



Theses and Dissertations

2010-03-19

Nationalism in Charles de Gaulle's Speeches During World War II

Mayavel Amado

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [French and Francophone Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Italian Language and Literature Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Amado, Mayavel, "Nationalism in Charles de Gaulle's Speeches During World War II" (2010). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2037.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2037>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

NATIONALISM IN CHARLES DE GAULLE'S SPEECHES
DURING WORLD WAR II

Mayavel Amado

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Yvon LeBras
Kirk A. Hawkins
Corry Cropper

Department of French and Italian

Brigham Young University

April 2010

Copyright © 2010 Mayavel Amado

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

NATIONALISM IN CHARLES DE GAULLE'S SPEECHES

DURING WORLD WAR II

Mayavel Amado

Department of French and Italian

Master of Arts

In a world where conflicts and supranational entities have emerged, nationalism has become an important topic for scholars in different fields. While much debate exists on what this term actually means and encompass, little attention has been paid to the rhetoric of nationalist leaders. Through scholarly and popular literature nationalism has often been confused with patriotism and populism. This work intends to look at what nationalism is, based on patterns drawn from observations in the rhetoric of nationalist leaders (sometimes opposing them to populist rhetoric) and at the same time it intends to expose Charles de Gaulle's nationalism in his speeches during the years of World War II.

Keywords: nationalism; nationalist; de Gaulle; discourse; speech analysis; holistic approach

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Dr. Corry Cropper for his insightful comments; to Dr. Yvon LeBras, the committee chair of my thesis, for taking time to sit with me and give me good feedback even for months before my defense. I am especially grateful for Dr. Kirk Hawkins for working with me for a long time, even from the beginning of my thesis, for believing in me and my project and giving me encouragement and ideas on how to carry out this work. Dr. Hawkins has truly walked extra miles to tutor me and help me in my intellectual and academic development in my undergrad and graduate years.

I would also like to thank Joni Hansen, whose help was invaluable in the polishing of my thesis. I thank her for her words of encouragement, her service and her interest in my success in the academic and other areas in my life.

I am grateful to my grandmother Aura Marina García de Pineda and all of my siblings who gave me ideas, showed interest and were so supportive of me and this work. To my Mom and Dad, I fall short in expressing my love and gratitude for them in all aspects of my life. Their righteous and exemplary lives, their love, support, encouragement and help encompassing all aspects of my life, ranging from the academic, financial, to the emotional and spiritual, have meant everything to me. It is impossible to express my gratitude to and for them.

I thank Brigham Young University for the opportunity to do pursue my studies in here. To my family, friends and colleagues I express my thanks for their listening ears, their encouragement and support in the process of earning my Master's degree, including the process of writing my thesis. Thank you all!

Brigham Young University

SIGNATURE PAGE

of a thesis submitted by

Mayavel Amado

The thesis of Mayavel Amado is acceptable in its final form including (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory and ready for submission.

Date

Yvon LeBras

Date

Kirk A. Hawkins

Date

Corry Cropper

Date

Anca Sprenger

Date

Ray Clifford

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	8
II. On nation and nationalism.....	13
A. Events and thoughts usually linked to nationalism	13
B. The problem with definitions of nationalism.....	14
C. Defining “nation”	16
1. The problem of defining “nation” in terms of religion language and ethnicity or race....	17
2. The problem of defining “nation” in a material manner	19
3. Weber’s definition of “nation”.....	20
D. Needed characteristics in a nation.....	21
E. Differentiating nationalism, patriotism, and populism.....	23
F. A few elements of nationalism	29
G. Summary and conclusion	32
III. On elements of nationalism	34
A. Morals and values	34
B. The celebration of victorious moments and people as a source of identity.....	38
C. A nation’s destiny and missions as a reformation from a rich past leading to a glorious future.....	43
D. Sacrifices and sorrows	48
E. Enemies	55
F. Opposition	58
G. Summary and conclusion	59
H. Elements of nationalism: Rubric	61
IV. On de Gaulle’s speeches: an overview	62
A. Methodology for the selection of de Gaulle’s speeches.....	62
1. Considerations of geography, themes, and chronological order for the sample.....	62
2. De Gaulle’s three periods.....	64
3. Selecting ten speeches per period	66
B. Analytical Approach	67
C. Overview of de Gaulle’s speeches: preliminary results.....	69
1. Rubrics: Summary of classification and elements of nationalism in de Gaulle’s speeches during World War II	69
D. Important considerations	74
1. The overlapping of elements, cosmic proportions and transcendence	75
2. Consistency in the presence of elements of nationalism	78
E. Conclusion.....	79
IV. On de Gaulle’s vision of the world: morals and values.....	80
A. The general or specific references to morals and values	80
1. The specificity of morals and values in nationalist speeches	80
2. The specificity of morals and values in Charles de Gaulle’s speeches.....	81

3. The meaning of de Gaulle’s specificity or generality when addressing morals and values for nationalism	84
B. The presence of duty and loyalty in de Gaulle’s speeches	86
C. Instilling morals and values in the French.....	90
D. Morals and values highlighted by other elements of nationalism	95
E. Conclusion.....	95
VI. On The celebration and remembrance of French victories as a source of identity.....	97
A. General and specific mention of victories	97
1. De Gaulle’s generality in celebrating recent victories	98
2. De Gaulle’s generality in celebration victories of a more distant past	101
B. International experience as part of the French identity	104
C. Reifications	106
1. The reification of France.....	107
2. A few connections in the reification of France	108
3. Implications through the reification of France.....	114
4. Transcendence through the reification of France.....	116
D. Conclusion.....	118
VII. On de Gaulle’s calling for action and change:	120
Reformation and destiny	120
A. Destiny	120
1. Destiny in nationalism	120
2. Destiny in Charles de Gaulle’s speeches	121
B. Restoration, renewal and reformation	127
1. Reformation in de Gaulle’s speeches.....	128
2. Attempts to explain the lack of references to specific times of grandeur	129
3. The use of cosmic proportions in addressing reformation.....	133
C. Reformation and destiny linked to morals and values	135
D. Progress and the future	137
E. Conclusion.....	143
VIII. On Sacrifice and sorrow	145
A. Who sacrifices and endures sorrows	145
1. The French	146
2. France.....	152
3. Others.....	154
B. The nature of sacrifices and sorrows.....	156
1. Material sacrifice and sorrow	157
2. Moral sacrifice and sorrow	159
C. Sacrifices and Sorrows turned into victories.....	164
1. Providing hope, values (such as unity), and inspire to victory in the near future.....	164
2. Emphasizing sacrifices and sorrows to highlight achievements and victories	167
D. The temporality of sacrifices and sorrows.....	169
E. The highlighting of spiritual qualities through sacrifice and sorrow.....	171
F. Conclusion.....	182
IX. On enemies	184

A. The importance of context.....	184
B. Who is the enemy?.....	187
C. Doings of the enemy	192
D. De Gaulle’s portrayal of the enemy.....	197
1. The enemy’s material description.....	197
2. The enemy’s moral description.....	199
3. Moral baseness—seeking to morally destroy France	202
E. Contrasting the baseness of the enemy with the spirituality of the nation	205
F. Conclusion.....	211
X. On the presence and the treatment of the opposition	214
A. The treatment of opposition in pluralism and populism	214
B. The treatment of opposition in nationalist speeches	216
C. The presence of opposition in de Gaulle’s speeches.....	219
D. Purpose for the treatment of opposition in nationalism.....	223
E. Conclusion.....	226
XI. Conclusion.....	229

I. Introduction

Working in coding speeches as a political science undergrad made me realize the importance of speech analysis. Part of the speech coding work consisted in finding patterns in populist rhetoric and comparing the rubric Dr. Kirk A. Hawkins created to describe and contrast a populist with pluralist speech. This rubric was used by many students and proved to be helpful and efficacious in the categorization of speeches as populist, semi-populist or pluralist.

Some of the findings were very interesting. The rubric provided insights on what populism and pluralism consist of and effectively discriminated leaders usually seen as populist but who, according to their rhetoric, were not. On the other hand, this rubric also helped discern leaders usually not labeled as populist but who actually have strong populist tendencies. Speech analysis thus was an important tool to discern and discriminate populist and pluralist speeches. While it is important to see the actions of world leaders, I have found that many scholars look at world leader's actions and are quick to make a judgment call to categorize them. Sometimes this categorization is wrong or misleading. My belief is that these mistakes can be avoided if we turn to speech analysis, which coped with the actions of the leaders, will provide us with a better understanding of movements, leaders and their tendencies as it has been done with Hawkins' work. There is much to be learned from speech analysis, and this type of analysis should be more seriously looked upon and used by scholars and anyone interested in the fields of humanities and social sciences.

Hawkins' work focuses on populism and his rubric is not meant to state that there are only two main movements existing in the modern world. In this sense his work is incomplete and leaves room to wonder how do other movements fit or would be described in a rubric for speech analysis, in other words, one can wonder if there are other movements to be described and how

they would compare to populism and pluralism. In this sense his work is pioneering others.

Having read speeches by Winston Churchill, Abraham Lincoln, Joseph Stalin, Francisco Franco and Augusto Pinochet, among others, it quickly became evident that there are more types of speeches other than pluralist and populist.

My curiosity arose for the nationalist speech, the patterns and elements present in it, the similarities and differences it would have with pluralist and, mostly, populist rhetoric and if it would be possible to describe and categorize a nationalist speech in a rubric as Hawkins did for populist speeches. Connecting my French studies and nationalism—and opposed the latter to patriotism and populism—I naturally thought of a very well-known nationalist leader: Charles de Gaulle. Charles de Gaulle is not only recognized as a nationalist in France, but also in the world. Knowing what populist speeches sound like and that even though populist leaders share topics and patterns, they differ in styles and emphasis, I decided to look for nationalist speeches other than the speeches from de Gaulle. This process and results will be described later in my thesis. The criteria to gather and analyze speeches General de Gaulle will also be described in later chapters. At this point I would like to limit myself to introducing my project and Charles de Gaulle.

If you would ask any person who knows about French politics or history to name one person who had great influence in France in the twentieth century, the most likely name to come out would be Charles de Gaulle. Many books, papers, and articles have been written about Charles de Gaulle exploring his ancestry, his writings, his character, his early years, his years during World War I, his years during World War II, his years under the Fourth and Fifth Republics, as well as his politics and his legacy. Most of these works and scholars would also concur with the idea that Charles de Gaulle loved France; that he had a high sense of honor, duty,

that he had love and a particular idea of France and that he fought for France's interest, keeping it as a priority in his thoughts and actions.

Richard Nixon wrote of him,

Most American remember de Gaulle as the strong-willed, difficult, and austere statesman whose demands complicated the work of Allied leaders in World War II and NATO leaders in the 1960s. But in my many encounters with him, I also saw him as an exceptionally kind, gracious, and thoughtful man and as a leader who made a profound positive difference not only for his country but also for the world (Cozier v).

Nixon later adds,

...de Gaulle managed to keep France as a major player in world events not through the strength of its armed forces but through the strength of his will. His assertiveness vis-à-vis the United States caused our presidents to never take France for granted. American policy makers might have resented the inconvenience this caused them, but they had to respect his tenacity in promoting French interests and power.

Without de Gaulle, France might not have survived the tragedy of World War II. Without de Gaulle, France might not have recovered from the devastation of World War II.

Without de Gaulle, the France-German rapprochement might not have been achieved.

Without de Gaulle France would not have adopted the constitution of the Fifth Republic and might have sunk into chaos politically, economically, and socially. And without de Gaulle, the spirit of France—which for centuries has inspired the world with its vibrancy, its élan, its radiance, its unique combination of distinctiveness and universality—might have died instead of being as vital and strong as it is today (Cozier vii).

These long quotes reflect the spirit of de Gaulle and, for the most part, what he was known for. It captures the nationalist spirit de Gaulle had and the influence he was to France and to the world. Indeed, Charles de Gaulle is regarded by many French as their savior, for he rose in a time of great need and became the leader that France needed in order to come out victorious from World War II, and brought back hope and morale to the French at that time. De Gaulle stepped forward again during the crisis of the Fourth Republic and became chief executive of the French Fifth Republic, giving France a new constitution, more order and stability.

Internationally, Charles de Gaulle was able to return dignity and an important role to France. De Gaulle put France's interest first in his negotiations, and made clear that he did not want France to lose its sovereignty in any way, which is why he opposed many multinational agreements and made it hard sometimes for the US to work with France during his mandate as France's chief executive.

In regards to what he desired for France, de Gaulle wrote, "To ensure her security in western Europe, by preventing a new Reich from threatening her again. To collaborate with West and East, if necessary to contract on one side, or else on the other, the necessary alliances, without ever accepting any kind of dependence" (Cozier 546). This shows de Gaulle's ambition to secure France, its sovereignty and identity as the motive behind many of his actions.

Because Charles de Gaulle fought to preserve France, the territory, state and culture, he is referred to as a nationalist. De Gaulle put France as his priority and succeeded to re-place it in an important position in the eyes of the world. De Gaulle always watched for the independence and interests of France. He wanted to make France grandiose. All of these attributes as well as the actions accompanying these ideals, make it obvious referring to de Gaulle as a nationalist leader.

Since there is probably no other figure as prominent as de Gaulle and no better example of nationalism in modern France, it seems logical to focus on de Gaulle's speeches to discover more about nationalism, its rhetoric, and test if de Gaulle was truly a nationalist and gain insights on the man whose legacy so richly influences France even today.

As previously stated, reading speeches of different leaders raised my curiosity for nationalism. As I contemplated the term, and did preliminary research on it, I realized that there are many different theories on what nationalism is and what it provokes in people. Noticing that populist discourse is a polarizing type of discourse while pluralist discourse is an accepting and tolerating type of rhetoric, I wondered what nationalist rhetoric would be like, and decided to test my speech analysis results against statements found in scholarly works. More on what scholars have written on nationalism will be addressed in the next chapter.

II. On nation and nationalism

A. Events and thoughts usually linked to nationalism

The conflicts in the Balkan region and clashes among peoples and states resulting in wars have caused scholars to think about and debate the meaning of the term nationalism. Currently the topics of multinationalism, supranationalism, global community, diaspora, and the search for and preservation of a regional identity in a smaller scale as opposed to supranational or global identities have caused some scholars to rethink about and readdress nationalism.

Extensive work exists on what nationalism is and what it does. Different theories on nationalism are used and debated among political scientists, philosophers, historians, sociologists, ethnomusicologists and experts in other fields. However, many scholars have attempted to define and describe this term based on recorded events, many even, based on conflicts. Nationalism has been tied to wars. No doubt nationalism is a word often mentioned in scholarly literature, and one that has impacted societies throughout the world. However, it is my opinion that in the attempt to explain nationalism, scholars have sometimes missed looking at one key source of information to define or describe this term: speeches of what they consider nationalist leaders.

My intent is thus to describe nationalism, and perhaps even come to a definition of it based on the description of the patterns found in the words that nationalist leaders say. In other words, in this work, I will focus on what nationalist leaders say rather than on what they do.

The analysis of nationalist rhetoric will increase the understanding of this term, and consequently, might evidenced whether nationalism leads to peace or conflict, if it is positive or negative as some scholars, such as Anderson (1983), Miller (2000), Gellner (1983), Freiderich

Meinecke (1965: Introduction) and Raymond Aaron (1962) have suggested (for more information refer to the website of the [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Nationalism](#)). Additionally, I want to be able to determine whether or not de Gaulle was a nationalist by analyzing a sample of his speeches and learn more about de Gaulle by closely looking at his rhetoric.

To define nationalism I will present a few points in the current debate on what nationalism is, the morality of nationalism, definitions of nation and nationalism and their respective problems, and point to some patterns present in most scholarly works regarding nation and nationalism. I will then use the process of elimination in trying to describe nationalism, juxtaposing nationalism, populism and patriotism. This whole process will give me a more accurate idea of things to look for and things to discard when defining nationalism and looking for nationalist speeches to create a descriptive rubric, helpful to analyze nationalism in any political speech, and most particularly here to analyze Charles de Gaulle's speeches.

B. The problem with definitions of nationalism

Since nationalism is such an abstract term, it has proven difficult for scholars to define it, agree on its definitions, and consequently, the implications carried by this term. Nationalism is a complex concept that comprehends several characteristics, even perhaps several facets. The different definitions of nationalism come from the different characteristics, facets or outcomes scholars chose to focus on—whether it is the territory of a group of people, their race, religion, language, economy, or something else.

Aside from debating what nationalism constitutes, there is also debate on the moral quality of nationalism. For instance, some scholars, including Gellner (1983), Aron (1962) and Yuval-Davies (1997) label nationalism as evil, blaming it as a cause for much violence in different parts of the world (Gellner and Aron), or as an ideology that imposes many demands on the people within the nation (Yuval-Davies). Others scholars, such as Miller, speak in favor of nationalism stating that there exists “various accretions that have given nationalism a bad name” and that it is necessary to separate these latter from nationalism itself ([Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: 3.1 The Moral Debate](#)). This is but a tiny glimpse of the current and perpetuating debate of whether nationalism is good or positive, evil or negative, or even neutral.

At this point it would be premature to take a stand in the moral question of nationalism. However it is an interesting concept to think about, one which this work will consider when looking for and analyzing nationalism, and one to which I will return to after the analysis of de Gaulle’s speeches is performed. At this point I consider it premature to choose and stand by a definition of nationalism without having considering and presenting some of the definitions in scholarly works.

Since it would be premature to choose only one definition of nationalism and discard all others at this point, I will present several definitions of nationalism, addressing first a few definitions of nation and a few problematic reasons of these definitions. Since there much misconception exists on what nationalism is I consider it important to look first at the core of the word nation. Once the term “nation” is presented and defined, I will proceed to note some of the definitions of nationalism and their respective problems.

C. Defining “nation”

As previously stated, even though there is much literature on nationalism there is still much confusion and misconception on what nationalism is. Much of the confusion and misconception comes from the way in which people define nation. While there is less debate about the definition of nation in comparison to that of nationalism, significant differences of opinions remain about the meaning of nation. The disagreements come in the definition of what constitutes a nation and when a nation is born. I present here a summary of a few points of view concerning the definitions and origins of a nation.

In his book *Imagined communities*, Benedict Anderson argues that a nation is an imagined community (37). Renan is even broader. In his address to the Sorbonne entitled What is a nation? Renan defines nation as a “soul, a spiritual principle”. Joseph Stalin defined a nation as a “historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture” (Hutchinson and Smith 20). Max Weber states: “a nation is a community of sentiment which would adequately manifest itself in a state of its own; hence, a nation is a community which normally tends to produce a state of its own” (Hutchinson and Smith 25). In Imagined Communities, Anderson also defines a nation as a community that shares a language, a race or an ethnic group, a culture, or a religion.

The scope of the definitions of nation presents a problem to our understanding of it. Some definitions are too narrow, others too simple; other definitions are too complex and others too vague. Further, some definitions equate state and nation, yet, there have been (and still are) nations without a state—such as the Jews before the creation of the state of Israel in 1948—, and there are states that include more than one nation.

1. The problem of defining “nation” in terms of religion language and ethnicity or race

A nation cannot be reduced to one or two factors, certainly not to religion or language. Going back in history, at the time of the Roman Empire, the Romans had succeeded in spreading their religion: Catholicism. Yet, even though religion was something most of the inhabitants in Western Europe shared, this element alone did not make all Western Europeans one nation. Even though most Europeans at that time were catholicized, significant differences among the peoples under the Roman Empire remained, enough as to separate them into different nations. Likewise, in modern days Catholicism is dominant in Western Europe and Latin America hardly any scholar would refer to these groups of countries as being one nation. Conversely, in the 18th century, England incorporated several religions, but the English were still a nation. Likewise we find several religions coexisting in different states, countries or “nations” today. These examples further the argument that a common religion cannot be the sole cause in defining a nation.

A common language has been listed as a cause and essential part of nationalism. Even though language is important in a nation this argument is highly debatable. To counter this argument I will take here the example of France. Continuing with our historical view of nationalism, a sense of the people belonging to or being part of a “nation” can already be detected in France at the beginning of the French Renaissance. Due to the wars against Italy, the French already wanted to make a distinction between the “Italians” and themselves—the French. One of the ways in which they approached this distinction was through language.

In 1539 François I made an edict in which he declared that all official documents, such as baptismal and burial records, were to be written in French (de Bertier de Sauvigny 147, Labourne and Toutain 48). Thus François I insisted on the languages as a way to separate the

French from other peoples. However the separation already existed between the French and other people, particularly between the French and the Italian.

