. this is one of the most awe-striking periods in the long history of France and Britain. It is also beyond doubt the most sublime. Side by side, unaided except by their kith and kin in the great Dominions and by the wide empires which rest beneath their shield – side by side, the British and French peoples have advanced to rescue not only Europe but mankind from the foulest and most soul-destroying tyranny which has ever darkened and stained the pages of history. Behind them – behind us- behind the Armies and Fleets of Britain and France – gather a group of shattered States and bludgeoned races: the Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Dutch, the Belgians – upon all of whom the long night of barbarism will descend, unbroken even by a star of hope, unless we conquer, as conquer we must; as conquer we shall.

Today is Trinity Sunday. Centuries ago words were written to be a call and a spur to the faithful servants of Truth and Justice: 'Arm yourselves, and be ye men of valour, and be in readiness for the conflict; for it is better for us to perish in battle than to look upon the outrage of our nation and our altar. As the Will of God is in Heaven, even so let it be.' (Spencer-Churchill 206-209).

8.3 A 'United States of Europe'

Zürich University, Switzerland

19th September 1946

I wish to speak to you today about the tragedy of Europe. This noble continent, comprising on the whole the fairest and the most cultivated regions of the earth, enjoying a temperate and equable climate, is the home of all the great parent races of the western world. It is the fountain of Christian faith and Christian ethics. It is the origin of most of the culture, arts, philosophy and science both of ancient and modern times. If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance, there would be no limit to the happiness, to the prosperity and glory which its three or four hundred million people would enjoy. Yet it is from Europe that have sprung that series of frightful nationalistic quarrels, originated by the Teutonic nations, which we have seen in this twentieth century and in our own lifetime wreck the peace and mar the prospects of all mankind.

And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? Some of the smaller states have indeed made a good recovery, but over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, careworn and bewildered human beings gape at the ruins of their cities and homes, and scan the dark horizons for the approach of some new form of peril, tyranny or terror. Among the victors there is a babel of jarring voices; among the vanquished the sullen silence of despair. That is all that Europeans, grouped in so many ancient states and nations, that is all that the Germanic Powers have got by tearing each other to pieces and spreading havoc far and wide. Indeed, but for the fact that the great Republic across the Atlantic Ocean has at length realised that the ruin or enslavement of Europe would involve their own fate as well, and has stretched out hands of succour and guidance, the Dark Ages would have returned in all their cruelty and squalor. They may still return.

Yet all the while there is a remedy which, if it were generally and spontaneously adopted, would by as if a miracle transform the whole scene, and would in a few years make all Europe, or the greater part of it, as free and as happy as Switzerland is today. What is this sovereign remedy? It is to re-create the European Family, or as much of it as we can, and provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom. We must build a kind of United States of Europe. In this way only will hundreds of millions of toilers be able to regain the simple joys and hopes which make life worth living. The process is simple. All that is needed is the resolve of hundreds of millions of men and women to do right instead of wrong and gain as their reward blessing instead of cursing.

Much work has been done upon this task by the exertions of the Pan-European Union which owes so much to Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and which commanded the services of the famous French patriot and statesman, Aristide Briand. There is also that immense body of doctrine and procedure, which was brought into being amid high hopes after the First World War, as the League of Nations. The League of Nations did not fail because of its principles or conceptions. It failed because these principles were deserted by those States who had brought it into being. It failed because the Governments of those days feared to face the facts, and act while time remained. This disaster must not be repeated. There is therefore much knowledge and material with which to build; and also bitter dear-bought experience.

I was very glad to read in the newspapers two days ago that my friend President Truman had expressed his interest and sympathy with this great design. There is no reason why a regional organisation of Europe should in any way conflict with the world organisation of the United Nations. On the contrary, I believe that the larger synthesis will only survive if it is founded upon coherent natural groupings. There is already a natural grouping in the Western Hemisphere. We British have our own Commonwealth of Nations. These do not weaken, on the contrary they

strengthen, the world organisation. They are in fact its main support. And why should there not be a European group which could give a sense of enlarged patriotism and common citizenship to the distracted peoples of this turbulent and mighty continent and why should it not take its rightful place with other great groupings in shaping the destinies of men? In order that this should be accomplished there must be an act of faith in which millions of families speaking many languages must consciously take part.