In 1549, a group of poets called La Pléiade wrote a manifesto to defend the greatness of the French language and to fulfill a need they felt, to enrich the French language and make it distinct, especially from Latin and Italian. The French thus wanted to create a distinction from the Romans of old and the contemporary Italians based on language. Two points should be highlighted from this event, in particular focusing on the distinction between French and languages spoken in Italy. First, that the French already disliked the Italians. Thus, there is already a distinction between those inhabiting France and other lands. The second, learned men chose language to create a distinction between their people and other peoples. While language is an important factor in what constitutes a nation, notice that the Pléiade's manifesto came as an urge to make clearer the distinction many of the French already felt towards other peoples in Europe. Still, the people of France already spoke differently than the Italians, and they wanted to stress the differences by further separating the languages of the peoples in France and in Italy.

Another interesting point to make on the subject of language in France at this time is that at this time several languages were still spoken in France (such as Picard and the languages of Oïl and Franco-Provençal) and yet note that the people in France already felt part of a community, distinct from others around. While it is noteworthy that the French, pushed mainly by the French leadership, sought to distinguish themselves and their grandeur (as a nation) both from the Romans and the Italians through language, language was a tool not the motive of that distinction. In other words, the French (including those who spoke Piccard and Franco-Provençal) already felt as part of a community, distinct from other peoples living around them. They did not feel Italian or without identity. The language was a result of this feeling, to draw a clearer line

between French and peoples from other nations, people outside of the French community. Therefore, while language can be a factor to consider what constitutes a nation, the claim that a nation is dependent upon a common language results invalid. Even reaching back further in time, *La Chanson de Roland* (Roland's Song) lets its reader know that there existed already among the people of France a feeling of belonging, of being a community, of being "French" since at least the eleventh century, even though the inhabitants of France at the time spoke different languages according to the regions they belonged to.

Taking the examples of France and England it becomes clear that a nation cannot be only limited to having one common religion, language, or both combined. A quick historical overview also shows that a nation can neither be defined as a group of people of same race or ethnicity, for many lands, nations, and states are constituted by several races and ethnics groups. These groups are not only mixed today, but have been since medieval times. France for instance has been inhabited by Celts, Romans, Gipsies, Germans, Arabs, Jews, and Arians, among others. Consequently we see that race or an ethnic group, language or religion cannot be the sole factors for a nation to exist.

2. The problem of defining "nation" in a material manner

Stalin defines a nation as a "historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture" (Hutchinson and Smith 20). This definition is problematic because it is too precise and too materialistic. Nationalism is somewhat of an abstract concept that cannot be completely tied to material things. In other words, Stalin's definition is too precise and also problematic as to its implications to the groups of people he includes and excludes.

Again, the element of a language is problematic. The element of a shared economic life is also problematic and leads to another type of debate, particularly in our days where many states are economically interdependent. The territorial element is also problematic because it is too precise and material, drawing the lines nearer to what a state or a country is. The psychological make-up is also problematic in the sense that due to the different wars they have endured in their own soil Western Europeans tend to think differently than people from the United States of America or even other countries in regards to wars. However, this does not indicate that all Western Europeans belong to the 'nation' of Europe. Stalin's definition is then perhaps too specific and materialist, as opposed to Anderson's, which presents too many questions to be considered a good definition of nationalism. There is a certain element of nationalism that cannot be materialized, and which lacks in Stalin's definition of a nation, an element so open as abstract as an 'imagined community'.

3. Weber's definition of "nation"

In order to simplify things, without falling into oversimplification, we shall apply and slightly modify Weber's definition of a nation. A nation then is "a community of sentiment which would adequately manifest itself in a state of its own; hence, a nation is a community which normally tends to produce a state of its own" (Hutchinson and Smith 25). A nation is a group of people with a communal sense, who believe to have the right to be sovereign. This to me seems the more accurate definition of a nation. It includes no material or quantifiable concepts, but does include the desire for becoming sovereign, independent from foreign rule. This definition also allows for some groups of people such as Americans, French, British, Russians, Japanese, but also people like the Basques, Jews (before and after the creation of Israel), Palestinians, and Irish among others.

D. Needed characteristics in a nation

Even though the purpose of this chapter is not to deeply burrow and dwell on the theme on the origins of nations (not even that of the French nation) it is important to note that a nation needs two things in order to become a nation.

First, the people forming a nation need to have commonalities. By commonalities I do not merely refer to things that people share as humans. Rather commonalities refer to sets of values, beliefs, shared experiences, and other elements that bind a community, making the people in that community feel distinct and unique from other communities. Language, ethnicity, religion could be examples of commonalities, but, as previously discussed, cannot be the only factor in defining a nation. More will be discussed on this issue as elements of nationalism are examined later in this thesis. However it is important to emphasize that the ties of commonalities are so strong that a community feels that they have or should have the right to be self-governed and that they are different than other peoples.

The second existing condition for a nation to exist is the idea of an evolutionary process through time. There has been and there still is much debate among scholars concerning the origins and rise of nations. In his book Imagined Communities, Benedict Anderson points out that capitalism was the main trigger for nations to arise. He argues that the concept of a nation is recent; it is tied to the late 18th century. In his book, Anderson states: “the convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language created the possibility of a new form of imaged community, which in its basic morphology set the stage for the modern nation” (Hutchinson and Smith 46).

Like Anderson, Gellner argues that nations are a modern invention. According to Gellner, nations are also a product of capitalism; however he takes a Marxist view on it. Gellner claims that the concept of nation came out of the opposition between groups of people of different socio-economic status. His argument is that the concept of a nation came as a result of the many pressures the industrial revolution created. The need of a common language, ideas, and other elements to create a common identity arose from the industrial revolution (For more on this refer to [The nationalism project: Quotes](#) by Eric Zuelow). Even though this description of how a nation came to be seems to cover a shorter period of time than Anderson's, the concept still includes an evolutionary process.

Renan does not directly address the formation of a nation; however, he implies that the idea that a nation is a process. He claims that history is an important factor in the soul of the nation. In other words, he states that events through time have contributed to forming nations. Scholars like Schleiermacher claim that nations have always existed, that it is "a natural division of the human race, endowed by God with its own character" (Guibernau 49). Scholars of this school of thought believe then that nations are as natural as life. Furthermore, Herder compares the nation with a tree, claiming that it is something that needs care and time (Guibernau 49).

Opinions and definitions of many other scholars can be presented in this section. Nevertheless the references made so far are a sufficient glimpse at the differences of opinions in scholarly literature concerning the time and manner in which nations emerge. Regardless of their differences, all of the opinions stated indicate that the formation of a nation is a process, and not an overnight event. This key concept plays significant part in nationalism. In addition, this is essential when looking and seeking to understand nation and nationalism, for a nation today might be different from what a nation was in different centuries (in terms of the inclusion of race,

ethnic groups, and language). More on the importance of the process to form a nation will be discussed later in the paper. Yet, for now, this concept—often neglected—helps explain the misconceptions of what constitutes a nation today and a nation in past days.

From the arguments presented above both from scholars and myself, it is clear that the origin of a nation is a highly debated topic and which deserves the attention of another work. For now we shall settle with the idea that the forming of a nation is a process that takes time.

A nation then consists of a group of people who share a communal sense—which communal sense is formed throughout time—and who believe in the right of being sovereign, meaning free from foreign rule.

E. Differentiating nationalism, patriotism, and populism

While searching to define nationalism, I have encountered much literature that confuses nationalism with patriotism and with populism. To clarify and later on define what nationalism is, it is important to contrast nationalism with populism and patriotism. Again much of the confusion of these terms arises from the definition of the term nation and establishing its origins.

Much of popular and scholarly literature refers to the American and French Revolutions as the starting points of nationalism (Smith and Hutchings 5, 7). This literature tends to equate the popular or mass movement with the sentiment that leads into the creation of a nation, a country or a state. Equating nationalism to this mass movement is wrong because of its misleading significances. For instance, many scholars emphasize equality and the sovereignty of the people as the dominant characteristic of nationalism (Hutchinson and Smith 4). While to

some extent sovereignty applies to nationalism and nationalist movements, it is important to note the difference between the sovereignty of the masses with the sovereignty of a nation.

In the definition provided of a nation we see that the sovereignty in a nation consists of opposing being ruled by what is considered a foreigner—an outsider of the community. The key is to emphasize that the sovereignty of a nation is in regards to an outside identity or force. As Smith states: “The people must be liberated—that is, free from any external constraint; they must determine their own destiny and be masters in their own house” (Hutchinson and Smith 4). If the popular freedom and sovereignty prevail in the ideology of a definition, we should then turn to the term populism. In populism the people, including the masses, are endowed with a collective will to rule over their community.

The French Revolution was not a nationalist movement, referred by scholars and non-scholars as a nationalist revolution is actually not a nationalist revolution for different reasons. The first one being that, as noted earlier in this chapter, the sense of belonging to a community and of sharing a common identity was long-time present in the French. The second reason why this revolution cannot be categorized as nationalist is because the ideas of the revolution emphasize the freedom from the rules of kings—who happened to be French—and not from foreigners. The Revolution changed the French regime, but did not change the French sense of belonging to a community; nor did it change the sense of the French sharing a communal identity. To reiterate, the French Revolution may have changed some of the French people’s values (valuing freedom to choose rulers and opposed to having monarchs) but did not change their sense of being part of a community. Since the French nation did not belong with the French Revolution and the revolution was not against foreigners, the French Revolution cannot be categorized as a nationalist movement.

However, when considering that the French Revolution is thought of as a mass or popular movement, and a movement that contained much aggression, promoting hostility against co-nationals, a more proper term to consider for this is populism—as opposed to nationalism. Discourse analysis further supports the idea that categorization for the French Revolution as a populist movement might be more accurate—as opposed to categorize it as a nationalist movement. Thus the value of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis serves to supports and more clearly make the distinction between populism and other movements, including nationalism. It clarifies what populist movements consist of.

According to Hawkin’s observations, in populist speeches the dominant themes are the sovereignty or rule of the people represented as a unifying and collective will, and a bellicosity towards opposing parties within the country. An example of this is found in one of Robespierre’s speeches,

We must crush both the interior and exterior enemies of the Republic, or perish with her. And in this situation, the first maxim of your policy should be to conduct the people by reason and the enemies of the people by terror. If the spring of popular government during peace is virtue, the spring of popular government in rebellion is at once both virtue and terror; virtue, without which terror is fatal! Terror, without which virtues is powerless! Terror is nothing else than justice, prompt, secure, and inflexible! It is, therefore, an emanation of virtue; it is less a particular principle than a consequence of the general principles of democracy, applied to the most urgent wants of the country [...]. Until when will the fury of tyranny continue to be called justice, and the justice of the people barbarity and rebellion? (Peterson 274-5).

Notice the hostility present in Robespierre's speech, even against French people. Robespierre is highly bellicose against those who do not support the revolution, those who support the monarchy, in other words, those of the opposition. Note also the emphasis Robespierre puts into the rule of the people or as he calls it, "the popular government". The bellicose tone and the emphasis on the people's government are typical characteristics of a populist speech.

The previous comments obviously correspond to a preliminary assessment of the French Revolution. Also, even though the quote from Robespierre is very bold and strong, and reveals populist trends. However, this is not meant to claim that Robespierre was a populist. More research needs to be done in order to label this revolution as a populist one. However, this explanation and example show the differences between nationalism and other types of movements. Furthermore these examples demonstrate the value of speech analysis when clarifying terms such as populism and nationalism.

Nationalism is not only confused with populism but also with patriotism. Much of the literature of nationalism highlights the usage of symbols such as flags, national anthems, and the mentioning of borders and words equivalent to father/motherland as illustrated by the following quotes: "Pido al Altísimo que nos ilumine y nos dé fuerzas para afrontar la difíciles tareas de Gobierno, y a mis compatriotas, la fe y el sacrificio para salvar a la Patria, dolida y enferma [...]", "Conciudadanos, Juro ante la bandera de los Padres de la Patria, que a los que hoy la responsabilidad del Gobierno no nos lleva otro norte sino el servir a Chile con toda fe y patriotismo [...]" ("I ask the Almighty to enlighten us and to give us strength to confront the difficult tasks of Government, and to my fellow compatriots, the faith and sacrifice to save the Motherland, hurt and sicken [...]", "Fellow citizens, I Swear before the flag of the Founding Fathers of the Motherland, that to those whose responsibility of Government takes us to no other

place than serving Chile with all faith and patriotism [...]” (Pinochet, Discurso pronunciado por la junta de gobierno al cumplirse un mes desde la fecha de constitución de la junta del gobierno); “Pactos electorales, hecho a costa de la integridad de la propia Patria, unidos a los asaltos a Gobiernos Civiles y cajas fuertes, para falsear las actas, formaron la máscara de la legalidad que nos preside [...] una y otra quebrantadoras de la Constitución que, en nombre del pueblo, era el Código fundamental de nuestras Instituciones” (“Electoral pacts, made at the expense of the Motherland, united to assaults to Civil Governments and safe boxes to falsify acts, made up the legality mask that presides over us”) (El Manifiesto de Franco en Las Palmas, 18 de julio de 1936).

As a matter of fact this element also appears in the preceding quote from Robespierre when he refers to the Republic and the government. While these symbols might have some basis on nationalism, to emphasize values, characteristics or an identity, these symbols tend to represent patriotism rather than nationalism. Nationalism, does not contain many of these symbols, but rather contains or celebrates symbols, people or events, pertaining to the nation, which is a collective identity that is (or seeks to be) autonomous.

Taking France as an example, a nationalist leader would tend to refer more to figures such as Joan of Arc, or even the values of the French Revolution, but would always come back to the identity of the nation as the core of his speech. A patriot will address the laws, the constitution, the French flag, and similar terms much more than Joan of Arc or the identity of a nation. Even though both might refer to the French Revolution, a nationalist would address more the values of the Revolution and come back to the values of the French and nationalist terms, such as France, French, etc., whereas a patriot leader would emphasize the change of regime, of laws, the constitution, and would more likely be prone to use terms referring to ‘la patrie’

(father/motherland) or country. Thus even though there might be overlapping in the symbols used in nationalism and patriotism, particularly in a nation-state, the usage and references to those symbols differ in both types of speeches: in a patriotic speech, references to the flag and constitution will be more frequent and emphasized much more than in a nationalist speech.

Theory confirms my observations in regards to what constitutes patriotism. According to the compilation by Hutchinson and Smith, patriotism makes reference to an identification with laws, a ruler, a type of rule, the state (with its geographical limitations) and its people (7). In many cases the people's identification with others within the state comes as a byproduct of the laws and the geographic boundaries of the state—as scholars arguing for involuntary nationalism and patriotism would point out. In addressing patriotism, Taylor admits that there are some common elements between nationalism and patriotism. Nonetheless Taylor clearly makes the distinction between these terms. He states: “patriotism can also have the meaning it had for the ancients. I love my fatherland, and what makes it essentially mine is its laws. Outside of these, it is denatured and no longer relay mine” (Beiner 229). In patriotism “there is no reference to a prepolitical identity [...] on the contrary, the *patria* is politically defined” (Beiner 229). A nation then does not need to have its, borrowing words from Céline, “religion drapeautique”—a cult for the flag, the law or even to the anthem—however this would be practiced by a patriot.

In the notion of patriotism the citizen is willing to die for his or her polity but not necessarily for the people or the community. Again, some elements of nationalism are found in patriotism, but the key difference is that patriotism highlights the loyalty to the law, the polity, and began with the formation of a country, whereas the feeling of commonality in nationalism existed independent from the formation of the country, or the polity. This also supports the claim that the origin of the French nation is not found in the French Revolution. By then the French

already had strong commonalities. The French already identified themselves as French before the Revolution. According to the distinction made by Taylor we could affirm that nationalism emphasizes the common values a certain group of people share (which will be addressed later in this chapter) while patriotism emphasizes the loyalty to the polity people live in.

Hopefully the differences between nationalism and patriotism are clear by now. However, as this thesis develops, I am confident that I will be able to show their differences when applied to de Gaulle's speeches.

So far then in attempting to understand nationalism, I have defined nation. In addition I have presented a few clarifications on the terms patriotism and populism, with the purpose of distinguishing them from nationalism. Thus I have argued that nationalism is not to be confused with populism or patriotism and have supported these arguments by citing scholars and illustrate them with a quote by Robespierre. This exercise is important because it helps identify the three movements as three different movements, distinct and separate from each other. Consequently, it helps me to know what to look for and what to discard when describing nationalism.

F. A few elements of nationalism

Knowing and sensing differences between nationalism, populism, and patriotism, I shall include a brief description of elements that, for now, seem key to nationalism.

I mentioned at the beginning of the chapter the importance of the idea of process in forming a nation. This is a key concept in nationalism. Nationalists are proud of their nation's history and feel the need to tie it to a victorious or successful past. Some of Renan's descriptions of nationalism fit into the importance of history. Renan states that a nation includes history, the past and the present. "One is the possession in common of a rich legacy of remembrances; the other is the actual consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of the

heritage which all hold in common” (Hutchinson and Smith 17). Further he states “The worship of ancestors is understandably justifiable, since our ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, of great men, of glory (I mean the genuine kind), that is the social principle on which the national idea rests. To have common glories in the past, a common will in the present; to have accomplished great things together, to wish to do so again, that is the essential condition for being a nation” (17). Certainly this applies to nationalism. Great victories, great heroes, great battles, are the things that unite and divide peoples. As a community identifies with a side of the battlefield, with martyrs or heroes, their identity as a community strengthens. While this is not the only element of nationalism, it is important to recognize that without a successful past, people would not unite in a feeling of belonging, and would not strive to become or continue being self-governed, meaning not governed by a foreigner.

Nationalists tend to often bring heroes or heroic deeds of the nation, which are by themselves, symbols of the greatness and ideals of the nation. Looking at de Gaulle’s speech delivered at Bayeux on June 16, 1946, we see the mentioning of a nationalist symbol: La Croix de Lorraine (the Lorraine Cross). De Gaulle made this particular cross a symbol of France’s liberation (see [Discours de Bayeux, 16 juin 1946](#), and the [Discours du 18 juin 1971](#)—given by Mr. Pompidou in de Gaulle’s honor), which symbol not only appears on his rhetoric but also one later used as a symbol in his political party—*Rassemblement du peuple français* (Rally of the French People).

The Lorraine Cross is a nationalist symbol not only because of its use in the medieval times but also because of its reference to Joan of Arc, a historic symbol herself of the divine commission to set the French nation free. The calling of heroes and heroic times in the past, in this case performed by making a reference to the Lorrain Cross and later using as the party’s

symbol, is a powerful tool for nationalism. This is then one of the characteristics to be looking for in a nationalist speech.

Even though past victories are important, they would be undermined if there were no future to which aspire to and work for. As Paul Gilbert states: “To look to tradition is to look backward. To look to a mission is to look forward. But for all that, tradition and mission cannot be *contrasted* as grounds of nationhood, for it can be argued that a nation’s mission is precisely to carry forward its traditions” (Gilbert 167). Nationalist leaders then use a heroic past to excite people to a glorious future. The national past gives the nation a sense of belonging, and a sense of purpose, which in turn gives them a mission to accomplish.

The mission to be carried out, or the destiny to be achieved can vary according to the nations’ past, or the speaker. For example, the Communist Revolution that took place in Russia gave a mission to accomplish to its people: live differently, and later, spread the communist ideology, even over the capitalist ideology. Later, during WWII, Stalin evoked national heroes to motivate Russians to win the war against Germany. In a way Kedourie’s assertion seems accurate: “Nationalists make use of the past in order to subvert the present” (Hutchinson and Smith 51). Even though I do not completely agree in the choice of “subvert” I think that Kedourie’s point is valid in the sense that nationalists use the past to strongly change or preserve the present they have, which in deed will affect the nation’s ability to carry on and reach its mission in a future. Adding to this, we can assume that the nation’s mission and destiny will be always portrayed in a favorable and even a glorious light. The bringing up of a bright future, mission or destiny for the nation then constitutes another present element of nationalism.

G. Summary and conclusion

Nationalism is not a populist movement and it is not necessarily formed after a state has been created. It does not necessarily addresses flags or a national anthem nor does it emphasize the law, constitution or even the ruler or type of rule the nation is under.

Through this chapter we have furthered our understanding of nationalism by looking into the definition of what a nation is and discarding elements of populism and patriotism from nationalism. To recall, a nation consists of a group of people who share a communal sense, formed throughout time, and who believe in the right of being sovereign. We have also seen that nationalists are proud of their past, a past full of heroic characters and moments, which has given the people of the nation a rich legacy sought to be perpetuated by nationalists leaders. Thus we can expect the references to values or virtues heroes of the nation have, and the recalling of the nation's victories in nationalist speeches. Furthermore, as described by Gilbert, a rich past provides a sense of duty to continue this tradition, thus providing the nation with a sense of a grandiose future, a mission or even, a destiny. This should also then show in a nationalist speech.

Since there is much confusion with the term nationalism among scholars, making it hard to take a position on what this term means, I will proceed to look at what nationalist say, in other words, I will turn to analyze their speeches. My aim is to find patterns in their speeches, and create a descriptive rubric, which will be my basis to analyze de Gaulle's speeches.