We all know that the two world wars through which we have passed arose out of the vain passion of Germany to play the dominating part in the world. In this last struggle crimes and massacres have been committed for which there is no parallel since the invasions of the Mongols in the fourteenth century and no equal at any time in human history. The guilty must be punished. Germany must be deprived of the power to rearm and make another aggressive war. But when all this has been done, as it will be done, as it is being done, there must be an end to retribution. There must be what Mr Gladstone many years ago called a 'blessed act of oblivion'. We must all turn our backs upon the horrors of the past. We must look to the future. We cannot afford to drag forward across the years that are to come the hatreds and revenges which have sprung from the injuries of the past. If Europe is to be saved from infinite misery, and indeed from final doom, there must be an act of faith in the European family and an act of oblivion against all the crimes and follies of the past.

Can the free peoples of Europe rise to the heights of these resolves of the soul and instincts of the spirit of man? If they can, the wrongs and injuries which have been inflicted will have been washed away on all sides by the miseries which have been endured. Is there any need for further floods of agony? Is it the only lesson of history that mankind is unteachable? Let there be justice, mercy and freedom. The peoples have only to will it, and all will achieve their hearts' desire.

I am now going to say something that will astonish you. The first step in the re-creation of the European family must be a partnership between France and Germany. In this way only can France recover the moral leadership of Europe. There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany. The structure of the United States of Europe, if well and truly built, will be such as to make the material strength of a single state less important. Small nations will count as much as large ones and gain their honour by their contribution to the common cause. The ancient states and principalities of Germany, freely joined together for mutual convenience in a federal system, might each take their individual place among the United States of Europe. I shall not try to make a detailed programme for hundreds of millions of people who want to be happy and free, prosperous and safe, who wish to enjoy the four freedoms of which the great President Roosevelt spoke, and live in accordance with their principles embodied

in the Atlantic Charter. If this is their wish, they have only to say so, and means can certainly be found, and machinery erected, to carry that wish into full fruition.

But I must give you a warning. Time may be short. At present there is a breathing-space. The cannons have ceased firing. The fighting has stopped; but the dangers have not stopped. If we are to form the United States of Europe, or whatever name or form it may take, we must begin now.

In these present days we dwell strangely and precariously under the shield and protection of the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb is still only in the hands of a State and nation which we know will never use it except in the cause of right and freedom. But it may well be that in a few years this awful agency of destruction will be widespread and the catastrophe following from its use by several warring nations will not only bring to an end all that we call civilisation, but may possibly disintegrate the globe itself.

I now sum up the propositions which are before you. Our constant aim must be to build and fortify the strength of UNO. Under and within that world concept we must re-create the European family in a regional structure called, it may be, the United States of Europe. The first step is to form a Council of Europe. If at first all the States of Europe are not willing or able to join the union, we must nevertheless proceed to assemble and combine those who will and those who can. The salvation of the common people of every race and of every land from war or servitude must be established on solid foundations and must be guarded by the readiness of all men and women to die rather than to submit to tyranny. In all this urgent work France and Germany must take the lead together. Great Britain, the British Commonwealth of Nations, mighty America, and I trust Soviet Russia – for then indeed all would be well — must be the friends and sponsors of the new Europe and must champion its right to live and shine (Spencer-Churchill 427-430).

8.4 The Audacity of Hope

Keynote Address at the 2004 Democratic National Convention

Boston, Massachusetts, July 27, 2004

On behalf of the great state of Illinois, crossroads of a nation, land of Lincoln, let me express my deep gratitude for the privilege of addressing this convention. Tonight is a particular honour for me because, let's face it, my presence on this stage is pretty unlikely.

My father was a foreign student, born and raised in a small village in Kenya. He grew up herding goats, went to school in a tin-roof shack. His father, my grandfather, was a cook, a domestic servant to the British.

But my grandfather had larger dreams for his son. Through hard work and perseverance my father got a scholarship to study in a magical place; America, that's shone as a beacon of freedom and opportunity to so many who had come before him.

While studying here, my father met my mother. She was born in a town on the other side of the world, in Kansas.

Her father worked on oil rigs and farms through most of the Depression. The day after Pearl Harbor, my grandfather signed up for duty, joined Patton's army, marched across Europe. Back home, my grandmother raised a baby and went to work on a bomber assembly line. After the war, they studied on the GI Bill, bought a house through FHA and moved west, all the way to Hawaii, in search of opportunity.

And they too had big dreams for their daughter, a common dream, born of two continents.