As a way to clarify what nationalism is, I will select speeches from leaders who are generally considered nationalist. I will purposefully select leaders from different parts of the world, which will help to more clearly see elements of nationalism present in their respective rhetoric. For this purpose, I thought of several leaders considered nationalists and looked into several internet sites and books and containing a collection of speeches. Taking into account the

elements of populism and pluralism described in Dr. Hawkins' rubric, the differences mentioned in the previous chapters between nationalism and patriotism, theory, and my observations of what is needed in nationalism, I selected speeches from four nationalist leaders. These leaders ended up being "modern" nationalists, meaning that they belong to the XX century. These four leaders also ended up getting formal education in the Western Hemisphere. This being said, they are from very different parts of the world, and their rhetorical styles vary, according to their personalities and culture.

The speeches I selected are the following: "First Inaugural Address" by former President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; "Ireland Among the Nations" by former Prime Minister of Ireland, Eamon de Valera; "Nation and Morality" by Sun Yat-Sen, the first President of the Chinese Republic and often referred to as the Father of Modern China; and "Road of Valor" by David Ben Gurion, leader of the Zionist movement and former Prime Minister of Israel.

My purpose is to take common characteristics from each of the aforementioned speeches and use some theory to support my observations, after which I will proceed to analyze nationalism in de Gaulle's speeches according to the elements found in the sample speeches. I will address my results in the coming chapter.

III. On elements of nationalism

This chapter is a description of elements found in the speeches of David Ben Gurion, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Sun Yat-Sen, and Eamon de Valera, four figures regarded as nationalist leaders. The elements addressed in this chapter are patterns observed in each of the speeches analyzed. As a disclaimer, these elements were not equally found in the four speeches, but they were still present. But, also note that while all of the speeches contain the elements described below, I will not quote each speech for each element, in order to save time and space in this chapter. The examples gathered from the different speeches will make clear the element of nationalism I intend to describe, which elements will be comprised into a rubric at the end of this chapter.

A. Morals and values

One of the most outstanding elements nationalist speeches share is a call for moral values. Nationalists care about the unity of their people, their community, or, as Jonathan Glover describes, their “tribe” (McKim and McMahan 13). According to Herder, nationalism “fulfills a deep need in human beings—the need to belong to a society that provides them with a complete form of life” (83). A complete form of life includes a moral code and a set of values. Thus it follows that in order to increase unity or cohesion in the community, nationalists appeal to increase or emphasize these morals and values.

Morals and values are positive and inspiring. They motivate people within the nation to become better individuals and, as they share the same good values and morals, they will become more united towards their fellow nationals. It is worth mentioning that it does not matter whether or not these values may be perceived by foreigners and even by scholars as

universal or, that they are found in or among other nations; nationalists will claim these values as theirs, as their nation's legacy and identity.

Note the following nationalist claim by a Dane who helped Jews during World War II. Answering the question as to why the Danish people helped the Jews in WWII, one Dane replied that the persecution of Jews was “in conflict with the sense of justice inherent in the Danish people and inseparable from our Danish Christian culture through centuries” (McKim and McMahan 20). Eamon Valera put it to the Irish in this manner: “The Irish genius has always stressed spiritual and intellectual rather than material values. That is the characteristic that fits the Irish people in a special manner for the task, now a vital one, of helping to save the Western civilization” (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 467).

Speaking to his fellow nationals, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, “Small wonder that confidence languishes, for it thrives only on honesty, on honor, on the sacredness of obligations, on faithful protection, on unselfish performance. Without them we cannot live” (510). Sun Yat-Sen declared, “[Coming] to the root of the matter, if we want to restore our race's standing, besides uniting all into a great national body, we must first recover our ancient morality—then, and only then, can we plan how to attain again to the national position we once held” (Crosscup 438-9). In all of these quotes, the leaders claim morals and values as part of their identity: de Valera claims the Irish preference of spiritual over material values, FDR claims honesty, honor and unselfishness as an American trait, and Sun brings about the return to old morals and values to make out of China a great and powerful nation again. Thus both theory and the quotes from our four nationalist leaders evidence that without moral values, a nation cannot exist for morals and values are an inherit part of the nation's identity.

As illustrated in the previous examples, the values nationalist choose to address may vary according to historical events, culture, or even to the speaker. However, two values are consistently emphasized in nationalist rhetoric: the values of duty and loyalty. While duty and loyalty are values mentioned in several scholarly works on nationalism, including those of Beiner (1998), Hutchinson and Smith (1994), and McKim and McMahan (1997), the weight of these terms are underestimated. These values are essential elements of nationalism, for without them, the sense of sharing and belonging to a community, the celebration of the nation and its people, would be meaningless. With goodness and sorrow (which will be discussed later in this chapter) come a sense of duty and a sense of loyalty: duty to act in behalf or for someone or something and loyalty to those who share similar values and experiences.

Paul Gilbert addressed the concepts of duty and loyalty by quoting parts of the proclamation of the Irish Republic, which states, “The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman” (Gilbert 20). As shown by this example, the Irish ought to give allegiance to the Irish Republic, or in other words, be loyal to their nation. With the Irish identity comes a sense of responsibility and loyalty to the Irish nation, which, in this case, has been transformed into a Republic.

In his “First Inaugural Address,” President Roosevelt stated, “We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values; with the clean satisfaction that comes from the stern performance of duty by old and young alike” (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 512). Again, FDR calls for values such as courage and national unity to overcome the challenges the United States of America was facing at the time: the Great Depression. Interestingly, FDR

calls all the people of the US to get and maintain these values, for these values seem to be the solution for the US' economic crisis. Like de Valera, FDR here seems to hold morals and values in higher esteem than material values.

Sun Yat-Sen, considered one of China's major nationalist leaders, declared, "If we say that loyalty is outworn today, what about the nation?" (Crosscup 438-9). This short sentence perfectly illustrates the call for loyalty and, further, the need of loyalty towards a nation. This quote also implies that without loyalty, a nation cannot exist.

Although the purpose of this thesis is not to compare nationalism with populism and pluralism, putting nationalism into a greater perspective in comparison to what a pluralist and populist speech sound like will give more insights and a better understanding of what nationalism is.

It is important to notice that in a pluralist speech, the speaker would not usually allude to morals and values. Instead, the speaker would focus on specific issues, issues that are less idealistic, less inspiring and more concrete, such as the economy, plans for improvement in laws or infrastructure. The following quote from Alvaro Uribe, current president of Colombia is a good example of pluralism. In speaking about universities he said:

Con un crédito de largo plazo y baja tasa de interés aumentaremos los préstamos del ICETEX de \$91.000 millones a 500.000 millones. La universidad a distancia a través del internet es una gran posibilidad. En Antioquia dejamos conectados 100 municipios y la Diócesis de Santa Rosa empezó una universidad a distancia para campesinos (With a long term credit and low interest rates, we will increase ICETEX loans from \$91,000 to \$ 500,000 million. Long distance university through the internet is a great possibility. In Antioquia we left 100 towns connected and the Diócesis of Santa Rosa began a long

distance university for farmers), after which, Uribe spoke for several more lines about education and employment. (Álvaro Uribe Vélez, Discurso de Lanzamiento de Candidatura, Bogotá, 21 de marzo de 2002).

In contrast a populist speaker would mention morals or values but, rather than alluding to them and asking the people to attain, develop and maintain those values the populist leader would frame issues as part of a larger struggle between good and evil, right and wrong or even between rich and poor. The populist leader would thus present issues in an antagonistic way, a struggle between good and evil in which no gray area is possible.

The differences between a pluralist, populist and nationalist speech are easily seen: the first almost listing or being elaborated and providing reason when addressing specific issues, the second being vague and framing morals and values in an antagonistic manner. The nationalist leader seeks to unite his people by inspiring them to do good and to seek and maintain moral values, without necessarily framing them into a larger struggle between good and evil. Focusing on the tone of the speech in these regards, the tone of the pluralist speech will tend to be neutral, with no passion; the tone of the populist highly passionate and antagonistic; the tone of a nationalist might be passionate, but for sure will be positive and inspiring, and will convey an idealistic view of the world.

B. The celebration of victorious moments and people as a source of identity

In the previous chapter, I mentioned the importance of the notion of process in forming a nation. History is a key concept in nationalism. Nationalists are proud of their nation's history and feel the need to tie it to a victorious or successful past. Some of Renan's descriptions of nationalism fit into the importance of history. Renan states that a nation includes history, the past and the present: "One is the possession in common of a rich legacy of remembrances; the other is

the actual consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of the heritage which all hold in common” (Hutchinson and Smith 17). Renan also points out, “The worship of ancestors is understandably justifiable, since our ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, of great men, of glory (I mean the genuine kind), that is the social principle on which the national idea rests” (17). Having common glories in the past, a common will in the present, and having accomplished great things together and wishing to do so again, form an essential condition of being a nation.

The following quotes bring forth the idea of a common past, even common glories or victories in the past. Franklin Delano Roosevelt talked about “[A] recognition of the old and permanently important manifestation of the American spirit of the pioneer [...]” (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 511). When talking about Ireland, de Valera stated,

Her gifts are the fruit of special qualities of mind and heart, developed by centuries of eventful history. Alone among the countries of Western Europe, she never came under the sway of Imperial Rome. When all of her neighbors were in tutelage, she was independent, building upon her own civilization undisturbed.

Further, to celebrate the strength and determination of the Irish people, de Valera added,

The invaders who came to Ireland in the twelfth century belonged to a race that had already subjugated England and a great part of Western Europe. Like the Norsemen before them, it was in Ireland that they met the most serious resistance—a resistance which was continued generation after generation against the successors of the first invaders until our own time, a resistance which will inevitably continue until the last sod of Irish soil is finally free. (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 466)

The purpose in these quotations is to bring forth the glories or heroism of the nation's past into the minds of the people in the present. In this case, to the Irish, it is a cause of pride to give fight to invaders, to resist foreign rule, and to not have been conquered by the Roman Empire; to the Americans, the spirit of pioneering is cause of pride. Thus we see the importance of history, the celebration of a common and redemptive past as a source of identity, which includes values and tradition.

As previously discussed, heroes and historical moments of the nation are often brought up in nationalist speeches. Yet the reference to a nation's heroes or events by itself is not a completely nationalist trait. To a nationalist, the evocation of the past often becomes romanticized. This romanticism, which contributes to a redemptive tone in a speech, is one of the key elements that distinguishes a nationalist from a pluralist speech.

Compare and contrast the following examples. Alvaro Uribe, President of Colombia, gave a speech to Congress on July 20, 2008, an important day in Colombia, marking the decisive battles for independence from Spain. In this speech, Uribe addresses current and specific issues, such as the economy, fuel, food, natural disasters and even a Constitutional reform. He supports these topics with facts, does not reify history and very briefly mentions Colombia's independence (in one paragraph of the speech) when stating that there have been celebrations in preparation for a bigger celebration in 2010 when Colombia celebrates its bicentennial anniversary. Note that Uribe does not mention any of the national heroes or any historical moment in the nation's past, but that instead he focuses on today,

Esta mañana conmemoramos el 20 de Julio en Leticia, como lo propusimos hace un año en San Andrés. Nos honró la compañía de los Presidentes Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva de Brasil y Alan García de Perú. El Himno Nacional entonado por Shakira y el concierto de

Carlos Vives, en el corazón amazónico, rompieron las tonadas musicales de más de 120.000 artistas que a esta hora adelantan conciertos en 1.048 municipios de la Patria. Es un anticipo del Bicentenario de 2010 [...]. (This morning we commemorated July 20th in Leticia, as we proposed doing a year ago in San Andrés. We were honored by the presence of Presidents Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva from Brazil and Alan García from Perú. The National Anthem, sung by Shakira and Carlos Vive's concert, in the heart of the Amazons, broke all musical tones of over 120,000 artists who, at this time, launch concerts in 1,048 town councils of our country. This is a preview of the Bicentennial celebration of 2010 [...]. (Palabras de Presidente de la República, Álvaro Uribe Vélez, en la instalación del Congreso).

As previously stated, Uribe talks about the here and now, such as the people who are abducted, contemporary artists and presidents who accompanied the celebration, and on the issues previously mentioned. There is hardly any redemptive tone in this speech, no transcendence, and there is not even a reference to a victorious battle, moment or character of the nation's history, a typical trait of a pluralist discourse.

On the other hand, in his speech "The Road of Valor," Ben Gurion, a leader of the Zionist movement and Israel's first Prime Minister, states, "In our days the King of Babylon was joined by the King of the sons of Ammon, but the Army and champions of Israel [...] set the schemes of Babylon and Ammon at naught; they broke through to right and left, they thrust back the invaders and scattered them" (Crosscup 19). Babylon and the sons of Ammon were enemies to Israel in the days of the Old Testament. Yet the God of Israel helped Israel to be free from its enemies.

The connection Gurion makes between the enemies of the past and the modern battles he refers to from the Arab-Israeli War is strong and significant. Note the language used to talk about his enemies and about Israel. The terms “Babylon” and “sons of Ammon” stir strong negative feelings among the people of Israel, since Babylon, a foreign land with different cultures, standards and traditions which had ruled over Israel, historically represented impurity. In addition, by referring to those who fight for Israel as “champions”, Gurion strongly opposes and abases the enemies of Israel to the romanticized Israelite fighters. This example reinforces the moral values of Israelis in opposition to those of the “sons of Ammon” during the combat. In addition, Gurion is successful at tying past and current events, to the point of giving transcendence over time to the conflicts of the Arab-Israeli War.

Gurion’s quote also illustrates the type of expressions that allude to glory or grandeur attributed to national characters and events of the past in nationalist rhetoric. By comparing Israeli workers, engineers, warriors and workers to champions, the speaker romanticizes all of the people of Israel—as opposed to a populist who would only romanticize a group of people in his nation or country (usually the poor). Gurion even elevates his co-nationals and makes them transcend their duties, roles and actions. Later in the speech, Gurion states, “[The men who laid the pipe line, the men of Solel-Boneh] had a proud share in this feat of combat and development, one that will be immortalized in the ageless annals of Zion set free, that will be a monument to Jewish prowess in arms and in labor, the passport, now and always, to victory” (Crosscup 20).

Gurion’s romantization of the people of Israel is strong. Moreover, by using the words “champions,” “immortalized,” “ageless annals of Zion” and “monument,” Gurion immortalizes Israelis and even gives them, and their actions, transcendence over time and space. Yet, the past is seen as a source for tradition and values, a source of identity which must be remembered and

celebrated. To reiterate, two ideas are important in this concept of history: first, that people, moments or myths of the past stand as a source of traditions, values, and identity; and second, that the past conveys a notion of transcendence.

In a populist speech, history will be reified. This means that history pushes people to do things, to take action. Thus in populism, history is a motor, a driving force for people to do things.

As previously illustrated, in a nationalist speech history plays an important role, yet different than in populism, for a nationalist will see history as something of value, a reference point to unite people, a source for traditions, values, and identity.

History is thus key in helping the reader distinguish between nationalist and populist rhetoric. Unlike populist rhetoric, history or the past is not a reification that compels people to take radical actions. Rather, as illustrated in the quotes by Gurion and de Valera, the past in nationalist discourse helps the people transcend themselves, times and space, making people feel beyond and above other peoples and nations because of the richness of values, glories, victories and traditions of the past, remembered and carried on in the present.

C. A nation's destiny and missions as a reformation from a rich past leading to a glorious future

Since history has been recently addressed, I feel compelled to make a final point about the way nationalist use it, particularly in contrast to the way populists and pluralists use it, which will result in a third element of nationalism.

The evocation of renowned characters and key moments of the nation not only serves the purpose of uniting people by tying them emotionally to a glorious past, but also serves to give the nation a purpose, mission and future. Gilbert states, "To look to tradition is to look backward.

To look to a mission is to look forward. But for all that, tradition and mission cannot be contrasted as grounds of nationhood, for it can be argued that a nation's mission is precisely to carry forward its traditions" (Gilbert 167). The message conveyed here is that a great nation, with noble and glorious origins, which needs to live in order to preserve its traditions and enlighten others with them. This characteristic is definitely present in nationalist rhetoric.

De Valera's words nicely illustrates this point:

I have spoken at some length of Ireland's history and her contributions to European culture, because I wish to emphasize that what Ireland has done in the past she can do in the future ...

In this day, if Ireland is faithful to her mission, and please God she will be, if as of old she recalls men to forgotten truth [...] then indeed, she can do the world a service as great as that which she rendered in the time of Columcille and Colombanus because the need of our time is no wise less [...] but Ireland to-day has no dearer hope than this: that true to her own holiest traditions, she may humbly serve the truth and help by truth to save the world (Copeland, Lamm and McKenna 467, 468).

Ireland's mission and destiny are strongly present in these quotes. Interestingly, they seem linked to the return of old Irish values. Ireland's mission and destiny is not limited to the Irish themselves, but encompasses the world, for according to this speech, Ireland has been a long-time example of resistance to foreign rules, of high values, and has contributed in many ways in European cultures. Ireland's mission seems to be not only to contribute to but to enlighten the world, and through the practice of her "holiest traditions" save the world.

The mission of the nation may differ with the values that the nation holds—which might be very different than other nations' values, or even the values the speaker holds. However, the sense of a mission and a destiny remains important in nationalism.

History thus plays an important part in nationalist discourse, for the past, the present and the future are all connected. The past not only reminds people of their unity through their heritage, but also gives them unity of purpose, the sense of carrying on a tradition into the present and future and the sense of a mission to accomplish. Since history is seen as a source of identity, it is also used as a starting point of pride in values and traditions which need to be carried on to the next generation. Further, since the nation is unique due to its unique past, or source of identity, the past serves to establish goals and create a sense of destiny and mission for the nation. The present is then a product of the past, it means the inheritance and continuation of the rich legacy passed on to the current generation. The future is a continuation and improvement of national values and a rich legacy that has been preserved in the future and which is to pass on to future generations. The future represents a fulfillment of a source of identity and a cumulative richness and improvements made from the past and the presence.

Elie Kedourie states, “Nationalists make use of the past in order to subvert the present” (Hutchinson and Smith 51). Subvert is too strong a word for what nationalists claim to do. In fact, nationalists allude to the past in order to support their ideas about the present and future of the nation. However, nationalists present their ideas of the present and future as a reformation, rather than an aversion, a revolution or a rupture from the past.

As seen in the examples of Gurion and de Valera, nationalists see time as progressive, since they acknowledge positive changes in history—including their nations' history. Since nationalists acknowledge progress made in the present while holding their past as important, they

will abdicate for reforms—in the British sense of the word—taking elements of the past and adapting current ideas, trends, political, economic, or technological advances to conform to modernity and the progress it brings to the nation. Therefore, even though nationalists propose changes, in their eyes, these changes are reformations of the past and not a revolt or rupture from it.

Sun Yat-Sen’s speech “Nation and Morality” serves to illustrate the rhetoric of a nationalist. He stated,

So coming to the root of the matter, if we want to restore our race’s standing, besides uniting all into a great national body, we must first recover our ancient morality—then, and only then, can we plan how to attain again to the nation position we once held [...] To say that ancient loyalty was due to kings and, since now we have no kings, we do not need loyalty and can do as we please is absolutely wrong. Now everybody who talks about democracy breaks down all the old moral standards, and the fundamental reason is right here. In a democracy it stands to reason that we should still show loyalty, not to princes but to the nation and to the people. (Crosscup 438, 439)

Note the reference to the past, particularly to the grandeur due to the moral values of China in the past and the way they are connected to the present. Sun Yat-Sen is not advocating a return to dynasties; rather he is adapting old values to modern circumstances. Instead of being loyal to a king, the people of China should be loyal to each other and to their nation.

A similar concept is found in Roosevelt’s First Inaugural Address: “The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social

values more noble than mere monetary profit [...] Restoration calls, however not for changes in ethics alone. This nation asks for action and action now” (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 509, 510). While Roosevelt does not specify which foundation or values he is alluding to, he still calls for a restoration of the past with a specific modification needed for the present: action.

Unlike nationalists, populists seek to radically change the system and the people’s past to begin a new system, a new era. To clarify this point, I will contrast this nationalist reformation of the past with a populist revolt against the past or, in the words of Dr. Hawkins referring to populists, “a systemic change” from the past. After being elected president of Bolivia, Evo Morales affirmed Bolivia had experienced a revolt by those who had been oppressed and that the will of the people had begun to “overcome the empire’s cannons” (I Believe Only in the Power of the People). These statements refer to the democratic election of an indigenous person as Bolivia’s new president. Note the strong and bellicose language, talking about a revolution in the present. In these sentences Morales contrasts the past and the present, providing a sense of ‘subversion’ or ‘systemic change’ by expressions such as “overcome the empire’s cannons”. The imagery of cannons is obviously one of a struggle, a battle, one of violence, and for sure, one of a radical change. The contrast of the empire’s cannons and the triumphant will of “the people of Bolivia” powerfully suggest a marked contrast from the submissiveness of the “people of Bolivia” and them breaking free through a revolution against the previous system. Breaking free from the past is subverting from the past, or making “a systemic change” from the past, which clearly is not the same as making reforms from the past.

Hugo Chavez stands as another example of using the past to subvert the present. Chavez often refers to his movement as the Bolivarian Revolution, one against the capitalist, and all those who had oppressed the people of the ‘Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela’ since the time of

the colonization by Spain. Further, in President Chavez's speech to the United Nations the speaker verbalized his need for an abrupt change these words: "The United Nations has exhausted its model, and it is not all about reform. The XXIst century claims deep changes that will only be possible if a new organization is founded. This UN does not work. [...] More than just reforms we in Venezuela call for the foundation of a new United Nations, or as the teacher Simón Bolívar, Simón Rodríguez said, 'Either we invent or we err'". In this case, the speaker is not calling for a reformation, but for a complete change; he is calling for a rupture of the system, a revolution of the past and present system, or Hawkins' words "a systemic change" (1064).

To recapitulate this last argument, populism demands a radical change from the past, "a systemic change" or a rupture from the past, usually in the form of revolution in the present (Hawkins 1064; Hutchinson and Smith 51). Nationalists can also encourage change, but their vision is very different than populists. As illustrated by quotes from FDR, de Valera, Gurion and Sun Yat-Sen, the changes nationalists advocate for is not radical; rather, they consist of reformations or modification of the past, always in reference to the past and a better future. Reformations from the past usually expresses the need for the people in the nation to carry on and preserve particular values the nation has internalized, yet adapting other qualities to improve the nation and make it modern. The nationalist element I have explained here comprehends a need for reform from a great and glorious past to work on the nation's mission and attain its grand destiny.

D. Sacrifices and sorrows

The next element of nationalism is a recollection of and a call for sacrifices and sorrows for the nation's sake. This is closely tied with the source of identity of the nation, the values and morals called for in the discourse—particularly those of duty and loyalty—and with the nation's

destiny. Before expanding on the important connections between this and other elements of nationalism, I would like to emphasize that the sorrows and sacrifices alluded to are for the common good of the nation. They are to safeguard the nation and to make it great, glorious, exemplar, and even ideal.

To recall the glories of the past means that somewhere along the lines there have been times of defeats and that sacrifices and sorrows have existed. Defeats bring sorrow to a nation. Yet the sorrows, endured along with the sacrifices undertaken, form part of the national history and help in shaping the character and identity of the nation. Thus it would not be surprising to find in nationalist rhetoric allusions of defeats or sorrows endured by the nation—including the people within it.

Common sacrifices and sorrow help unite communities. There is a strong emotional bond developed when people are connected not only by victories but by sacrifice and sorrow, past, present, and future. Ernest Renan wrote, “A nation is a grand solidarity constituted by the sentiment of sacrifices which one has made and those that one is disposed to make again. It supposes a past, it renews itself especially in the present by a tangible deed: the approval, the desire, clearly expressed, to continue the communal life” (Hutchinson and Smith 17).

The same author adds, “[Common] suffering is greater than happiness. In fact national sorrows are more significant than triumphs because they impose obligations and demand a common effort [...]” (Hutchinson and Smith 17). Franklin D. Roosevelt put it in these words: “If I read the temper of our people correctly, we now realize [...] that if we are to go forward we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline, no progress is made... We are, I know, ready and willing to submit our lives and property to such discipline because it makes possible a leadership which

aims at a larger good” (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 511). Sun Yat-Sen expressed this same idea in the following manner: “When we undertake a task we should not falter from first to last until the task is done; if we do not succeed, we should not begrudge our very lives as a sacrifice—this is loyalty” (Crosscup 18).

In nationalism thus it seem that the greater good is embodied in the nation, along with the idea that the leader of the nation has the welfare of its people, including their freedom, prosperity, respect, fraternity, etc., as a main focus. Therefore it is to be expected that a nationalist leader would speak of the sacrifices and sorrows in the past, present or future, in order to achieve this ideal. As illustrated by the previous examples, the obligations and demands posed by the sorrows and sacrifices demanded are evident in nationalist rhetoric. In addition, it is seen that, sacrifices and sorrows as well as victories unite the people of the nation by giving them a sense of commonality, same origin, and empathy towards each other for the sacrifices and sorrows made and endured, all focused for the greater good: the nation’s survival and greatness. The sacrifices from the past (either made by directly national forbearers) affect the present and near future, and serve to give a sense of duty and loyalty to the nation.

At the beginning of this chapter, I quoted Renan who stated that the social principle on which the national idea rests is the worship of ancestors, a common past and glories (Hutchinson and Smith 17). This quote has been significantly present in nationalist rhetoric; yet, it is important to recognize that victories and defeats represent two sides of the coin of identity. I alluded to this when addressing the second element of nationalism. Where there is a victory, there is a defeat; where one has conquered, another one has been conquered. There is always the other story, the opposite and sorrowful side of victory.

To make clearer the notion and importance of sacrifice and sorrow, I will contrast it with a similar element found in populism: the notion of oppression, bondage or “immiseration” (Hawkins 1064). In populism, sacrifices and sorrows of the present and the past are identified more with oppression. The populists feel that the people have been oppressed for so long that a revolution is necessary for a change. The people have endured too much; indeed, the people have been wronged for too long; they have been silenced for too long, oppressed for too long, denigrated for too long, “immiserated” for too long. The perspective is gloomy and there is a sense of resentment towards the oppressors, the “others” who have wronged the people.

In contrast, in nationalist rhetoric the sorrows of the past are seen with a sense of sadness, contrition, respect and even admiration for the co-nationals who endured them, admitting how past sorrows have marked the nation and the people of the nation and are required for the nation’s good and greatness. The need to dwell on them in order to feel shame or bitterness, to revolt against someone or a system is not existent. In nationalism, the sorrows do not bring a sense of resentment towards other peoples or nations. In fact, sacrifices and sorrows are turned into defining moments of the nation which, having been endured, have brought forth the good and unique qualities and victories of the people of the nation.

Margalit wrote, “The effects of national humiliation include both compensatory illusions and sensitive insights. People who have been humiliated see themselves as representing some sort of ‘great spirituality’ [...] As they see it, they themselves embody human sensitivity, warmth, a poetic soul, and spiritual closeness to ‘what really is important in life’, and so their inferiority is artificial and transient” (McKim and McMahan 77). I suggest an alternative reading of the previous quote, replacing the words *humiliation* and *humiliated* with the expressions *sorrow* and *endured sorrow*. Thus, the quote states that “The effects of national [sorrow] include both

compensatory illusions and sensitive insights. People who have [endured sorrow] see themselves as representing some sort of ‘great spirituality’ [...]. As they see it, they themselves embody human sensitivity, warmth, a poetic soul, and spiritual closeness to ‘what really is important in life’, and so their inferiority is artificial and transient” (77).

Margalit’s quote highlights what this facet of sacrifices and sorrows encompasses in nationalist rhetoric, for sacrifice and sorrow serve to highlight the good qualities a nation has had and is expected to maintain. Again, I quote from Ben Gurion and de Valera, respectively:

In the road we open today there is set the crown of our fight for the Homeland and freedom. Into its making went the most tragic heroism and the greatest grandeur of that fight since the day we were called to face our many enemies and save Jerusalem [...] [...]. Our Third Return to Israel took a course opposite to the First and the Second. We have come now not westering from the east, but from the Occident moving eastward, not from desert to sea, but from sea to desert [...]. We took only little of the lowlands, and late. Of the mountains, we held almost nothing except for Jerusalem, which in every generation from every quarter drew Jews to it. Within the last century this magnetism has turned Jerusalem into a Jewish metropolis, with a great and growing Jewish majority (Crosscup 17-18).

Since the period of her missionary greatness, Ireland has suffered a persecution to which for cruelty, ingenuity and persistence there is no parallel. It did not break—it strengthened—the spirit and devotion of her people and prepared them for the renewal of their mission at a time when it is of no less vital importance to the world than was the mission of the Irish saints of the seventh and eight centuries to the world today[...]

[...] a resistance which was continued generation after generation against the successors of the first invaders until our own time, a resistance which will inevitably continue until the last sod of Irish soil is finally freed. (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 466)

The previous quotes show that the sorrows and sacrifices of the present and the past serve to inspire, to emphasize the spiritual qualities, the goodness that the nation, and people of the nation have possessed. Thus, in nationalist rhetoric, sorrows and sacrifices are often turned into hidden victories of value, either because, after the loss, the people of the nation were able to gain a battle or because the sorrows and sacrifices emphasized the ‘spiritual qualities’ the nation possessed or possesses.

In addition to heightening the nation’s qualities, allusion to the sacrifices and sorrows of the past serves to highlight role models to co-nationals in the present. In the words of Ripstein, “Just as people seek connection with the past, so they try to model their lives on the lives of others they admire, from the past or the present, from cultural tradition or contemporary life” (McKim and McMahan 212). In the second element of nationalism, I describe the importance of alluding to the some of the nation’s past heroic moments or people, which provide the people a source of identity, a sense of rich legacy and even an inspiration and a sense of transcendence, which they remembered, identified with and patterned their lives after. This is as true for the heroes who had a lot of victories as for the heroes who endured through sacrifices and sorrows, even those who were martyred.

Roosevelt makes allusion to the character and goodness of the Americans of the past when he stated, “Compared with the perils which our forbearers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for” (Copeland, Lamm, and

McKenna 509). Ben Gurion also addresses the defeats, set-backs and victories of the battle. He states,

Upon [Jerusalem] the enemy rained his fiercest blows indiscriminately, viciously, night and day without surcease [...] Our relief column was led by a gallant and honored American Jew, Colonel David Michael Marcus. He was not fated alas! to enter the Jerusalem he came to free, and on the very eve of the first truce he died in the Judean hills [...]. Its units in a brave engagement penetrated the village and burned it down, but were forced back by massed artillery. A Palmach Brigade, with typical courage, renewed the assault, but it too had to withdraw, not unscathed. (Crosscup 19)

Here too, the defeats are seen as only set-backs for Israel's victory and the people involved in them as regarded as heroes, even though not all of them lived for long or had immediate success. They are portrayed as heroes because they endured, they suffered and sacrificed for sake of the nation, and their characters are to be emulated by the current people of Israel.

By tying the connections between the past and the present, and the victories the sacrifices and sorrows from the past have brought in the present, nationalist leaders add a sense of transcendence, a key element in nationalism. By tying the present with the past and the future, by uniting the people through sorrows and sacrifices and providing role models from the past, nationalists give continuity to the glories of the past. By highlighting the goodness of the people and comparing the sorrows and sacrifices from the past with those of the present and near future, all for the nation's well-being, honor and glory, nationalists merge all times in one and are able to add a sense of transcendence to the nation's people, events and even the nation itself.

Consequently, the sense of the having a common source of origin and transcendence over

common or temporary tasks is more complete when celebrating not just past and present victories, but sacrifices and sorrows endured as well.

Sacrifices and sorrows endured for the greater good—the nation’s good—are inspiring and idealistic; they reaffirm a sense of duty, of identity, of values and worth that merit to be endured. They help unite people within the nation recognizing sacrifices and sorrows from the past, and the ones needed for a better future. Thus not only co-nationals are united with their contemporary co-nationals, but they transcend to unite with co-nationals from past and future times. Sacrifices and sorrows also provide an identity as much as victories and heroes do. Because of the nation’s disposition to endure sacrifices and sorrows into bringing to past a glorious future and highlighting the uniqueness and ‘spiritual qualities’ of the nation, sacrifices and sorrows form another key element of nationalism.

E. Enemies

In his rubric on populism, Dr. Hawkins addresses the presence and depiction of enemies in populist rhetoric. In populist rhetoric, enemies can be from the inside or outside of the nation. In populism, enemies can take the form of a movement, such as liberalism or neo-liberalism, or an elite, and are not treated with respect. Rather the tone towards it is incendiary or condescending (1064). I did not find much of this element in nationalist discourse. Due to its nature, we should expect that nationalists tend to focus on their nation and not on others. Yet, because these elements are defining features of populist rhetoric, I feel compelled to address their corresponding use in nationalist rhetoric.

Enemies do not form a crucial element of nationalism since they are not always presence in nationalist rhetoric and because they do not help to define the nation. However, it is important to notice that if nationalists address enemies, the enemies will be from another nation. Unlike

populism, where enemies can be inside the nation—for instance, those belonging to the elite class—in nationalist speeches these enemies will only be from another nation, country or land.

Ben Gurion's speech is one that has the presence of enemies. Note that enemies are foreigners, not people from Israel—including Jews recently immigrated. Also, it seems that Ben Gurion uses enemies to highlight the participation and qualities of Israel.

...the suffering of Jerusalem was seven-fold. Our enemy knew the mortal stroke he might with ease deliver was to seize and destroy this city of ours...

With strategic astuteness the enemy deployed his strength from the start in the effort to sunder Jerusalem from Tel Aviv...

the concentrated wrath of the enemy was vented upon Jerusalem...

the Army and champions of Israel [...] set the schemes of Babylon and Ammon at naught; they broke through to right and left, they thrust back the invaders and scattered them...

the enemy rained his fiercest blows indiscriminately viciously, night and day without surcease... (Crosscup 18, 19)

As illustrated by the quotes provided above, David Ben Gurion contrasts the goodness of the people of Israel with the baseness of the people from the Arab States. Even more, Ben Gurion uses the words such as *enemy* and *invaders* to convey ideas of hostility and conflict that the Israelis face. These words are followed by other expressions that stress the hostility and harshness Israel's enemies have showed to Israel. In these examples, it is clearly seen that an enemy exists and, moreover, its intrusion has been felt and resented in Israel. Yet the enemy remains a foreigner, an invader, an outsider of the Israeli nation.

Differently than in populism, where the enemy can be from within or without the nation, in nationalism enemies are exclusively from without the nation. Even in the eventuality of mentioning an enemy found within the nation, the enemy will be seen as a collaborator from another nation and the fact that he is allied with another nation more than its own will be emphasized. The emphasis in any case will be placed on the foreigner, not on a co-national.

Sun Yat-Sen is another example of how a nationalist addresses exterior enemies. Note how he does not focus on the enemies themselves, focusing instead on other nations' misdeeds to highlight the goodness of the people of China. After explaining Japan's broken treaties in order to enter in agreements with the Germans and World War II and to gain the independence of Korea, Sun Yat-Sen explained, "The independence of Korea was proposed and demanded by Japan herself and effected by threats of force; now Japan is fat from eating her own words". Further, he stated, Japan advocates keeping her treaty with England but not with China because England is strong and China is weak. Japan's entry into the European War is because of fear of compulsion, not because of 'faithfulness' or 'justice'. China was a strong state for thousands of years and Korea lived on; Japan has been a strong state for over twenty years and Korea is already destroyed. From this one can see that Japan's sense of 'faithfulness and justice' is inferior to China's and that China's standards have advanced beyond those of other nations.

(Crosscup 18, 19)

Unlike Ben Gurion's speech, these excerpts from Sun Yat-Sen do not contain the words *enemies* or *invaders*, yet it is clear that there is some abasement and hostility towards the Japanese. The descriptions provided for the Japanese convey a message of hostility, even of outrage for the treaties they have broken. Nevertheless, like Ben Gurion, Sun Yat-Sen does not spend too much time on other nations, even those nations who have not kept their treaties, who

have betrayed honor and other values important to the Chinese (or Israelis). The purpose for bringing Japan into Sun Yat-Sen's speech seems to contrast the goodness of the Chinese with the badness of the Japanese—a people from another nation. Soon after this passage, Sun Yat-Sen returns to the subject of moral qualities Chinese should have.

The quotes from de Valera also reveal that these speeches contain little to no hostility towards a current “enemy.” De Valera talks about invaders from the past, yet does so in a non-belligose form. However, he addresses these invaders and struggles from the past in a way that emphasizes the greatness and endurance of the Irish nation.

These examples show that the emphasis of a nationalist is not to cultivate hatred or hostility towards a group of people, even those of other nations, but rather to emphasize the qualities their co-nationals should unite around, aspire to and maintain. The purpose of discussing opposing nations is to emphasize goodness and the moral qualities the nation has had and maintains.

F. Opposition

Addressing opposite parties or people from opposite view is almost non-existent in nationalist rhetoric. Again, due to nature of a nationalist speech, which focuses on the celebration of a common source of identity, morals and values, sacrifices and sorrows, and the progressive state of the nation towards a bright future, the lack of focus on the opposition is to be expected.

Ben Gurion does not address opposition within Israel, nor does Sun Yat-Sen or de Valera. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in turn, speaks of mistakes made in the past; yet he does not stress or dwell on them. He avoids naming people and gives only short and vague descriptions of the occurrences or the bad attributes of the people giving way to the economic crisis. Yet, these bad attributes are surrounded by the goodness and values “fellow-Americans” have (Copeland,

Lamm, and McKenna 509). Roosevelt's speech does not denigrate or pin-point a group of people; rather, he calls for repentance, hard work and a restoration of the values of the past in order to overcome the challenges of the present. Roosevelt thus stresses the willingness and moral values needed to work towards recovery and the great future of the nation.

From my reading of these speeches, it seems that nationalist leaders—at least modern ones—feel respect for a scientific type of rhetoric, one that reflects thought and some evidence to support current events and ideas on how to face them, even though these ideas might not coincide with the leader's personal beliefs. Nationalists focus on the positive things, seeing this kind of rhetoric within the nation as a sign of progress, and will not degrade the opposition in their speeches. If hostility is present in nationalist rhetoric, it will not be a central point in the speech and will definitely be geared towards an outsider of the nation, with the purpose of heightening the qualities the nation has. This is the general impression from the speeches read so far. More will be said regarding the presence and treatment of opposition when analyzing this element in de Gaulle's speeches.

G. Summary and conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed five elements of nationalism. These elements have been compiled from readings from four nationalist leaders: David Ben Gurion, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Eamon de Valera, and Sun Yat-Sen. In addition, I have included quotes from scholars in regards to nationalism. Nationalism can be described in six elements.

The first element involves morals and values as important issues to address, acquire and maintain; the second comprises the importance of the past, particularly of victorious or renowned people and events, as a source of pride and identity for the nation. Cosmic proportions are usually used to describe the people and events alluded to, bringing a sense of transcendence to

the nation and the people of the nation. The third element comprehends the allusion of a nation's destiny or mission, including reformations from a glorious past to the achievement or restoration of the nation's glorious future. The fourth element is the recalling of and calling for sacrifices and sorrows from the people of the nation, which incidentally brings the other side of the coin of identity, and strengthens the bond of unity among co-nationals, and values—in particular those of duty and loyalty. In addition, this element provides role models from the past and adds transcendence to the speech as continuity is given to the task the founding fathers started, as all times, past, present and future, converge in the sacrifices and sorrows undertaken in the present. The fifth element of nationalism consists of the presence of enemies, and the sixth element the presence and treatment of the opposition.

These elements of nationalism indicate that nationalist rhetoric is a celebration of a nation's past, present and future. Unlike populists, nationalists seek to unite people towards a common goal: the retention and glory of a greater good, embodied in the nation. The following table summarizes the elements of nationalism previously discussed. This rubric will be the one used to analyze nationalism in Charles de Gaulle's speeches. The findings of this analysis will be located in the coming chapters.

H. Elements of nationalism: Rubric

0: The speech contains little or no elements of nationalism

1: The speech contains strong or clear nationalist elements, but that the elements are not consistent throughout the speech or that they are tampered by non-nationalist elements

2: the speech is “extremely [nationalist], and comes very close to the ideal [nationalist] discourse. [The] speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal [nationalist] discourse, and has few elements that would be considered [non-nationalists]” (Hawkins 1062)

Vision of the world; issues	Nationalism is a way of life and openly incorporates a set of values. Morals and values—especially duty and loyalty—are addressed as fundamental issues. Issues are not framed as a struggle between good or evil but as set of ideals to which we all can do and aspire.
Proportions; celebration of victorious characters and events	Victorious moments and people are brought into remembrance in order to create a sense of a shared source of communal identity, and to convey a sense of transcendence over struggles or common chores of the time.
Action and change: reformation to attain the nation’s destiny	Progress is key in reforming the nation, for it takes national values adding to them modern values, as a rubric to reform, instead of re-create, society or rupturing with the past. The leader envisions the ultimate goal: the nation’s destiny.
Remembrance of and a call for sacrifice and sorrow	The nation—or the people of the nation—are remembered and required to endure sacrifices and sorrows. Sacrifices and sorrows for the good of the nation serve to create a strong bond and identity, provide role models and highlight the “spiritual qualities” of the nation. They are turned into victories and transcend the struggles the nation faces.
Enemies or evil	Though not fundamental to nationalism, enemies are constituted exclusively by foreigners. The baseness of the enemies serves to contrast and glorify the goodness of the people of the nation
Treatment of opposition	Opposition is generally treated with respect. Focus is more on unity with co-nationals than partisan divisions.