My parents shared not only an improbable love; they shared an abiding faith in the possibilities of this nation. They would give me an African name, Barack, or "blessed," believing that in a tolerant America your name is no barrier to success.

They imagined me going to the best schools in the land, even though they weren't rich, because in a generous America you don't have to be rich to achieve your potential.

They're both passed away now. And yet I know that, on this night, they look down on me with great pride.

And I stand here today grateful for the diversity of my heritage, aware that my parents' dreams live on in my precious daughters.

I stand here knowing that my story is part of the larger American story, that I owe a debt to all of those who came before me, and that, in no other country on Earth is my story even possible.

Tonight, we gather to affirm the greatness of our nation not because of the height of our skyscrapers, or the power of our military, or the size of our economy; our pride is based on a very simple premise, summed up in a declaration made over two hundred years ago: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

That is the true genius of America, a faith in simple dreams, an insistence on small miracles; that we can tuck in our children at night and know they are fed and clothed and safe from harm; that we can say what we think, write what we think, without hearing a sudden knock on the door; that we can have an idea and start our own business without paying a bribe; that we can participate in the political process without fear of retribution; and that our votes will be counted—or at least, most of the time.

This year, in this election, we are called to reaffirm our values and commitments, to hold them against a hard reality and see how we are measuring up, to the legacy of our forbearers, and the promise of future generations.

And fellow Americans, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, I say to you, tonight, we have more work to do, for the workers I met in Galesburg, Illinois, who are losing their union jobs at the Maytag plant that's moving to Mexico, and now they're having to compete with their own children for jobs that pay seven bucks an hour; more to do for the father I met who was losing his job and choking back the tears, wondering how he would pay \$4,500 a month for the drugs his son needs without the health benefits that he counted on; more to do for the young woman in East St. Louis, and thousands more like her, who has the grades, has the drive, has the will, but doesn't have the money to go to college.

Now, don't get me wrong, the people I meet in small towns and big cities and diners and office parks, they don't expect government to solve all of their problems. They know they have to work hard to get ahead. And they want to.

Go into the collar counties around Chicago, and people will tell you: They don't want their tax money wasted by a welfare agency or by the Pentagon.

Go into any inner-city neighborhood, and folks will tell you that government alone can't teach kids to learn.

They know that parents have to teach, that children can't achieve unless we raise their expectations and turn off the television sets and eradicate the slander that says a black youth with a book is acting white. They know those things.

People don't expect government to solve all their problems. But they sense, deep in their bones, that with just a slight change in priorities, we can make sure that every child in America has a decent shot at life and that the doors of opportunity remain open to all. They know we can do better. And they want that choice.

In this election, we offer that choice. Our party has chosen a man to lead us who embodies the best this country has to offer. And that man is John Kerry.

John Kerry understands the ideals of community, faith, and service because they've defined his life. From his heroic service in Vietnam to his years as prosecutor and lieutenant governor, through two decades in the United States Senate, he has devoted himself to this country. Again and again, we've seen him make tough choices when easier ones were available. His values and his record affirm what is best in us.

John Kerry believes in an America where hard work is rewarded. So instead of offering tax breaks to companies shipping jobs overseas, he offers them to companies creating jobs here at home.

John Kerry believes in an America where all Americans can afford the same health coverage our politicians in Washington have for themselves.

John Kerry believes in energy independence, so we aren't held hostage to the profits of oil companies or the sabotage of foreign oil fields.

John Kerry believes in the constitutional freedoms that have made our country the envy of the world, and he will never sacrifice our basic liberties nor use faith as a wedge to divide us.

And John Kerry believes that in a dangerous world, war must be an option sometimes, but it should never be the first option.

You know, a while back, I met a young man named Seamus in a VFW Hall in East Moline, Illinois. He was a good-looking kid, 6'2", 6'3" clear eyed, with an easy smile. He told me he'd joined the Marines and was heading to Iraq the following week.

And as I listened to him explain why he had enlisted -- the absolute faith he had in our country and its leaders, his devotion to duty and service -- I thought, this young man was all any of us might hope for in a child. But then I asked myself: Are we serving Seamus as well as he's serving us?

I thought of the nine hundred men and women, sons and daughters, husbands and wives, friends and neighbors who will not be returning to their hometowns. I thought of the families I had met who were struggling to get by without a loved one's full income or whose loved ones had returned with a limb missing or nerves shattered, but still lacked long-term health benefits because they were Reservists.