IV. On de Gaulle's speeches: an overview

A. Methodology for the selection of de Gaulle's speeches

Charles de Gaulle was a very eloquent man and spoke in multiple occasions. The collection of all of his speeches adds to five volumes¹. Due to the significant amount of speeches, it became necessary to draw a sample in order to analyze nationalism in de Gaulle's rhetoric. To collect my sample, I considered the following to be important: first, consistency with the speeches used to create the nationalist rubric; second, the acknowledgement that France's historical context changed from 1940 until 1969 (the years when de Gaulle delivered his speeches). In connection to France's historical context, to recognize that de Gaulle rhetoric changed through time, that he spoke about many different topics, in different places and that he delivered his speeches in different periods of his life. Because de Gaulle spoke for many years, in several different occasions, with different contexts, and in different places, both in and out of France, the possibilities of organizing the speeches varied. I considered the possibility of organizing the speeches in a chronological, topical, or even geographical manner. I also reflected on the amount of speeches I should include in my sample. This sample had to be one that would make my work doable and, at the same time, one that would be representative of de Gaulle's rhetoric.

1. Considerations of geography, themes, and chronological order for the sample

To address my first concern, that of giving validity to my analysis, I wanted the selection of de Gaulle's speeches to be consistent with the selection of speeches used to describe nationalism in my previous chapter—well-known speeches of famous nationalist leaders from different parts of the world. It is important to keep in mind that while the purpose of the rubric is

its applicability to any world leader, it is my purpose in this thesis to apply it to the rhetoric of Charles de Gaulle. Thus, in consistency with the speeches gathered to extract six elements of nationalism, I needed to find famous or well-known speeches of de Gaulle. A preliminary research on books and the internet, in consultation to my advisors, gave me an idea of the speeches that I could include in my sample.

The following step consisted in including speeches that were given in different places and different times. By this, I am particularly thoughtful of the different time periods France went through from the beginning of the twentieth century until the decade of the seventies; and the changes de Gaulle's rhetoric had, probably adjusting to the changes occurred in France, particularly since 1940 until 1969.

Some of these changes take into account the leadership France needed in 1940 to unite the French and fight against the Germans and their allies. De Gaulle provided that leadership and many French men and women welcomed it. However, the historical context—and de Gaulle's support for that matter—changed in the sixties. The protests against the general—as de Gaulle was usually referred to—and the independence of French colonies show changes in France from 1946 to 1969. De Gaulle's rhetoric also changed in these years. Thus I consider it important to be aware of these changes and to study what kind of changes the general made in his rhetoric and if those changes affected the presence of nationalism in his speeches.

I also considered that de Gaulle was a man who spoke of many topics in different parts of France and of the world, and asked myself if it would be relevant to analyze de Gaulle's nationalism in his speeches comparing and contrasting the speeches delivered in Paris to the ones delivered outside of Paris, and to the ones delivered in France to the ones delivered abroad. I concluded that though this exercise might be interesting, it would not add much to the purpose of

my thesis at this point. The same applies for a thematic selection of speeches. In fact, it would be best to select famous speeches (consistent with the base provided for the description of the elements of nationalism) and arrange them in a chronological order. The chronological selection and analysis of speeches would provide me with a better understanding of de Gaulle's changes in rhetoric, France's changes in with its historical context, and changes in the presence of nationalism in de Gaulle's rhetoric.

In addition a chronological order would give me a better idea into the manner in which de Gaulle made those changes—if these changes were gradual and subtle, or if they were abrupt—which in turn might reflect de Gaulle's commitment to ideas and ideals expressed in his speeches. For this purpose I looked for speeches not only pertaining to the war or de Gaulle's presidency period, but of from the war period through the end of de Gaulle's presidency—coinciding with the end of his public appearance, and the end of his life.

Subsequently, in looking at de Gaulle's rhetoric through the years, it became important to make a distinction between different periods of his lifetime. This division becomes helpful into better understand de Gaulle's rhetoric and track the changes in it. This division would also make easier the location of the speeches in their historical contexts, providing the readers points of reference in French history when analyzing de Gaulle's nationalism.

2. De Gaulle's three periods

Placing so many of de Gaulle's speeches into different periods can prove difficult since he spoke so much about different issues, and in several occasions. France itself went through different stages in those years, and different works divide de Gaulle's speeches into different periods. Yet, in order to simplify, I believe that de Gaulle's rhetoric can be divided into three main periods: the years during the war (1940-1946), the years during the Fourth Republic (1946-

1958), and the years of de Gaulle's presidency during the Fifth Republic (1958-1969). This division also coincides with three different interesting and important periods France went through in the last century.

De Gaulle's height was achieved during World War II. He represented the leader of the French nation in opposition to the government of Vichy subject to the German government. It is in this light that he became France's nationalist leader. Thus, his rhetoric becomes important during the years of the war. De Gaulle does not assume the executive power in the Fourth Republic, yet, remains a leader opposing the new government, campaigning for a different constitution and then for himself as France's new executive. In 1958 De Gaulle assumes executive powers and becomes again France's leader to the world, thus making him eligible again for the speech analysis of nationalist leaders.

While de Gaulle was not France's leader in the years of the Fourth Republic, I consider important to include speeches of this period in my analysis because, at the time, he is still a prominent figure in France, the speeches might enlighten our understanding of de Gaulle's rhetoric, and most importantly, because the inclusion of these speeches in the analysis might prove helpful in tracking de Gaulle's changes through the years. For this reason the focus on de Gaulle's rhetoric through the years will begin during the war—after his famous call of June 18, 1940—and will end with the end of his presidency in 1969, having a transitory time in between his exercise leadership in the executive power. De Gaulle's well-known speeches will be then placed in accordance to these periods.

Next, I found a website containing several of de Gaulle's well-known speeches. The website has even divided these speeches into the three periods I have previously described. Having contacted experts on Charles de Gaulle, which assured me that their selection of

speeches was based on the speeches' political importance, I went ahead and used the selection this website provided consisting of de Gaulle's ten well-known and important political speeches per period. These speeches are found on an official website dedicated to Charles de Gaulle: http://www.charles-de-gaulle.org/rubrique.php3?id_rubrique=102.

3. Selecting ten speeches per period

I am aware that the ten speeches selected from each period might not be consistently spread throughout the years, in other words, they might not have the same interval of time between them. However, please note that the goal in here is to test consistency throughout time, but also in well-known or important political speeches, just as I did to establish elements of nationalism with the aid of well-known speeches of David Ben Gurion, Eamon de Valera, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Sun Yat-Sen. If de Gaulle's rhetoric changed, the change would reflect not only in not well-known and perhaps unimportant speeches, but also in well-known and politically important speeches. Further, it might be easier to note the changes in rhetoric important speeches in any of the three periods of time already described.

The number of speeches per period would help me establish the tone and level of nationalism in each period. In addition, since not all of de Gaulle's speeches have the same length (they range from 376 to 3,582 words counting text and titles) I believe that this exercise will be revelatory as to the condition of nationalism in regards to the length of the speech. So far, the speeches read in the previous chapter, for the most part were over 400 words, but shorter than de Gaulle's speech at the Chaillot Palace, delivered on September 12, 1944 (containing 3,582). For the most part, De Gaulle's speeches tend to be short. Thus, I will be able to see if de Gaulle is able to express nationalism in shorter or longer speeches, and see if the length of a speech is crucial to speech analysis. Certainly, content will be crucial to determine this. Consequently, by

choosing ten of the most important or know speeches from each period, I will be testing nationalism in de Gaulle's speeches in a variety of years and a variety of speech lengths.

Additionally, ten well-known speeches per period seem resourceful in this analysis. Since my approach is qualitative, rather than quantitative, ten speeches per period seems about the right number of speeches I could manage to read, analyze, and compare and contrast to the rest of the speeches within the same period of time, and with the speeches in the other periods. Ten political important and well-known speeches can be reflective of de Gaulle's rhetoric through the years, and is enough material to analyze and make my work doable. Thus I find this number to be of good balance to my work in this thesis.

B. Analytical Approach

Since my work is based on the work Dr. Hawkins made when analyzing populist rhetoric, I will be using similar tools and taking a similar approach. First, I will analyze each speech separately. Second, with the aid of the rubric made in the previous chapter, I will highlight and take notes of the elements of nationalism present in each speech. Third, I will create a document containing a 3 x 6 rubric for each speech: the first two columns will be exactly as the rubric of the preceding chapter—containing a topic and a description of each element of nationalism—and in the third column, I will insert quotes from the speech according to the element they belong to. Fourth, at the end of the document I will write comments about the speech, for example, overall impressions from the speech; and finally, at the top of the document the reader will find a small title describing what the rubric is about, the title of the speech, and below it the grade assigned to the speech.

The grading will be holistic in a scale ranging from zero to two. A holistic approach is used in many schools and upper educational institutions in our days. It evaluates an assignment

as a whole rather than analyzing by pieces. The advantages of a holistic approach are that it is less time consuming than the analytical approach, for it looks at the piece as a whole, rather than the pieces or details of it. The assessment is not only quicker but accurate, and thus reliable. A disadvantage of this method is that since the reader gets an overall feeling of the work, while the grade assigned, the reader might not be able to provide exact reasons for the assessment made on the work, as opposed to a time-consuming analytical approach that would be able to provide exact feedback on the work. This being said, it is important to bear in mind that for the preliminary assessment of de Gaulle's speeches it is not as important to state why, but to recognize if de Gaulle is nationalist or not.

Just as three levels might be used in grading scale to categorize student's work (low, average or high in quality), three numbers, zero, one and two, seem accurate to use in categorizing nationalist speeches. The grades are equivalent to the three grades found in Dr. Hawkins' rubric: a grade zero indicates that the speech contains little or no elements of nationalism; a grade one indicates that the speech contains strong or clear nationalist elements, but that the elements are not consistent throughout the speech or that they are tampered by non-nationalist elements; finally, a grade two indicates that the speech is "extremely [nationalist], and comes very close to the ideal [nationalist] discourse. [The] speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal [nationalist] discourse, and has few elements that would be considered [non-nationalists]" (1062).

Since my work consists not only of analyzing and categorizing de Gaulle's speeches, but of actually describing his nationalism by finding patterns and changes in and throughout his speeches, I will then re-read all of the rubrics analyzed for one period, and will gather and compare all of the quotes pertaining to each element of nationalism. I will thus be making a cross

reference analysis, by analyzing the each element of nationalism as it shows in the different speeches. I will then address the occurrences, patterns, and possible meanings of these quotes in regards to the element of nationalism they belong to. This process will be carried for each element of nationalism in each of the periods of de Gaulle's speeches. Thus the approach in this part of the work will be very analytical and will complement my previous holistic approach.

After this exercise, I intent to compare and contrast my findings of each period to the other periods, and write some concluding remarks about de Gaulle's nationalism and changes in his discourse. My thesis will then show element by element how Charles de Gaulle is nationalist in his rhetoric, according to the elements found in his speeches, and perhaps provide insights into some unique characteristic of de Gaulle's nationalism, or at least of his rhetoric.

C. Overview of de Gaulle's speeches: preliminary results

I originally intended to analyze thirty of de Gaulle's speeches (ten for each period). However, this task proved to be too big for the current work. After analyzing the speeches of the first period, I realized that it would be better to go deeper in the description and understanding of the presence—or lack—of the elements of nationalism in de Gaulle's speeches. The following tables provide an overview of my findings. These tables contain the title of the speech, its grade, and one or two quotes per element of nationalism found in the speech. I put the speeches in chronological order according to the grade assigned to them.

1. Rubrics: Summary of classification and elements of nationalism in de Gaulle's speeches during World War II

Speech	Grade	Vision of the World	Proportions; celebration of victorious characters or moments	Action and change for the future: Reformation
Appel du 18 juin 1940	2	Absent	« la flamme de la résistance française ne doit pas s'étendre et ne s'éteindra pas »	« Le destin du monde est là »
Manifeste de Brazzaville 27 octobre 1940	2	« ce devoir sacrée » « les plus hautes valeurs intellectuelles et morales de la Nation »	Absent	« qui proclament leur volonté de contribuer à restaurer l'indépendance et la grandeur de la France »
Albert Hall 15 novembre 1941	2	« notre volonté est de demeurer fidèles » « Il n'y a plus maintenant pour nous, d'autre raison, d'autre intérêt d'autre honneur, que de rester, jusqu'au bout, des Français dignes de la France »	« une poignée d'évadés français avaient emporté avec eux l'âme éternelle de la France » « demeurer fidèles aux principes démocratiques que nos ancêtres ont tirés du génie de notre race et qui sont l'enjeu de cette guerre pour la vie ou pour la mort »	« les liens de l'unité française avec la volonté de résistance pour la vengeance et de redressement pour la grandeur » « Il n'y a pas le moindre doute que, de la crise terrible qu'elle traverse, sortira, pour la nation française, un vaste renouvellement »
Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942	2	« ...ceux qui ont le courage de se remettre [...] debout sont d'avance approuvés, accueillis, acclamés par tous les Français Combattant »	« après une victoire écrasante » « et voilà la guerre gagné grâce à la France ! »	« le salut de la patrie »
Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris, 25 août 1944	2	« il s'agit de devoirs de guerres » « de nous montrer, jusqu'à la fin, dignes de la France »	« émotion profonde et sacrée » « [Paris] libéré par lui-même, libéré par son peuple avec le concours des armées de la France, avec l'appui et le concours [...] de la France éternelle »	Absent
Discours du Palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944	2	« Nous savons dans quel état nous sommes, matériellement, démographiquement, moralement » « a mis en éclatante lumière à la fois la volonté de combattre, l'enthousiasme et la sagesse de notre peuple »	« une vague de joie, de fierté, d'espérance a soulevé la nation française » « l'horizon se dore des lumières de la victoire » « l'aube de la libération » « vous tous croisés à la croix de la Lorraine »	« [la nation française] a discerné également les voies et moyens de retourner à sa vocation de liberté et de grandeur » « c'est bien de l'avenir qu'il s'agit ! de l'avenir [...] dont la nation entière veut qu'il soit une rénovation »

Remembrance of and a call for sacrifice and sorrow	Enemies	Treatment of opposition
« Toutes les fautes, tous les regards, toutes les souffrances n'empêchent qu'il y a, dans l'univers, tous les moyens nécessaires pour écraser nos ennemis »	« Infiniment plus que leur nombre, ce sont les cars, les avions, la tactique des Allemands qui nous font reculer »	« Ce gouvernement alléguant la défaite de nos armées s'est mis en rapport avec l'ennemi pour cesser le combat »
« La France traverse la plus terrible crise de son Histoire » « [...] jusqu'à son âme sont menacés de destruction » « J'appelle à la guerre, c'est-à-dire, au combat ou au sacrifice »	« il s'agit de défendre contre l'ennemi »	« Dans son état de servitude, cet organisme ne peut être et n'est en effet, qu'un instrument utilisé par les ennemis de la France contre l'honneur et l'intérêt du pays »
« malgré le tumulte de la guerre, jamais encore nous n'avons plus clairement discerné ce que nous sommes, ce que nous voulons et pourquoi nous sommes certains d'avoir choisi la meilleure part pour le service de la France »	« cette guerre de trente ans, déchaînée en 1914 par l'agression allemande » « Peut-être l'Allemagne commence-t-elle à subir, à son tour, la fascination du désastre qui n'avait longtemps, paralysé que ses ennemis ? Peut-être l'Italie sera-t-elle bientôt une fois de plus, suivant le mot de Byron : 'La triste mère d'un empire mort ?' »	« Sauf une poignée de malheureux et une chambrée de misérables qui, par panique, folie ou intérêt, ont spéculé sur la défaite de la patrie et qui dominent provisoirement par la tromperie, la prison, ou la famine, la nation n'a jamais marqué une pareille unanimité »
« Tous ceux qui ont le courage de se remettre debout, malgré l'ennemi et la trahison, sont d'avance approuvés, accueillis, acclamés par tous les Français Combattants »	« malgré l'ennemi »	« Méprisez les cris des traîtres qui voudraient vous persuader »
« Elle y rentre sanglante, mais bien résolue. Elle y rentre éclairée par l'immense leçon, mais plus certaine que jamais, de ses devoirs et de ses droits »	« l'ennemi chancelle, mais il n'est pas encore battu »	Absent
« Cette victoire pour la saisir telle qu'elle doit être, c'est-à-dire complète et totale de nouveaux et sanglant efforts seront sans doute encore nécessaires » « au prix de quel périls et quelles pertes ! » « la nation est décidée, en dépit de ce qu'elle a souffert, à supporter noblement ces épreuves, comme un grand peuple qui refuse de gaspiller le présent, afin de mieux bâtir l'avenir »	« le voilà donc enfin refoulé et humilié cette puissance allemande » « pour chasser l'envahisseur »	« et, parfois, la trahison de certains dirigeants des nations qu'elle voulait asservir, favorisée par la dispersion des États du parti de la liberté » « la nuit de l'isolement, la propagande mensongère, l'obstination de servitude des usurpateurs du pouvoir »

Speech	Grade	Vision of the World	Cosmic Proportions Celebrations of victorious characters or moments;	Action and change: Reformation to achieve the nation's destiny
Appel du 22 juin 1940	1	« L'honneur, le bon sens, l'intérêt de la Patrie commandent à tous les Français libres de continuer le combat »	Absent	« Si les forces de la liberté triomphaient de celles de la servitude, quel serait le destin d'une France qui se serait soumise à l'ennemi ? »
Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942	1	In reference to France : « parmi mesdames les nations, aucune n'a jamais été plus belle, meilleure, ni plus brave que notre dame la France »	« parmi mesdames les nations, aucune n'a jamais été plus belle, meilleure, ni plus brave que notre dame la France »	« de ce qu'ils font pour la gloire de la France » « vous verrez se lever de nouveau une grande armée française »
Discours de Brazzaville 20 janvier 1944	1	« [La France élève les hommes dans] la dignité et fraternité »	« Depuis un demi-siècle, à l'appel d'une vocation civilisatrice vieille de beaucoup de centaines d'années [...] les Français ont pénétré, pacifié, ouvert au monde, une grande partie de cette Afrique noire »	« la nation dont l'immortel génie est désigné pour les initiatives qui, par degrés élèvent les hommes vers les sommets de dignité et de fraternité où quelque jour, tous pourrons s'unir » « la France est aujourd'hui animé [...] d'une volonté ardente et pratique de renouveau »
Discours radiodiffusé, Londres 6 juin 1944	1	« le devoir simple et sacré »	« L'Afrique et l'Italie, l'océan et le ciel ont vu leur force et leur gloire renaissantes »	« La Terre natale [verra leur force et leur gloire] demain ! »

Remembrance of and a call for sacrifice and sorrow	Enemies	Treatment of opposition
« Il est absurde de considérer la lutte comme perdue. Oui, nous avons subi une grande défaite [...] Mais il nous reste un vaste Empire [...] peuvent donner, demain, la victoire »	« le gouvernement français [...] connaît maintenant les conditions de l'ennemi »	« Tant que ses Alliés continuent la guerre, son gouvernement n'a pas le droit de se rendre à l'ennemi » « l'esprit d'abandon du Gouvernement »
« vous avez faim parce que l'ennemi mange notre pain et notre viande. Vous avez froid, parce que l'ennemi vole notre bois et notre charbon, vous souffrez, parce que l'ennemi vous dit et vous fait dire que vous êtes des fils et de filles de vaincus »	« la France a une voisine brutale, rusée, jalouse » « L'Allemagne, enivrée d'orgueil et de méchanceté, a voulu [...] réduire en servitude les nations qui l'entouraient. Au mois d'août 1914, elle s'est donc lancée à l'attaque »	Absent
« cette Afrique noire, que son étendue, les rigueurs du climat, la puissance des obstacles naturels, la misère et la diversité de ses populations avaient maintenue, depuis l'aurore de l'Histoire, douloureuse et imperméable »	«occupation provisoire de la Métropole par l'ennemi »	Absent
« Derrière le nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes voici que reparaît le soleil de notre grandeur »	« l'ennemi qui écrase et souille la patrie, l'ennemi qui détesté, l'ennemi déshonoré » « il n'est plus qu'une fauve qui recule »	Absent

These tables are a part of the holistic approach used in this thesis, and help the reader get an overall feel of what de Gaulle's rhetoric sounds like. Further, they serve as a point of comparison among the ten speeches analyzed.

As the tables show, de Gaulle's speeches during the first period, the years during the war, are, for the most part, highly nationalist. Six of the ten speeches correspond to a grade 2—highly nationalist or close to the ideal of a nationalist speech—and the remaining four correspond to a 1, which means that the speech contains elements of nationalism but misses key elements, or that elements of nationalism are present but not consistent throughout the speech.

The six nationalist speeches were the following: Appel du 18 juin 1940, Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940, Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941, Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942, Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris, 25 août 1944, and Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944. The four with few or some nationalist elements or that lack consistency of the elements throughout the speech are Appel du 22 juin 1940, Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942, Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944, and Discours radiodiffusé given in London June 6 1944.

D. Important considerations

Before proceeding to analyze each element of nationalism in de Gaulle's speeches during the years of the war, I would like to make two general observations dealing with the non-exclusivity of the elements of nationalism. The first one deals with the characteristic of applying cosmic proportions to elements of nationalism other than victories or the celebration of the source of identity; the second, with the appearance of more than one element in the same sentence.

1. The overlapping of elements, cosmic proportions and transcendence

The first observation is that the terms “cosmic proportions” and “transcendence” are not only applicable when the leader refers to victorious moments or people of the nation. As a way of reminder, I separated the elements of nationalism into six categories to establish a base and a point of comparison with Dr. Hawkins’ word, which has proven to be insightful into understanding nationalism. Further, the distinction of each element of nationalism makes it quicker and easier to spot them in a speech. Consequently the separation of the six elements of nationalism makes more efficient the work of distinguishing a nationalist speech from medium or non-nationalist speech. This being said, the conveniences offered by separating elements of nationalism do not imply that these elements are mutually exclusive. On the contrary, elements of nationalism can—and often are—intertwined.

The overlapping of elements has been previously mentioned in the analysis of the speeches by Ben Gurion, de Valera, Roosevelt and Sun. However I want to make a note that this overlapping is also present in de Gaulle’s speeches. Interestingly, de Gaulle often attributes cosmic proportions and transcendence to the category of sacrifice and sorrow. He also applies cosmic proportions and transcendence to the categories of enemies, the treatment of opposition, the nation’s mission and destiny, and morals and values.

The following are a few examples of the application of several elements of nationalism, and the attribution of cosmic proportions and transcendence to elements other than the celebration of victories, in de Gaulle’s speeches. In the speech given on June 18, 1940 de Gaulle stated: “Toutes les fautes, tous les regards, toutes les souffrances n’empêchent qu’il y a dans l’univers tous les moyens nécessaires pour écraser nos ennemis” (“All of the mistakes, all of the eyes, all of the sufferings cannot keep that there exists in all of the universe of the necessary

means to crush our enemies”). This sentence could definitely appear under the element of sacrifice and sorrow, because it obviously addresses those elements. Yet there other aspects that highlight and bring more importance to the value this element of sacrifices and sorrows.

First, we notice the crescendo in the sentence. This crescendo enhances cosmic proportions to the words spoken by the Gaulle. The usage and repetition of the word “all” gives emphasis to the sorrows the French nation has endured. This adds cosmic proportions because it indicates that not only the French know about the mistakes and sufferings, but that “all” people across the planet, and perhaps, even people from the past and future have, or will have, looked upon the mistakes and sorrows of the French. The culmination of the crescendo in regards to the cosmic proportions, which brings transcendence to this sentence, is marked by the word “universe”. It is precisely the use of words such as “all” and “universe” that define cosmic proportions, for the events described in here, the events to which de Gaulle ascribes these cosmic proportions, affect everyone in the geographic world, even the universe, and possibly everyone (or “all”) across time.

It is thus evident that by ascribing cosmic proportions to the feelings and events talked about, de Gaulle brings transcendence to the sacrifices and sorrows over themselves and over the French in France at the current time. The feelings and events are above the French nation; they are beyond common people, governments, even beyond this world. These events encompass all of the French, all of the people in the world, and go beyond the people of the world, and appeal to a strength or means found in the universe to help the French nation. By this example we then see that cosmic proportions can be applied to elements of nationalism other than the remembrance of victories or symbols of victories.

Second, after addressing the sorrows, de Gaulle mentions enemies. He states: “Toutes les fautes, tous les regards, toutes les souffrances n’empêchent qu’il y a dans l’univers tous les moyens nécessaires pour écraser nos ennemis” (“All of the mistakes, all of the eyes, all of the sufferings cannot keep that there exists in all of the universe of the necessary means to crush our enemies”). In this sentence the general alludes and almost pleads to the strengths and means the universe possess in other to crush France’s enemies. The word “crush” is powerful since it connotes defeat, harshness, and bellicosity. In here de Gaulle is talking about winning the war, winning, mainly, opposing Germany. Germany is France’s enemy. There is obvious hostility towards the German people, perhaps one comparable to the one found in the speech by Ben Gurion directed against the Arabs. Yet, even though enemies are present, it is important to keep in mind that they are foreigners (concurring with the findings of the elements of nationalism). The presence of enemies tells us that the sentence could also belong to the category of enemies.

Having already made clear that ascribing cosmic proportions and transcendence to any element of nationalism is possible, this quote then illustrate how different sentences in a speech could easily fit into more than one category, for this sentence itself can fit into two main categories: the first and most obvious the element of sacrifice and sorrow; the second, a less fundamental, yet present, the element of enemies.

Here is another example to show that elements of nationalism are not mutually exclusive but are often intertwined. Again, from Charles de Gaulle: “Il n’y a pas le moindre doute que, de la crise terrible qu’elle traverse, sortira, pour la nation française, un vaste renouvellement” (“Not even the merest doubt exists, that from the terrible crisis that she is going through, a vast renewal will come to past for the French nation”). In this quote the cosmic proportions ascribed to the sorrows and renewal of France give transcendence to the events the French nation is going

through. Yet amid the cosmic proportions two elements of nationalism appear side to side: the element of reformation or restoration, and the element of sacrifice and sorrow. This quote then fits into both categories.

Applying cosmic proportions, which help conveying a sense of transcendence, when referring to victories as well as sacrifice and sorrows, the nation's destiny, in short any of the—and even multiple—elements of nationalism heightens nationalism in the people. Cosmic proportions and transcendence instill pride, courage, and unity in people. The more cosmic proportions are present in a speech, the more redemptive the speech becomes. The more transcendent people, events and the nation become, the more people feel united as a part of something big, and the more willing they become to act for the nation. Consequently, the more cosmic proportions and transcendence are present in a speech promoting national unity, the more nationalist the speech becomes.

Transcendence in de Gaulle's speeches seems to be key in his nationalist rhetoric. Cosmic proportions and transcendence are so important that they can make a difference in the grading of speeches. Their presence or lack of presence can make a difference between assigning a higher or lower grade to a speech. This explains why some of the speeches not containing all of the nationalist elements—even (and curiously) those of morals and values or destiny—have been graded as a two rather than a one. The same argument is valid in the opposite direction, meaning grading speeches as a one instead of a two even though these speeches might contain all of the elements of nationalism. This is true for the speech delivered on June 6, 1944.

2. Consistency in the presence of elements of nationalism

In addition, the consistency of the elements and tone throughout the speech are also important in the grading process. A speech consistently containing nationalist elements will be

given a higher grade (even a two). On the other hand, a speech that from time to time showing from time to time elements of nationalism, even though at these instances the elements carry a redemptive tone, will not be considered a two, precisely because the lack of consistency in the elements of nationalism it contains. For example, the speech entitled Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942, contains elements of nationalism, even cosmic proportions and transcendence. Yet the presence of these elements of nationalism is not constant, and the redemptive tone of the speech fades right after de Gaulle's reifications of France and Germany. Thus, even though the beginning of speech is highly nationalist, the fading of the redemptive tone along with the lack of consistency of nationalist elements, put this speech into the category of one, rather than two.

E. Conclusion

In this work ten speeches pertaining to de Gaulle's period corresponding to the years during the war have been analyzed. In this preliminary assessment the holistic approach has been helpful in reading and determining whether the speeches of Charles de Gaulle contain elements of nationalism. Six of the ten speeches were found to be highly nationalist and the other four somewhat nationalist. A note was made to the reader as to the non-exclusivity of the elements of nationalism and the ascribing of cosmic proportions and transcendence to values and actions of the people. It was also pointed out that de Gaulle uses much cosmic proportions and transcendence in his speeches. Additionally, it was also noted that consistency is important when categorizing speeches as highly nationalist. Lack of transcendence and consistency can diminish a speech from the category of highly nationalist to somewhat nationalist. The six coming chapters will analyze patterns in the presence of elements of nationalism in de Gaulle's rhetoric.

IV. On de Gaulle's vision of the world: morals and values

As described in the rubric: *Nationalism is a way of life and openly incorporates a set of values. Morals and values—especially duty and loyalty—are addressed as fundamental issues. Issues are not framed as a struggle between good or evil but as set of ideals to which we all can do and aspire.*

In this chapter I will explain the vision de Gaulle has of the world and France. I will go over his speeches and illustrate with examples the morals and values he cherishes the most in the French nation. In this section I will address three basic points: first, de Gaulle's general addresses of morals and values; second the presence of duty and loyalty and of the morals and values de Gaulle addresses the most; third the manner in which de Gaulle instills the French to gain or sustain morals and values.

A. The general or specific references to morals and values

The first point to address is de Gaulle's generality when addressing morals and values. To show this I will compare the specificity and development present in the speeches of de Gaulle to the presence and development of morals and values in the speeches of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Eamon de Valera and Sun Yat-Sen.

1. The specificity of morals and values in nationalist speeches

To briefly recall, FDR spoke on the value of work (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 509). Sun Yat-Sen devoted much of his speech describing and thus emphasizing the importance of Chinese morals and values, namely loyalty, filial devotion, kindness and love, and faithfulness and justice (Crosscup, 435-44). He developed them as a pluralist would have talked about issues: in a developed and logical way. Finally, while Eamon de Valera did not expand much on the Irish morals and values, he did was very specific in mentioning some of them. Among other

values, de Valera spoke of devotion to freedom, independence, persistence and learning (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 466-8).

David Ben Gurion is different in this regard: he does not spend much time talking about the values in a specific manner. Of the leaders previously analyzed, Gurion is the closest in this element of nationalism to what a populist leader would sound like, for the reader can sense a Manichean view, a dualistic view opposing things in a struggle of good vs. evil. Another characteristic of Gurion's pertaining to this element of nationalism, is that he does not address specific morals and values as the aforementioned leaders did. However, when Ben Gurion mentions Israeli forces or their leaders, he attributes morals and values he holds in high esteem, and presumes innate in the Jewish identity. Also Gurion implicitly includes morals and values in the Israelis and ascribes cosmic proportions to Israeli people or events: "Our relief column was led by a gallant and honored American Jew;" "the Army and champions of Israel;" "a monument to Jewish prowess in arms and in labor, the passport, now and always, to victory" (Crosscup 19, 20). Thus, as illustrated in these examples, though in not such an explicit manner morals and values are still present in Gurion's speeches. Ben Gurion stills mentions them with frequency, and inspires the Israelis to pursue them or retain them. As far as the dualistic view sensed in the speech of Ben Gurion, I would like to stress the fact that the emphasis of the speech is still placed on Israel, its people, its victories, and that there are other elements that discard Ben Gurion from being a populist.

2. The specificity of morals and values in Charles de Gaulle's speeches

A careful reading of the speeches of Charles de Gaulle reveals patterns in regards to morals, values, or qualities the French nation possesses. De Gaulle addresses them both in a general and a specific way. Examples of how de Gaulle addresses morals and values in a general

manner will be provided first, followed by examples of de Gaulle's referring to specific morals and values.

The following quotes show the pride de Gaulle has for the goodness of the French people. Note, that even though the morals, values or qualities are inspiring, the general does not address any particular moral or value in these quotes:

...de mettre en œuvre toutes nos ressources militaires, économiques, morales... (...of putting in action all our military, economic and moral resources...) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, October 27 1940)

...déterminer sans la France les conditions politiques, économiques, morales, dans lesquelles les habitants de la terre auront à vivre après le drame, serait un peu aventuré, car [...] beaucoup de nos semblables croient que toute grande construction humaine serait arbitraire et fragile s'il manquait le sceau de la France... (...determining without France the political, economic, and moral conditions in which the inhabitants of the earth will dwell in will be somewhat risky, since [...] many individuals believe that any grand human construction will be arbitrary and fragile without the seal of France...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Vous étudierez ici [...] quelles conditions morales, sociales, politiques, économiques... (You will study in here [...] under what moral, social, political, economic conditions [...]) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

...qui synthétisent les plus hautes valeurs intellectuelles et morales de la Nation... (...who synthesize the Nation's highest intellectual and moral values...) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

As noted before, de Gaulle talked about morals and values, but in doing so, did not even refer to one of them in particular. However, it is clear that to him morals are very important, and that he considered his co-nationals to possess them.

In spite of his vagueness, de Gaulle also addresses specific morals and values in his speeches. Consider the following quotes:

Nous nous sommes rendu à nous-mêmes le droit d'être Français fiers et libres. (We have given ourselves the right to be proud and free Frenchmen.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

Nous disons 'Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité', parce que notre volonté est de demeurer fidèles. (We say 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', because our will is to remain true) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

Je dis d'abord de ses devoirs [...] il s'agit de devoirs de guerre. (I say first of their duties [...] it is concerning the duties of war.)

...l'unité nationale... (...national unity...) (Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville, Paris, 25 août 1944)

...cette continuité de la volonté et j'ajoute, l'effort de notre peuple dans la guerre...les lois justes républicaines... (...this continuity of the will, and I add, the effort of our people in the war...the republican just laws...) (Palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

...notre peuple entier discerne...un peuple fort... (...our people as a whole discerns...a strong people...) (Palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

...beaucoup de Français n'acceptent pas la capitulation ni la servitude, pour des raisons qui s'appellent l'honneur, le bon sens, l'intérêt supérieur de la Patrie...leur devoir...la tâche nationale...vivent dans l'honneur et dans l'indépendance... (...many of the French

do not accept the capitulation nor the servitude, for reasons called honor, good sense, the supreme interest of the country...their duty...the national task...lived in honor and independence...) (Appel du 22 juin 1940)

...ne retire rien à la France en guerre de ses devoirs et de ses droits...[la France élève les hommes dans la] dignité et fraternité... (...does not exempt at all the struggling France of her duties and rights...[France elevates men in] dignity and fraternity...) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

...le devoir simple et sacré... (...the simple and sacred duty...) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

As seen in the previous quotes, de Gaulle makes particular mention of some morals and values of the French. Most commonly, he mentions honor, fidelity, union, fraternity, effort or work, and freedom. The bringing up of fidelity, rights and duty, is consistent with the morals specifically and most mentioned in nationalist rhetoric.

Due to its importance for its consistency with the descriptive rubric of nationalist elements, the presence of duty and loyalty, will be discussed in the coming section of the chapter.

3. The meaning of de Gaulle's specificity or generality when addressing morals and values for nationalism

At this point I would like to make a note that Charles de Gaulle does not spend as much time discussing the morals and values of the French nation as Sun Yat-Sen does for the Chinese. Yet de Gaulle is more explicit and less dualistic than Ben Gurion when it comes to address the morals and values of his nation. De Gaulle is probably somewhere in between de Sun Yat-Sen and Gurion in this element for he does bring out morals and values in an implicit and explicit

manner, but is not as dualistic as Gurion nor as explicit as Sun Yat-Sen, or even de Valera, in describing some of these social values.

The specificity and lack of it in referring to morals and values in de Gaulle's speeches raise interesting questions as to the pattern a nationalist speech should follow in tone and specificity when addressing morals and values. For instance, it could be questioned whether Sun is more nationalist than Ben Gurion or de Gaulle because Sun spends more time addressing the morals and values important in the Chinese than Ben Gurion does for the Israelis and de Gaulle for the French. On the other hand, the question if de Gaulle is less nationalist than Ben Gurion because de Gaulle is not as passionate or redemptive when referring to morals and values as Gurion is could also arise.

Perhaps more research could be done to determine this. However, my preliminary conclusion on this matter is that when analyzing a speech, the reader needs to consider the ensemble of the speech, and not concentrate only on one or two things (including elements and tone). The overall look and feel of the speech will be better to determine the categorization of the speech than the concentration of one or two elements of the rubric. This is one of the values of the holistic approach in speech analysis. David Ben Gurion, and Sun Yat-Sen are both nationalist leaders with different styles, nevertheless they are both nationalists. In this case, the specificity of the morals and values present in the speech could also be more reflective of the character of the leader than importance of addressing morals and values in a specific matter or the importance of the quantitative analysis of recurring words referring to morals and values.

Another question posed by the comparison of specificity in addressing morals and values among these leaders touches on the importance of the context in which the speech was delivered. De Valera and Sun were not at war or had not recently been at war when they delivered their

address, while Ben Gurion and de Gaulle were or had recently been at war. Thus, perhaps de Valera and Sun Yat-Sen were able to spend more time in defining and explaining the values of the nation than Ben Gurion and de Gaulle. Consequently, it is possible to contemplate that the specificity of the references to values can be contextual: more elaboration on morals and values will be done in times of peace, and more implications, vagueness and use of cosmic proportions in times of war. Again, more data is needed to assert this last argument, but the possibility is not to be completely disregarded.

The different styles, personalities, and historical context constitute attempts in trying to explain the reasons behind some of the differences in specificity when nationalist leaders address morals and values. Yet, it is clear to me that these assessments are preliminary and more research needs to be done in order to more firmly assert the previous explanation. Even though these questions are an interesting subject both for the interests of a political scientist and a person interested in knowing more about Charles de Gaulle, I will refrain from commenting further on them in order to proceed with the main purpose of this chapter, which is to describe the observations made from the presence of morals and qualities in General de Gaulle's speeches.

B. The presence of duty and loyalty in de Gaulle's speeches

Duty and loyalty are present in many of de Gaulle's speeches. Sometimes de Gaulle alludes to them in a direct way, by saying those exact—or similar—words. In the speech in London in 1944 General de Gaulle refers to the sacred duty; in the Appel of June 22 1940 he repeats the word *duty* or *duties* at least three times (in a speech of 539 words—not counting the subtitles). In addition, the following expressions are found in the speech given in Paris on August 25, 1944, “*Je dis d’abord de ses devoirs [...] il s’agit de devoirs de guerre,*” “*Ce devoir de guerre*” (“I say first of their duties [...] it is concerning the duties of war,” “This duty of war”);

from the speech at Brazzaville in 1944, “...ses devoirs...” (...her duties...), and from the speech from London in 1944, “...le devoir simple et sacré...” (“...the simple and sacred duty...”). Further, in other speeches de Gaulle uses expressions such as “*l’engagement solennel*” (“solemn commitment”) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940), “*fidèles et loyaux*” (true and loyal”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941), and the verb “*commander*” (to command) (Appel 22 juin 1940). All of these expressions convey a sense of duty, commitment and loyalty to the nation along with its history, values, and goodness the nation possesses.

Further, references to these values appear in seven of the ten speeches analyzed, which are: Appel du 22 juin 1940, Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1942, Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941, Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1944, Discours de l’hôtel de ville, 25 août 1944, and the Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944.

The reappearance of these values in de Gaulle’s speeches indicates that they are important to Charles de Gaulle. Curiously, expressions such as *devoir* appear in all of the seven speeches spoken of above, and expressions of loyalty, fidelity, and commitment, only appear on the speeches that already contain the word *devoir* or *devoirs* (duty or duties) as in to adding emphasis to these words. Six out the seven speeches containing the word *devoir* or *devoirs* contain one other expression referring to commitment or loyalty. Interestingly enough the speech that does not have words such as fidelity, loyalty or commitment is the one delivered at the Hôtel de Ville in Paris (in 1944). However, it is also good to observe that in this same speech the word *devoir* (or *devoirs*) appears four times in the speech (which is even more considerable with realizing that the speech is a short one comprised of 602).

Further, it is also interesting to note the proximity of the words *devoir(s)* (duty or duties) and the terms *France, Français, Française, français, françaises* (etc.). The expression *devoir(s)*

appears seventeen times throughout de Gaulle's speeches. This expression is present in the same sentence as the nationalist expressions *France, français* etc. in six different times. On a percentile basis, the total number of appearances of the word when *devoir(s)* equals 100 %, the words *France, français*, etc. accompany it the same sentence 35.3 % of the time.

A similar analysis was run for the expressions *loyal*, or *loyaux, fidèle*, or *fidelité* in proximity to *France, français* etc. These expressions appear in the same sentence two of the six times *loyal*, or *loyaux, fidèle*, or *fidelité* emerge in de Gaulle's speeches. On a percentile basis, the total number of appearances of the words *loyal*, or *loyaux, fidèle*, or *fidelité* (equaling 100 %), the words *France, français*, etc. accompany them in the same sentence is 33.3 % of the time.

The same analysis was performed for another expression that less frequently appears in de Gaulle's speeches but that connotes the meaning of commitment, duty and loyalty. The expression *engagement* (or any of its variations, such as *engagé*) shows five times in de Gaulle's speeches; its placement in the same sentence than the presence of the words *France, français*, etc. totals to five. In other words, *engagement* and *France, français*, etc. are placed in the same sentence 40% of the time.