When we send our young men and women into harm's way, we have a solemn obligation not to fudge the numbers or shade the truth about why they're going, to care for their families while they're gone, to tend to the soldiers upon their return, and to never, ever go to war without enough troops to win the war, secure the peace, and earn the respect of the world.

Now, let me be clear. Let me be clear. We have real enemies in the world. These enemies must be found. They must be pursued. And they must be defeated.

John Kerry knows this. And just as Lieutenant Kerry did not hesitate to risk his life to protect the men who served with him in Vietnam, President Kerry will not hesitate one moment to use our military might to keep America safe and secure.

John Kerry believes in America. And he knows it's not enough for just some of us to prosper. For alongside our famous individualism, there's another ingredient in the American saga, a belief that we are all connected as one people.

If there's a child on the south side of Chicago who can't read, that matters to me, even if it's not my child.

If there's a senior citizen somewhere who can't pay for their prescription and having to choose between medicine and the rent, that makes my life poorer, even if it's not my grandparent.

If there's an Arab-American family being rounded up without benefit of an attorney or due process, that threatens my civil liberties.

It's that fundamental belief—I am my brother's keeper, I am my sisters' keeper—that makes this country work.

It's what allows us to pursue our individual dreams, yet still come together as a single American family: *E pluribus unum* – “Out of many, one.”

Now even as we speak, there are those who are preparing to divide us, the spin masters and negative ad peddlers who embrace the politics of anything goes.

Well, I say to them tonight, there's not a liberal America and a conservative America; there's the United States of America.

There's not a black America and white America and Latino America and Asian America; there's the United States of America.

The pundits like to slice and dice our country into red states and blue states; red states for Republicans, blue states for Democrats. But I've got news for them, too. We worship an awesome God in the blue states, and we don't like federal agents poking around our libraries in the red states.

We coach little league in the blue states and, yes, we've got some gay friends in the red states.

There are patriots who opposed the war in Iraq, and there are patriots who supported the war in Iraq.

We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the stars and stripes, all of us defending the United States of America.

In the end, that's what this election is about. Do we participate in a politics of cynicism, or do we participate in a politics of hope?

John Kerry calls on us to hope. John Edwards calls on us to hope. I'm not talking about blind optimism here, the almost willful ignorance that thinks unemployment will go away if we just don't think about it, or the health care crisis will solve itself if we just ignore it.

That's not what. I'm talking about something more substantial. It's the hope of slaves sitting around a fire singing freedom songs; the hope of immigrants setting out for distant shores; the hope of a young naval lieutenant bravely patrolling the Mekong Delta; the hope of a millworker's son who dares to defy the odds; the hope of a skinny kid with a funny name who believes that America has a place for him, too.

Hope in the face of difficulty, hope in the face of uncertainty, the audacity of hope: In the end, that is God's greatest gift to us, the bedrock of this nation, a belief in things not seen, a belief that there are better days ahead.

I believe that we can give our middle class relief and provide working families with a road to opportunity.

I believe we can provide jobs to the jobless, homes to the homeless, and reclaim young people in cities across America from violence and despair.

I believe that we have a righteous wind at our backs, and that as we stand on the crossroads of history, we can make the right choices and meet the challenges that face us.

America, tonight, if you feel the same energy that I do, if you feel the same urgency that I do, if you feel the same passion that I do, if you feel the same hopefulness that I do, if we do what we must do, then I have no doubt that all across the country, from Florida to Oregon, from Washington to Maine, the people will rise up in November, and John Kerry will be sworn in as president. And John Edwards will be sworn in as vice president. And this country will reclaim its promise. And out of this long political darkness a brighter day will come (Dionne&Reid 5-13).

8.5 Yes, We Can

New Hampshire Primary Concession Speech

Nashua, New Hampshire, January 8, 2008

Thank you. Thank you, New Hampshire. I love you back. Thank you. Thank you.

Well, thank you so much. I am still fired up and ready to go. Thank you. Thank you.

Well, first of all, I want to congratulate Senator Clinton on a hard-fought victory here in New Hampshire. She did an outstanding job. Give her a big round of applause.

You know, a few weeks ago, no one imagined that we'd have accomplished what we did here tonight in New Hampshire. No one could have imagined it.

For most of this campaign, we were far behind. We always knew our climb would be steep. But in record numbers, you came out, and you spoke up for change.