For any of the above expressions, the proximity to the nationalist words *France, français*, etc. is highly frequent thus creating a strong link between the two concepts: duty and commitment and the nation of France. Note that the lowest percentage in which expressions of the values of duty or loyalty appear in the same sentence as *France, français*, etc. is 33.3%. In other words a third of the total times the values of duty and loyalty emerge in de Gaulle's rhetoric appear they are accompanied by the words *France, français* (and their variants) in the same sentence.

A similar analysis was carried to determine the proximity, this time measuring it within four sentences, of each of the aforementioned terms of values and of nationalism. To summarize these results, the terms *engagement* and *français* (and their respective variants) were near each other within four sentences 100% of the times the word *engagement* appeared; the terms *loyal* and *fidèle* are placed within four sentences of expressions such as *France* or *français* 133.3% of the total times the terms of moral value emerges in de Gaulle's speeches. Finally, *devoir(s)* is within four sentences of *France*, *français* and the like 123.5 % of the total time it emerges in de Gaulle's speeches. This analysis was not exclusive, meaning, that it did not exclude terms such as *France* or *French* for showing in the same sentence or two sentences after the term referring to the values analyzed. This is why two of the percentages are over 100.

As a way of clarification, almost every single time that any of the values of duty or loyalty come into sight, a nationalist expression is within four sentences near to it, the exceptions being three times where the word *devoir* or *devoirs* (duty or duties) show three times in the speech delivered at the Chaillot Palace, having no proximity to any of the nationalist expressions looked at in this analysis.

The very strong correlation in the proximity of these expressions suggests that de Gaulle considers these values to be important to France and its people. Furthermore, even though de Gaulle does not spend too much time explaining the importance of these values and what these values mean, because of the strong correlation in their appearance with *France*, *Français*, or *français*, he is able to instill the idea that the French have these values, that these values are as part of the French as any of the organs their body possess. Even more the consistent proximity of these words also convey the idea that the French practice the values of duty, loyalty and commitment in particular towards their nation and their co-nationals.

C. Instilling morals and values in the French

To answer to the question of how Charles de Gaulle instills the morals and values in the French, it is important to look at how he addresses those morals and values. We have seen that de Gaulle does talk about duty, loyalty, honor, courage, and other morals. Yet his way of addressing these issues is very particular to him. As a point of reference, Sun Yat-Sen was very specific and clear when he talked about morals to the Chinese. He specifically told them that the morals of duty and loyalty were part of their ancestors, and call the Chinese people to return to the practice of these morals and values”(Crosscup 435-44). He elaborated on what the morals and values included and explained why it was so important for the Chinese to re-gain these values (see the previous chapter). De Valera also gave continuity to the character of the Irish men and women. He spoke of values of old that have been carried into the present; those morals and values were an inherent part of the Irish (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 466-468). De Gaulle is similar yet different to these leaders.

As previously noted, de Gaulle does address morals and values, yet does not address them or expands them as issues like de Valera and Sun Yat-Sen do. Yet, de Gaulle’s close and frequent proximity in referring to values and *France* or the French, conveys the idea that the values and the nation of France are not separate concepts but closely connected, even so close that they are inseparable. This is one of the ways in which de Gaulle instills values in the French.

Another way in which de Gaulle inculcates morals and values in the French is by implication. Thus, he indirectly addresses morals and values but is able to convey them and their importance in his speeches. An example of this is found in the following quote: “*Tous ceux qui ont le courage de se remettre debout, malgré l’ennemi et la trahison, sont d’avance approuvés, accueillis, acclamés par tous les Français Combattants*” (“All who have the courage to re-arise,

in spite of the enemy and treason, have already been approved, received, acclaimed by all of the Combatant French”) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942). This quote honors the brave persons who will stand against the enemy, even in the midst of difficulty, even though currently, those who stand up against the enemy seem to be in a lower position than the enemy. However, this quote, particularly the last part of the sentence, by implication tells us more about the Combatant French—the Combatant or Free French who one day will be called simply French (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941).

The implication is that the Combatant French are already fighting against the Germans. They are brave, for they have risked their material possessions, comforts, lives, and their families to save France. They are already in their feet standing against the enemy, and they are welcoming and cheerful towards those who stand up for freedom.

The Combatant French are fighters, fearless, and lovers of freedom. They do not surrender in the midst of trials or afflictions, but they are able to stand up again and again for their nation, for their values, for their identity, for a free France, which will lead to a free and better world. The Combatant French are thus brave, true to their beliefs, praiseworthy, and consequently, heroic. Similarly to Ben Gurion, de Gaulle transmits the importance of morals and values of the French nation by implication.

Additionally, similar to Ben Gurion, de Gaulle attributes morals, values, and qualities of the French when speaking about them, “...*cette continuité de la volonté et, j’ajoute, l’effort de notre peuple dans la guerre, lui donne le droit, oui le droit, de faire valoir ses interest...*” (“...this continuity of will, and I add, the effort of our people in the war, gives them the right, yes the right, to assert their interest...”) (Discours du Palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944). In here, de Gaulle implies that the French have a strong will, a committed will to stand for their nation,

and that they put much effort in the war. Their will and effort gave them the rights of having a voice, an important voice in the world to put into effect France's interests.

In a similar style to Ben Gurion when attributing morals and values to his co-nationals, de Gaulle states: "...[cette libération] a mis en éclatante lumière à la fois la volonté de combattre, l'enthousiasme et la sagesse de notre peuple..." ("...[this liberation] has brought to blazing light the will to fight, the enthusiasm and wisdom of our people...") (Discours du Palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944). In this quote, de Gaulle brings forth the attributes of willing to fight, enthusiasm, and mostly, the wisdom of the French.

However, more than attributing qualities of tenacity, willingness to stand up for France and wisdom, Charles de Gaulle adds 'cosmic proportion' or transcendence to his statements in regards to the characteristics of the French. For instance, in the last quote, de Gaulle uses much imagery. He does not merely conform to describe the French, but states that their performance "...a mis en éclatante lumière..." ("...has brought to blazing light...") the qualities of the French.

A fourth way in which de Gaulle addresses and inculcate morals and values in the French is by assuming that they are an inherit part of their identity and give them continuation from the past to the present and into the future. The following quotes illustrate this notion:

Nous disons : "Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité," parce que notre volonté est de demeurer fidèles aux principes démocratiques que nos ancêtres ont tirés du génie de notre race et qui sont l'enjeu de cette guerre pour la vie ou la mort. (We say: 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', because it is our will to remain true to our ancestors' democratic principles, principles that they drew from the genius of our race and that are at the stake of this war, for life or death.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

De Gaulle here assumes and implies that the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity are an inherent part of the French, at least since the French Revolution. Further, he also implies that the race (or races) that contributed to the French nation is gifted, for he qualifies it as “genius”. But coming back to the morals and values, the values that served as the slogan during the French Revolution are recalled here by Charles de Gaulle. The assumption that de Gaulle makes in regards to the French possessing those values is emphasized by the verb *demeurer* (to remain). Furthermore, de Gaulle mixes the inherited part of these values with the value of loyalty by using the words “*demeurer fidèles*” (“to remain true”), which truly conveys the idea of ingrained principles, morals or values within the French people.

A similar pattern is present in the following quote: “*Nous nous sommes rendus à nous-mêmes le droit d’être des Français fiers et libres*” (“We have given ourselves the right to be proud and free French) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). With this quote de Gaulle implies that first, those French who have resisted Germany are proud of being French. They are also free, which seems to be part of being French. Second, that because they are proud and free, consequently implying that they are French, that for a long time (perhaps from the beginnings of time—which will be a cosmic proportion), people from the nation of France have been proud and free, and have fought for the rights that come with being French. In this sentence then we have three implications, each of which is implied but yet they all significantly add to the idea that French inherently possess certain moral codes or values because of their nationality.

Coming back to the presence of cosmic proportions and transcendence, the previous two quotes stand also as examples of them. By not mentioning a specific time where the values of “*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*” (or the genius of the French race) started, de Gaulle is ascribing cosmic proportions and transcendence to these values. The same thing can be said for the quote

found in the previous paragraph. However, there are other instances where the ascription of cosmic proportions and transcendence are more evident in de Gaulle's rhetoric:

...ce devoir sacré... (...this sacred duty...) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940)

Il n'y a plus maintenant, pour nous, d'autre raison, d'autre intérêt, d'autre honneur, que de rester, jusqu'au bout, des Français dignes de la France. (There is no other interest, reason or honor for us now, than to remain, until the end, French worthy of France.)

(Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

By adding expressions such as *sacré* (sacred) and *jusqu'au bout* (until the end), de Gaulle adds cosmic proportions and transcendence to the actions, values, and ultimately the identity of the French.

To sum up then, there are at least four ways in which de Gaulle instills morals and values in the French. The first is by specifically addressing them and describing them. This is the least recurring way in which de Gaulle instills morals and values to the French, nevertheless it is present. The second way is by implication through the adjectives that describe France or the French. A third manner in which he instills values in the French is also by implication and continuation. This defers from the previous in that the description of the nation is more subtle, but also in that there is a sense that the values or qualities of the French are an inherit characteristic of the French, one that has been continued and will be continued from and for a long time. Lastly, de Gaulle addresses and instills values in the French by ascribing cosmic proportions and transcendence to the acts and values of the French nation—*devoir sacré* (sacred duty). This is connected to the previous idea of continuity: the continuity of a long tradition, from a remote past to a “forever” in the future gives importance and transcendence to the people of France and the values they (according to de Gaulle) hold.

D. Morals and values highlighted by other elements of nationalism

There is even another way in which morals and values are not only present but even emphasized in de Gaulle's speeches. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the elements of nationalism are often times interconnected. Another way in which morals and values surface in de Gaulle's speeches is through other elements of nationalism. Since it will take a few pages to develop to clearly show through examples and theory that morals and values are highlighted in other elements of nationalism, I reserve this discussion for further chapters. As a note, please refer to chapters VI, VII, VIII and IX (particularly pages 101-112, 129-131, 158-163, 164-176 and 199-205) for details on this point.

E. Conclusion

As seen in this chapter, even though de Gaulle does not address morals and values in a developed way as Sun Yat-Sen does, their presence is strong in de Gaulle's rhetoric. It is evident that de Gaulle does not ask the French to re-acquire those values; rather he assumes that morals and values are already present in the French because they form part of the French identity. Thus, even though de Gaulle might not address morals and values exactly as issues or expand on them as a pluralist would and like other nationalist do, the principle of refereeing to morals and values remains: de Gaulle feels that high morals and values are inherent in the French nation; he is proud of them, and makes Frenchman and Frenchwomen feel that pride for the attributes they as part of the nation possess.

The assumption that the French already have those values is an indicator of their presence in nationalist rhetoric and, at the same time, is a way to instill them in the people of the French nation, to praise the French people for these values, make them proud of and hence, inspire them to sustain them. People are prompt to identify and feel unity and pride with others from the same

community who have the same values and attributes. De Gaulle describes the French with moral qualities and implies others in the way, making the presence of morals and values subtle but strong. Moreover, de Gaulle emphasizes the importance and greatness of these attributes by ascribing them cosmic proportions and linking them from the past to the present and into the future. By describing these values, qualifying the French with values, implying that these values are inherit in the French, linking the morals and values to the past, present and future, and ascribing them cosmic proportions, the presence of morals and values in de Gaulle's speeches becomes very strong and Charles de Gaulle succeeds to inspire and instill these virtues in the French.

VI. On The celebration and remembrance of French victories as a source of identity

As stated in the rubric: Victorious moments and people are brought into remembrance in order to create a sense of a shared source of communal identity, and to convey a sense of transcendence over struggles or common chores of the time.

As other nationalists, de Gaulle brings to memory the victories the French as a nation have had. In this section I will address the following issues: first, if Charles de Gaulle talks about victories in a general or is a specific manner. Second, I would like to note any particular victories de Gaulle bring out and if there are some in particular that recur throughout his speeches. Third, since cosmic proportions and reification of the nation (as well as of other nationalist symbols) have originally been placed in this element, I will address other important reifications de Gaulle might make, but in particular I will focus on France's reification and explore the contribution this reification makes to de Gaulle's nationalism. Finally, I will address the manner in which de Gaulle instills pride, cohesion, and identity by the way in which he addresses the second element of nationalism—the celebration of victories as a part of the nation's source of identity.

A. General and specific mention of victories

As with other nationalist leaders, Charles de Gaulle recalls victories in his speeches. By evocating victories, de Gaulle appeals to pride and unity in the French people. The General is successful at bringing the past to the minds of the French and reminding them of their source of identity as a nation. In addition, he is successful at tying past victories to recent and even future victories.

1. De Gaulle's generality in celebrating recent victories

For the most part de Gaulle speaks of victories in a general way. At times he tries to be specific, yet, does not really expand on victories or simply lacks description of victorious battles.

Interestingly, most of the times where de Gaulle refers to victories, he refers to recent victories, thus celebrating more recent than past victories. This is probably due to the period the French are going through, since these speeches were given during World War II and the French Resistance, a time when the French needed more current examples to further inspire them to stand for the liberation of France.

Before providing some quotes to illustrate this point, I would like to draw attention to the cosmic proportions added to the victories de Gaulle mentions. It is through these cosmic proportions that de Gaulle is successful at instilling nationalist pride by connecting the past to the present and give transcendence to the current victories the French experience.

The following quotes are examples of how de Gaulle addresses victories generally or in a specific way. Again, even though he might refer to a specific victory, he is still vague about its details. From the Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942: “*Partout l’ennemi chancelle et fléchit*” (“Everywhere the enemy totters and weakens”); from the speech given at the Hôtel de Ville in Paris 1944 : “*[Paris] libéré par lui-même, libéré par son peuple avec le concours des armées de la France, avec l’appui et le concours des armées de la France*” (“[Paris] freed by himself, freed by his people with the support and aid of the armies of France”); lastly from a Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944: “*L’Afrique, l’Italie, l’océan et le ciel ont vu leur force et leur gloire renaissantes. La Terre natale les verra demain!*” (“Africa, Italy, the ocean and the sky have seen their strength and their reborn glory. Their own soil will see them tomorrow!”).

The examples above show that de Gaulle lacks specificity in celebrating particular victories. He rather talked about them in general terms, without referring to a particular place or date where the battles took place, even when he addresses the recent battles France has won against any country belonging to the Axis powers, which are very recent battles. In the quotes where he mentions the victories in Africa against Italy, the only specifics provided are Africa, Italy, ocean and sky (and even these terms become broad), and the coming battle of the next day in French soil. Even in the case of the struggle to free Paris from Germany, an important victory for the French, de Gaulle does not mention tactics, weaponry, heroes (soldiers or citizens), time or dates.

One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that this is just the way in which de Gaulle speaks. De Gaulle does not like specificity. He likes vagueness just as other pluralist speakers, love being specific about issues or things to be addressed to their audiences. As seen in other chapters, Gaulle's vagueness is not only limited to his references of French heroes or victories, but it is rather consistent in many other elements and aspects of his rhetoric. In a nutshell, this might just be de Gaulle's style.

Another possibility for de Gaulle's lack of specificity in referring to victorious moments and people of France consists in de Gaulle's unwillingness to distort data. By talking about victories, particularly recent ones, in general terms, de Gaulle did not have to provide numbers that might not be favorable or might even discourage the French from fighting against the Germans. One could even go to the extent of saying that perhaps the battles spoken of in General de Gaulle's speeches were not even that important, but by mentioning them the general brought more hope and instilled more confidence and pride in the French without presenting false facts or numbers to them.

Another explanation contemplates the historical context of France. During WWII the French felt truly discouraged; we could say that some of them had almost mentally and morally lost the fight. Because they had been occupied by the Germans, some of the French might have lost part of their identity, their morale. As part of losing their morale, they lost their attachment to their nation and their co-nationals, for some of them, at least those in the Vichy government, were collaborating with France's long-time enemy: Germany. Since some French felt a lack of attachment or the lack of communal identity, by being occupied by foreigners, it would thus follow that they would feel very distanced from their national heroes and victories of the past. Since the French lost their morale and needed more recent examples of victorious battles, characters and deeds, de Gaulle sought to point them out in his speeches. Providing recent examples in a brief and general way would be enough to lift up the decaying morale of the French.

A fourth possibility for de Gaulle's generality in addressing victorious moments and characters of France is that through the vagueness of his terms, de Gaulle is more able to give victorious battles and people transcendence. As illustrated by the previous quotes, since the victorious battles and people of France are not located in a specific time or with specific people or numbers, it is easier to ascribe to them cosmic proportions and give transcendence over time and space to these victories. Thus in this way, it is easier to provide a sense of belonging and inclusion to the nation to the people of France, attach them to the past, present and future, and overcome both notions of time and space. The French are fighters, they have always won, and they will always win.

The four possibilities described above are attempts to explain de Gaulle's lack of specificity when mentioning national heroes or victories. Although this exercise provides

insights into de Gaulle's character, and probably a deeper analysis to further explore these considerations, the fact that de Gaulle often refers to victorious moments or characters of the French nation, is an indicator that as Sun, de Valera, and other nationalist leaders, de Gaulle feels pride in the history of the French nation. Through the occurrences of victories de Gaulle shows that France has had victories in the past, that they will continue in the present and near future, and that these victories will carry into the future. The element of celebration of the past and that of sharing a purpose a communal identity still comes out in these speeches in spite of de Gaulle's lack of specificity when mentioning a communal source of identity based in victorious moments or characters of France.

2. De Gaulle's generality in celebration victories of a more distant past

The victories addressed so far seem to refer to recent events. However, as a nationalist leader de Gaulle alludes to the victories in a more distant past. In other words, consistent to a nationalist leader, de Gaulle celebrates past victories as a source of identity for the current nation of France.

I could include here several lines (probably even pages) of de Gaulle's celebration of a source of identity, an allusion to a more distant past. However, I would limit myself to present and discuss quotes referring to two components of the French identity de Gaulle holds in high esteem. The first one is important to the French because it has been a significant symbol of the sovereignty of the French nation dating from the Middle Ages. The second one is important in terms of the contribution the French nation has made to the world with ideas that surged in the 18th century, which were fought for years in France. These last ideas touch on the identity and are closely linked to de Gaulle's vision of France and the world.

The first important reference to the French source of identity I would like to discuss is what became the symbol of de Gaulle's party. It is found in the speech delivered at the Chaillot Palace in 1944. It reads: "*Et vous, hommes et femmes de la Résistance Française, vous tous croisés à la croix de la Lorraine, vous qui êtes le ferment de la nation dans son combat pour l'honneur et pour la liberté*" ("And you men and women of the French Resistance, all of you crossed at the Lorraine cross, you, who are the ferment of the nation in her struggle for honor and freedom"). This statement is powerful in the minds of the French because it alludes to the Lorraine Cross. The Lorraine Cross has been a symbol of French identity throughout the years, even for several centuries. It was used in France in Medieval Times, and thus it is associated with an ancient past, a common source of identity that has obviously impacted French society throughout time.

The Lorraine Cross is immediately tied to a defining time period and one particular character of France' history: the Hundred Years War and Joan of Arc. During this war France fought to remain one as a nation, expel invaders and, overall, to remain sovereign and independent from a foreigner government. Joan of Arc is herself a symbol of French nationalism because she received the divine commission to set the French nation free. She carried the Lorraine Cross and successfully drove out the foreigners (in this case the English) from France. France, after over a hundred years of war, regained its sovereignty and as a result the French were able to reinstate a French ruler for the French nation.

Recalling the struggle to become free from "any external constraint", the fight to not be governed by foreigners, the Lorraine Cross was also used as a symbol of resistance by the French against the annexation and rule of German foreigners during the annexation of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany following the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871).

As seen in the previous paragraphs, the Lorraine Cross is a powerful symbol of struggle for French sovereignty. When de Gaulle brings out the Lorraine Cross in his rhetoric he is making reference to a not-so-distant past (however more distant than battles won during WWII) as well as a very distant past in the minds and spirits of the French, and using a symbol under which the French can rally against foreigners and keep their honor and freedom, in sum, their French identity.

The second reference celebrated as a source of identity includes the ideas that led to the French Revolution. De Gaulle alludes to them in several speeches in different ways. The following quotes illustrate how de Gaulle feels about the ideals, ideas, and progress France has had and made in the past, particularly those belonging to the Enlightenment and most particularly to the ones belonging to the French Revolution. From the Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944: “...la nation dont l’immortel génie est désigné pour les initiatives qui, par degrés, élèvent les hommes vers les sommets de dignité et fraternité...” (“...the nation from which the immortal genius is designed for initiatives that, by degrees, lift men to the summits of dignity and fraternity...”); and from the speech delivered in the Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941: “*Nous disons ‘Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité’, parce que notre volonté est de demeurer fidèles aux principes démocratiques que nos ancêtres ont tirés du génie de notre race et qui sont l’enjeu de cette guerre pour la vie ou pour la mort*” (“We say ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’, because our will is to remain true to the democratic principles that our forbearers pulled from the genius of our race, which are at the heart of this war to life or to death”). There are several other instances in de Gaulle’s speeches, where he refers particularly to the ideals behind the French Revolution. Note that he does not explicitly say “the French Revolution”, however, he refers to the genius and the values that served as a banner in the French Revolution.