And with your voices and your votes, you made it clear that at this moment, in this election, there is something happening in America.

There is something happening when men and women in Des Moines and Davenport, in Lebanon and Concord, come out in the snows of January to wait in lines that stretch block after block because they believe in what this country can be.

There is something happening. There's something happening when Americans who are young in age and in spirit, who've never participated in politics before, turn out in numbers we have never seen because they know in their hearts that this time must be different.

There's something happening when people vote not just for party that they belong to, but the hopes that they hold in common.

And whether we are rich or poor, black or white, Latino or Asian, whether we hail from Iowa or New Hampshire, Nevada or South Carolina, we are ready to take this country in a fundamentally new direction.

That's what's happening in America right now; change is what's happening in America.

You, all of you who are here tonight, all who put so much heart and soul and work into this campaign, you can be the new majority who can lead this nation out of a long political darkness.

Democrats, independents and Republicans who are tired of the division and distraction that has clouded Washington, who know that we can disagree without being disagreeable, who understand that, if we mobilize our voices to challenge the money and influence that stood in our way and challenge ourselves to reach for something better, there is no problem we cannot solve, there is no destiny that we cannot fulfil. Our new American majority can end the outrage of unaffordable, unavailable health care in our time. We can bring doctors and patients, workers and businesses, Democrats and Republicans together, and we can tell the drug and insurance industry that, while they get a seat at the table, they don't get to buy every chair, not this time, not now.

Our new majority can end the tax breaks for corporations that ship our jobs overseas and put a middle-class tax cut in the pockets of working Americans who deserve it.

We can stop sending our children to schools with corridors of shame and start putting them on a pathway to success.

We can stop talking about how great teachers are and start rewarding them for their greatness by giving them more pay and more support. We can do this with our new majority.

We can harness the ingenuity of farmers and scientists, citizens and entrepreneurs to free this nation from the tyranny of oil and save our planet from a point of no return.

And when I am President of the United States, we will end this war in Iraq and bring our troops home.

We will end this war in Iraq. We will bring our troops home. We will finish the job -- We will finish the job against Al Qaida in Afghanistan. We will care for our veterans. We will restore our moral standing in the world.

And we will never use 9/11 as a way to scare up votes, because it is not a tactic to win an election. It is a challenge that should unite America and the world against the common threats of the 21st century: terrorism and nuclear weapons, climate change and poverty, genocide and disease.

All of the candidates in this race share these goals. All of the candidates in this race have good ideas and all are patriots who serve this country honorably.

But the reason our campaign has always been different, the reason we began this improbable journey almost a year ago is because it's not just about what I will do as president. It is also about what you, the people who love this country, the citizens of the United States of America, can do to change it.

That's what this election is all about.

That's why tonight belongs to you. It belongs to the organizers, and the volunteers, and the staff who believed in this journey and rallied so many others to join the cause.

We know the battle ahead will be long. But always remember that, no matter what obstacles stand in our way, nothing can stand in the way of the power of millions of voices calling for change.

We have been told we cannot do this by a chorus of cynics. And they will only grow louder and more dissonant in the weeks and months to come.

We've been asked to pause for a reality check. We've been warned against offering the people of this nation false hope. But in the unlikely story that is America, there has never been anything false about hope.

For when we have faced down impossible odds, when we've been told we're not ready or that we shouldn't try or that we can't, generations of Americans have responded with a simple creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes, we can. Yes, we can. Yes, we can.

It was a creed written into the founding documents that declared the destiny of a nation: Yes, we can.

It was whispered by slaves and abolitionists as they blazed a trail towards freedom through the darkest of nights: Yes, we can.

It was sung by immigrants as they struck out from distant shores and pioneers who pushed westward against an unforgiving wilderness: Yes, we can.

It was the call of workers who organized, women who reached for the ballot, a President who chose the moon as our new frontier, and a king who took us to the mountaintop and pointed the way to the promised land: Yes, we can, to justice and equality.

Yes, we can, to opportunity and prosperity. Yes, we can heal this nation. Yes, we can repair this world. Yes, we can.

And so, tomorrow, as we take the campaign south and west, as we learn that the struggles of the textile workers in Spartanburg are not so different than the plight of the dishwasher in Las Vegas, that the hopes of the little girl who goes to the crumbling school in Dillon are the same as the dreams of the boy who learns on the streets of L.A., we will remember that there is something happening in America, that we are not as divided as our politics suggest, that we are one people, we are one nation.

And, together, we will begin the next great chapter in the American story, with three words that will ring from coast to coast, from sea to shining sea: Yes, we can (Dionne&Reid 46-50).

8.6 Remarks on Trayvon Martin Washington, D.C., July 19, 2013

I wanted to come out here, first of all, to tell you that Jay is prepared for all your questions and is very much looking forward to the session. The second thing is I want to let you know that over the next couple of weeks, there's going to obviously be a whole range of issues -- immigration, economics, et cetera -- we'll try to arrange a fuller press conference to address your questions.

The reason I actually wanted to come out today is not to take questions, but to speak to an issue that obviously has gotten a lot of attention over the course of the last week -- the issue of the Trayvon Martin ruling. I gave a preliminary statement right after the ruling on Sunday. But watching the debate over the course of the last week, I thought it might be useful for me to expand on my thoughts a little bit.

First of all, I want to make sure that, once again, I send my thoughts and prayers, as well as Michelle's, to the family of Trayvon Martin, and to remark on the incredible grace and dignity with which they've dealt with the entire situation. I can only imagine what they're going through, and it's remarkable how they've handled it.

The second thing I want to say is to reiterate what I said on Sunday, which is there's going to be a lot of arguments about the legal issues in the case -- I'll let all the legal analysts and talking heads address those issues. The judge conducted the trial in a professional manner. The prosecution and the defense made their arguments. The juries were properly instructed that in a case such as this reasonable doubt was relevant, and they rendered a verdict. And once the jury has spoken, that's how our system works. But I did want to just talk a little bit about context and how people have responded to it and how people are feeling.

You know, when Trayvon Martin was first shot I said that this could have been my son. Another way of saying that is Trayvon Martin could have been me 35 years ago. And when you think about why, in the African American community at least, there's a lot of pain around what happened here, I think it's important to recognize that the African American community is looking at this issue through a set of experiences and a history that doesn't go away.

There are very few African American men in this country who haven't had the experience of being followed when they were shopping in a department store. That includes me. There are very few African American men who haven't had the experience of walking across the street and hearing the locks click on the doors of cars. That happens to me -- at least before I was a senator. There are very few African Americans who haven't had the experience of getting on an elevator and a woman clutching her purse nervously and holding her breath until she had a chance to get off. That happens often.

And I don't want to exaggerate this, but those sets of experiences inform how the African American community interprets what happened one night in Florida. And it's inescapable for people to bring those experiences to bear. The African American community is also knowledgeable that there is a history of racial disparities in the application of our criminal laws -- everything from the death penalty to enforcement of our drug laws. And that ends up having an impact in terms of how people interpret the case.

Now, this isn't to say that the African American community is naïve about the fact that African American young men are disproportionately involved in the criminal justice system; that they're disproportionately both victims and perpetrators of violence. It's not to make excuses for that fact -- although black folks do interpret the reasons for that in a historical context. They understand that some of the violence that takes place in poor black neighborhoods around the country is born out of a very violent past in this country, and that the poverty and dysfunction that we see in those communities can be traced to a very difficult history.

And so the fact that sometimes that's unacknowledged adds to the frustration. And the fact that a lot of African American boys are painted with a broad brush and the excuse is given, well, there are these statistics out there that show that African American boys are more violent -- using that as an excuse to then see sons treated differently causes pain.

I think the African American community is also not naïve in understanding that, statistically, somebody like Trayvon Martin was statistically more likely to be shot by a peer than he was by somebody else. So folks understand the challenges that exist for African American boys. But they get frustrated, I think, if they feel that there's no context for it and that context is being denied. And

that all contributes, I think, to a sense that if a white male teen was involved in the same kind of scenario, that, from top to bottom, both the outcome and the aftermath might have been different.

Now, the question for me at least, and I think for a lot of folks, is where do we take this? How do we learn some lessons from this and move in a positive direction? I think it's understandable that there have been demonstrations and vigils and protests, and some of that stuff is just going to have to work its way through, as long as it remains nonviolent. If I see any violence, then I will remind folks that that dishonors what happened to Trayvon Martin and his family. But beyond protests or vigils, the question is, are there some concrete things that we might be able to do.

I know that Eric Holder is reviewing what happened down there, but I think it's important for people to have some clear expectations here. Traditionally, these are issues of state and local government, the criminal code. And law enforcement is traditionally done at the state and local levels, not at the federal levels.

That doesn't mean, though, that as a nation we can't do some things that I think would be productive. So let me just give a couple of specifics that I'm still bouncing around with my staff, so we're not rolling out some five-point plan, but some areas where I think all of us could potentially focus.

Number one, precisely because law enforcement is often determined at the state and local level, I think it would be productive for the Justice Department, governors, mayors to work with law enforcement about training at the state and local levels in order to reduce the kind of mistrust in the system that sometimes currently exists.

When I was in Illinois, I passed racial profiling legislation, and it actually did just two simple things. One, it collected data on traffic stops and the race of the person who was stopped. But the other thing was it resourced us training police departments across the state on how to think about potential racial bias and ways to further professionalize what they were doing.

And initially, the police departments across the state were resistant, but actually they came to recognize that if it was done in a fair, straightforward way that it would allow them to do their jobs better and communities would have more confidence in them and, in turn, be more helpful in applying the law. And obviously, law enforcement has got a very tough job.

So that's one area where I think there are a lot of resources and best practices that could be brought to bear if state and local governments are receptive. And I think a lot of them would be. And let's figure out are there ways for us to push out that kind of training.

Along the same lines, I think it would be useful for us to examine some state and local laws to see if it -- if they are designed in such a way that they may encourage the kinds of altercations

and confrontations and tragedies that we saw in the Florida case, rather than diffuse potential altercations.

I know that there's been commentary about the fact that the "stand your ground" laws in Florida were not used as a defense in the case. On the other hand, if we're sending a message as a society in our communities that someone who is armed potentially has the right to use those firearms even if there's a way for them to exit from a situation, is that really going to be contributing to the kind of peace and security and order that we'd like to see?

And for those who resist that idea that we should think about something like these "stand your ground" laws, I'd just ask people to consider, if Trayvon Martin was of age and armed, could he have stood his ground on that sidewalk? And do we actually think that he would have been justified in shooting Mr. Zimmerman who had followed him in a car because he felt threatened? And if the answer to that question is at least ambiguous, then it seems to me that we might want to examine those kinds of laws.

Number three -- and this is a long-term project -- we need to spend some time in thinking about how do we bolster and reinforce our African American boys. And this is something that Michelle and I talk a lot about. There are a lot of kids out there who need help who are getting a lot of negative reinforcement. And is there more that we can do to give them the sense that their country cares about them and values them and is willing to invest in them?

I'm not naïve about the prospects of some grand, new federal program. I'm not sure that that's what we're talking about here. But I do recognize that as President, I've got some convening power, and there are a lot of good programs that are being done across the country on this front. And for us to be able to gather together business leaders and local elected officials and clergy and celebrities and athletes, and figure out how are we doing a better job helping young African American men feel that they're a full part of this society and that they've got pathways and avenues to succeed -- I think that would be a pretty good outcome from what was obviously a tragic situation. And we're going to spend some time working on that and thinking about that.

And then, finally, I think it's going to be important for all of us to do some soul-searching. There has been talk about should we convene a conversation on race. I haven't seen that be particularly productive when politicians try to organize conversations. They end up being stilted and politicized, and folks are locked into the positions they already have. On the other hand, in families and churches and workplaces, there's the possibility that people are a little bit more honest, and at least you ask yourself your own questions about, am I wringing as much bias out of myself as I can? Am I judging people as much as I can, based on not the color of their skin, but the content of their character? That would, I think, be an appropriate exercise in the wake of this tragedy.

And let me just leave you with a final thought that, as difficult and challenging as this whole episode has been for a lot of people, I don't want us to lose sight that things are getting better. Each successive generation seems to be making progress in changing attitudes when it comes to race. It doesn't mean we're in a post-racial society. It doesn't mean that racism is eliminated. But when I talk to Malia and Sasha, and I listen to their friends and I see them interact, they're better than we are -- they're better than we were -- on these issues. And that's true in every community that I've visited all across the country.

And so we have to be vigilant and we have to work on these issues. And those of us in authority should be doing everything we can to encourage the better angels of our nature, as opposed to using these episodes to heighten divisions. But we should also have confidence that kids these days, I think, have more sense than we did back then, and certainly more than our parents did or our grandparents did; and that along this long, difficult journey, we're becoming a more perfect union -- not a perfect union, but a more perfect union (Dionne&Reid, pages 234-241).