It is also important to notice here the interconnection of the first two elements of nationalism: the references of morals and values, and the celebration of victories as to remember and celebrate French national identity. In these quotes, De Gaulle refers to history, to a source of French identity. However, through it he is also reaffirming and inspiring the morals and values the French as a nation have. The morals, values, genius, in sum the progress the French nation has made and brings out to the world, is part of the source of the French identity.

B. International experience as part of the French identity

In addition to the references of symbols of national sovereignty and progress –through the implementation of values such as Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity—Charles de Gaulle alludes to the rich international experience and role the French nation has as part of its identity.

The speeches transmitted from London on November 8, 1942 and June 6, 1944, the speech at the Chaillot Palace in 1944 and the one at Brazzaville on January 30, 1944, make clear that de Gaulle is proud of the history of the French nation in the international arena. In the aforementioned speech of Brazzaville de Gaulle affirmed:

Depuis un demi-siècle, à l'appel d'une vocation civilisatrice vieille de beaucoup de centaines d'années [...] les Français ont pénétré, pacifié, ouvert au monde, une grande partie de cette Afrique noire... elle est la France, c'est-à-dire, la nation dont l'immortel génie est désigné pour les initiatives qui, par degrés, élèvent les hommes vers les sommets de dignité et de fraternité..." (From a half-century ago, responding to the call of a civilized vocation dating from several centuries ago, the French penetrated, pacified, and opened to the world a big part of this black Africa... she is France, meaning, the nation from which the immortal genius is designed for the initiatives that by degrees elevate men to the summits of dignity and fraternity...)

Reaching further down in time, and claiming authority and its world position in deciding the terms for Germany after the war, de Gaulle states:

...il se trouve qu'aucune puissance n'est plus intéressée que la France à ce qui touche au voisin dont elle a eu depuis plus de deux milles ans, à s'occuper plus que quiconque et qu'il serait bien aléatoire de vouloir édifier quelque chose en dehors du principal intéressé... (...it happens that none of the world power has more interest than France in regards to her neighbor, which neighbor France has had to deal with for over two thousand years, and that it would be very risky to want to build anything excluding the most interested party...)

Further in the same speech general de Gaulle declares,

...décider sans la France quoi que ce soit qui concerne l'Europe serait une grave erreur; d'abord parce que la France est intégrée à l'Europe, au point que ce qui touche une partie quelconque du vieux continent la touche elle-même [...] ensuite parce qu'elle s'honore de pouvoir apporter à la solution de chacun des problèmes européens une expérience assez chèrement acquises et une confiance assez exceptionnelle de la part de beaucoup... (...making a decision, whatever the decision might be, in reference to Europe without France will be a terrible mistake; first because France is integrated to Europe, to the point... that whatever regards a piece of the old continent regards France herself [...] then because [France] gets honor in being able to contribute to the solution of each of the European problems with an experience that has been dearly acquired and an exceptional confidence that many have on her) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944).

Through these quotes it is evident that de Gaulle feels that the French nation has longtime contributed to the world. The French nation knows its neighbors and has gained much experience and wisdom which, de Gaulle argues, are to be included in the aftermath of the war.

To sum up the two sections, the French should be proud of their nation for what their collective identity throughout time has achieved both within and outside the nation. In de Gaulle's view the source of identity of the French is both found within France—the internal struggles and progress the nation has made in itself—and the presence and contributions it has made throughout the years in the international arena. There is a sense that France has played an important role in the world, a role which needs not to be abandoned but pursued, even perhaps emphasized. De Gaulle makes references to the Lorraine Cross, the ideas present in the French Revolution, and France's vast international experience with its neighbors, in its continent and in other places of the world, all of which take part in the French national source of identity.

C. Reifications

In the speech given at the Hôtel de Ville in Paris in 1944, de Gaulle exclaimed: "*Paris! Paris outragé! Paris martyrisé! mais Paris libéré!*" ("Paris! Insulted Paris! Martyred Paris! But freed Paris!"). De Gaulle describes France with the following terms : "*la France veuille*" ("France wants") (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944) ; "*la France Combattante*" ("combatant France") (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942) ; "*la France rentre à Paris chez elle*" ("France enters home through Paris") (Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris, 1944) ; "*la voix de la France*", "*l'âme éternelle de la France*" ("France's voice", "the eternal soul of France") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). All of the above quotes, in addition to the allegorical reification of France and Germany from the speech given in December 1942, are considerable evidence of the consistent reification of France –or parts of

it—in de Gaulle speeches. However, one reification appears in more constantly and is more emphasized in de Gaulle’s speeches: the reification of France.

1. The reification of France

As the reader can appreciate, the references to the great past are surrounded by cosmic proportions. However, de Gaulle raises up the cosmic proportions by the many reifications he makes throughout his speeches, particularly the reification of France. The reification of France cannot be more evident than in the speech given in London on December 24, 1942. The speech is entitled *Message adressé aux enfants de France* (Message addressed to the children of France). As previously noted, this is an example of a speech graded as one due to the lack of consistency of the elements of nationalism throughout the speech.

The speech begins with a redemptive tone and is full of elements of nationalism, particularly those of celebration of the past as a source of identity, the cosmic proportions and reifications made to the nations of France and Germany. In this speech de Gaulle sets up an allegory treating France as the most virtuous, most noble, and the best of ladies; and, on the other hand, treats Germany as a coward, proud and jealous woman. Through this allegory, it is clearly seen that to de Gaulle, the nation of France embodies all virtues, morals and values anyone should aspire to. Germany on the contrary, represents the lack of these qualities. Aside from the combination of three elements of nationalism in this allegory, the most important point in here is the reification of France, for France is seen as a lady and is treated as such in this speech. While this is probably the speech charged the most with reifications of France, this reification of France or its cities is rather common in de Gaulle’s speeches.

The reification of France is an important idea from the identity of the French nation. First, the reification of France is significant in that it helps people, particularly the French, to better

visualize the nation and the ideals the French nation is supposed to have. This is best seen in the allegory de Gaulle makes in December of 1942, where he makes statements such as, “...*parmi mesdames les nations, aucune n’a jamais été plus belle, meilleure, ni plus brave que notre dame la France...*” (“...among the nation-ladies, none has ever more beautiful, brave, nor better than our lady of France...”) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, December 1942). Reifications, allegories, and metaphors are common when leaders or writers wish to convey important ideas into the minds and hearts of the people. In what follows, I will provide several examples of how allegories, in particular personifications, are present in the French culture. I would like to state first, that de Gaulle does not mention any of these examples; nevertheless, these examples illustrate the importance of France’s reification in de Gaulle’s speeches and the French culture.

2. A few connections in the reification of France

The first example is the well-known work in French literature by Guillaume de Lorris, *The Romance of the Rose*. *The Romance of the Rose* is an allegorical work that illustrates how a knight or a gentleman is to woo his beloved. In the dream presented in this work, the man has to enter a garden in order to pick the rose (which rose represents the woman). In the quest of the rose, the man has to overcome challenges such as Hate, Miserliness, Sadness, Perfidy, and Baseness. All of these challenges are personified. The descriptions provided for each of them are detailed and reflective of what each one of these words means. Likewise, the virtues acquired by the knight are also described and personified. By putting an ugly or pretty face and personifying these defects and qualities, de Lorris is more effective at conveying the characteristics needed in a knight to obtain the love of his lady. The challenges to be overcome by the ugly faces of Hate, Miserliness and Baseness (among others) become clearer, and the virtues of Courage, become more inspiring and desirable. The reifications of these desirable and non-desirable

characteristics makes the story and development of the knight more powerful, since the reader is better able to visualize the knight's ugly and difficult trials. This is achieved through an allegorical work, which at its center has the reification of morals, values, virtues and vices.

The Old and New Testament of the Bible provide similar allegories or personifications. I would like to make a small pause to explain that Catholic tradition has been strongly present in French history and has consequently, greatly influenced French culture. De Gaulle, being a traditionalist, was raised with the catholic tradition, and most French at his time would identify with Biblical passages. Again, I would like to clarify that de Gaulle does not quote from the Bible, but that the example I put below, serves to illustrate the use of personification, touching also on the French culture or part of their source of identity, in this case, because of the strong influence the catholic tradition has had on France.

In one occasion the evangelist records a comparison between Christ's Church at His Second Coming to ten virgins waiting for the bridegroom. In this parable, Christ was the bridegroom. He spoke of ten virgins, five of which carried extra oil for their lamps—and thus were wise—five of which were foolish and had oil only in their lamps. The wise virgins were prepared to wait and receive the groom whenever he would come; the five foolish virgins were unprepared and their ability to receive the groom became restricted to the time the oil in their lamps would give them. At the end of the parable, the five wise virgins were able to receive the groom and go with him to the marriage, while the foolish virgins were unable to enter the marriage because they had not taken the extra oil with them (see King James Version, Matt. 25.1-12). A reading of this passage suggests that the ten virgins represent people within the Church of Christ, and the oil in their lamps represent their spiritual preparation, which includes the effort put into developing qualities or virtues expected from those belonging to the a

collective identity, the Church of Jesus-Christ. While the virtues are not necessarily reified in this parable, the reader has the image of ten virgins: pure and noble women, waiting for the bridegroom. And while the oil—and not a person—represents the efforts in developing Christ-like attributes, the virgins are the one holding the lamps, the imagery of the virgins is strongly present in the parable. The particularly interesting characteristic of this parable is that the ten virgins represent people, but people from the Church or Christ, a collective identity. In this case, the number of people each virgin represents does not matter. What matters is that virgins, representing a collective identity comprised by members of the Church of Jesus Christ, were prepared and had the attributes necessary to go with Christ, represented by the groom.

Much like de Lorris and the writings of the Christian tradition, Charles de Gaulle expresses the virtues and morals possessed by the French nation by personifying France. Reification is more effective at conveying the characteristics France as a nation has, which characteristics need to resurface in each French individual. Through its reification of France, a nation with a 'soul', the most beautiful, brave, in sum, the best of 'all ladies' become more inspiring and desirable, like the rose in de Lorris work. Further, France, much like the Church of Christ, is a collective identity, which collective identity is reified to more effectively reach the hearts and minds of the people belonging to that collective identity precisely so that people can better identify with the reifications and the story and virtues they embody.

The reification of France into a woman is an idea dating at least from the French Revolution. Marianne, as the French Republic is usually referred to, is linked to the ideas of Reason and Liberty. However, I would also like to point out, that this reification is possibly linked to a more distant past, a past also connected with the French source of identity.

As pointed out, *The Romance of the Rose* is a well-known allegorical work in the French literature. It dates back to the 12th or 13th century, and it narrates and explains the important challenges a knight must overcome and the attributes or virtues he must acquire in order to gain the rose. However, earlier in French literature, women have been idealized as the embodiment of morals, and virtues men should aspire and struggle to acquire. The literature on Courtly Love serves this purpose.

In the *Lais de Marie de France*, we find the story of Lanval, a vassal of King Arthur, who is overlooked by the king and his fellow knights. One day, as he wandered in a meadow, he finds two beautiful women who take him to the lady they worked for. The latter is described as “...*un modèle de générosité, de sagesse et de beauté...*” (“...a model of generosity, of wisdom and of beauty...”) exceeding even the Roman emperor Octavian and “...*[la] reine Sémiramis, à l’apogée de sa richesse, de sa puissance et de sa sagesse...*” (“...Queen Semiramis, at the peak of her wealth, of her power, of her wisdom...”) (Lais de Marie de France, 149).

In the story, Lanval makes a vow to never reveal the affair with his lady, a vow, which he breaks later in the story to defend himself against the accusations of King Arthur’s wife. Yet, throughout the story, Lanval, by obeying the instructions of his lady, learns loyalty, fidelity, generosity, courtesy, and becomes highly regarded among his fellow knights, and desirable to Arthur’s wife. Due to his fidelity to his mistress, Lanval rejects Queen Guinevere’s advancements, which takes him to a trial for his life. At the end of the story, the mistress comes at the rescue of her lover and end up riding to Avalon together.

In this story, the mistress is described in very broad terms, and unlike in other stories by Marie de France, not much time is spent in describing the spiritual attributes or the lady. Yet, the audience familiar with similar courtly love stories can fill in the blanks and imagine the attributes

this lady must have, because in addition to the attributes ascribed to women in other Courtly Love stories, this lady is described as a model for generosity and wisdom, and teaches Lanval important moral values.

The point I would like to stress here is that in medieval French literature, women were not only idealized, but became the embodiment of ideals, ideals towards which the knights worked for in order to become deserving of their mistress, be better individuals, and even to be saved. Thus, in a sense, virtues, morals, and values are embodied in women, in this case in Lanval's mistress. Lanval's mistress represents what all men should aspire to, work for and even become, to be deserving of physical, moral, and spiritual beauty. In a similar way, de Gaulle describes France as the embodiment of these ideals (honor, loyalty, fidelity, duty, wisdom, etc.), ideals into which French may find their identity, their ideals, their restoration and salvation³.

Additionally, throughout his speeches de Gaulle links the love and protection of France to the virtues and values developed in the French, just as the love protection of the lady makes the knights develop important attributes. For instance,

Nous sommes de Français de toutes origines, de toutes conditions, de toutes opinions, qui avons décidé de nous unir dans la lutte pour notre pays... C'est de ce foyer qu'a jailli, chaque jour plus haute et plus ardente, la grande flamme française que nous a désormais trempés... Car c'est à l'appel de la France que nous avons obéi... ("We are French of all origins, of all conditions, of all opinions, who have decided to unite ourselves in the fight for our country... It is from this hearth that has emerged each day more burning and high, the great French flame that has from now on soaked us... Because it is to France's call that we obeyed...") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

Note the chivalrous elements in de Gaulle's quotes: fight, hearth, more ardent and great flame, all of which refer to the relation him or the French have with France.

In reference to the resistant movement for France's sake, de Gaulle states:

Nous étions une poussière d'hommes. Nous sommes maintenant un bloc inébranlable.

Nous nous sommes rendus à nous-mêmes le droit d'être des Français fiers et libres...Il

n'y a plus maintenant, pour nous, d'autre raison, d'autre intérêt, d'autre honneur, que de

rester, jusqu'au bout, des Français dignes de la France. ("We were a dust of men. We

now are an unshakeable block...There is not any other now, no other interest, no other

honor but to remain, until the end, French worthy of France.") (Discours de l'Albert Hall,

Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

Note how in this last set of quotes, the French fighting for France have changed for the better, precisely because they fight for France.

Finally, in speaking about the importance of helping France de Gaulle claims,

En premier lieu et tout simplement parce qu'elle est la France, c'est-à-dire la nation dont

l'immortel génie est désigné pour les initiatives qui, par degrés, élèvent les hommes vers

les sommets de dignité et de fraternité où, quelque jour tous pourront s'unir. (In first

instance and in all simplicity, because she is France, meaning the nation from which the

immortal genius is designed for initiatives that, by degrees, lift men to the summits of

dignity and fraternity.) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

In sum, through these last examples, it is clear that to de Gaulle, the nation of France inspires, teaches and unites the French; she gives them strength, pride and freedom. She teaches them obedience, loyalty and gives them honor if the French accept her and defend her. Lastly, she inspires all men, in particular French men and women, to reach higher, to the top of dignity

and fraternity. These descriptions seem to perfectly fit the descriptions and purposes of the “lady” in Courtly Love, and the virtues the knight develops when wooing her beloved.

Note how virtues, morals, and values are a prominent theme in the previous discussion. Even though the reification of France, due to its transcendence, has been placed and discussed in the second element of nationalism, it is very closely linked to the vision of the world Charles de Gaulle has. In other words, the previous discussion also has part under the first element of nationalism, and thus, influences greatly the presence of both elements of nationalism.

3. Implications through the reification of France

The reification of France is important because it provides one source of identity to the French. France is reified into a woman. This is significant, not only because of the influence of the catholic tradition and mix of other traditions in the Middle Ages, but also because it indicates that all of the French have one common source of identity, for they are all begotten children of the same mother: France. This is significant considering that for the fact of descending from the same mother, the French are brothers and sisters; they have a filial relationship.

This filial relationship is enhanced when considering the history of France, particularly the times of struggle when French had to unite in order to achieve national sovereignty or ideals. A time to consider, which time also sends us back to a source of identity, is the time of the French Revolution, where the slogan “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” was used. Note the emphasis on Fraternity and de Gaulle’s reification of France, making it a woman, putting it into the position of a mother, the mother of all French.

Another important facet of making France a woman, particularly considering its motherhood, is the carrying and nurturing side of it. Just as a mother cares, nurtures, teaches, and in a sense, leads her children, France, as the mother of the French, possesses these same

attributes and puts them in action. This idea touches again on the vision of France and the world de Gaulle holds, and to the celebration of a common source of identity for the French.

In addition, for those familiar with French culture, this concept of motherhood, a carrying and leading character, brings to the minds the famous painting of Eugène Delacroix. In this painting Liberty, portrayed as a woman and thus could also be interpreted a France, leads the French people against the bad government in the July Revolution of 1830. The consideration that France and Liberty are thus not new to the French at the time of WWII, since from the time of the Revolution Marianne was linked to Reason and Liberty, and appears as such in Delacroix's painting. Considering that de Gaulle addresses France as a woman, the woman holding the flag could easily be France, for de Gaulle also cherished Liberty. Furthermore, note in the preceding quotes how often de Gaulle does speak about "France" and "Liberty" within the same sentence⁴.

As a parenthesis, in Delacroix's painting, Liberty (or Marianne) reflects the unity of the French people from the upper and lower classes because it portrays all of the French as united in the struggle against the current government, against tyranny, and for ideals fought for in the revolution of 1789, particularly that of Liberty. This idea is reflected in de Gaulle's rhetoric, particularly in following statements:

Nous sommes des Français de toutes origines, de toutes conditions, de toutes opinions, qui avons décidé de nous unir dans la lutte de notre pays...Il n'y a pas à cet égard, la moindre distinction à faire entre les Français de Brazzaville, de Beyrouth, de Damas [...] de Strasbourg [...] ceux des Français qui vivent ne vivent plus que pour vouloir la libération nationale. (We are French of all origins, of every condition, of all kinds of opinions, who have decided to unite in the struggle of our country...In this regard, not even the slightest distinction is to be made among the French of Brazzaville, of Beyrouth,

of Damas [...] of Strasbourg [...] those of the French who live, live only to desire national liberation.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

As in Delacroix's painting, de Gaulle unites all French under the banner of Liberty, under the banner of France's liberty.

Thus, through the reification of France, de Gaulle mentally sends the French back to a source of identity, reflected in Delacroix' famous painting *Liberté Guidant le Peuple* (*Liberty Guiding the People*). Even though de Gaulle does not explicitly refer to Delacroix's painting or talks about La Marianne, his reification of France—along with the powerful ideas present in the French culture in La Marianne and this painting—instills a more powerful sense of nationalism in the French.

4. Transcendence through the reification of France

Transcendence is an important part of France's reification in de Gaulle's rhetoric and closely linked to the identity of the French nation. It is widely known that the French Republic is represented as a woman whose name is Marianne. This name is composed by the names *Marie* and *Anne*, which were very common in France during the Middle Ages (Marianne). The reification of France as a woman thus also alludes to the traditions of the Middle Ages and to the catholic religion (who greatly influenced France at the time). The allusion to Marianne is significant because it sends the minds of the French and Christian audiences to Mary, the mother of Christ, who was the purest and the most virtuous of all women. Her image transcends over space and time, for she is well known in many nations, many languages, for many centuries. By making reference of this name, the speaker endows the French nation with attributes that Mary possessed. Furthermore by naming France after Mary, transcendence is also given to France for

France shall be remembered for generations and in a diversity of nations as Mary has transcended for centuries. Thus, by carrying the name of Mary, France transcends over time and space.

Throughout his speeches, de Gaulle gives France a body, a personality, and even a soul. We have already read some quotes by de Gaulle showing the way he portrays France. However, I would like to add a few more quotes. “*La France traverse la plus terrible crise de son Histoire. Ses frontières, son Empire, son indépendance et jusqu’à son âme sont menacés de destruction*” (“France is going through the most terrible crisis of her History. Her borders, her Empire, her independence, and even her soul are threatened by destruction”) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940). The reference to body, personality, and soul to France brings forth two important ideas. The first, that France is a character, and as such, is able to make mistakes but also, to correct them and evolve throughout time. The second, that precisely because the nation progresses through time and has a soul, France becomes almost a mystic, even mythical character, such as the goddesses from the Greek mythology.

Paradoxically to the laws of nature, in which children die after their parents, France, who has borne many children for centuries, will keep doing so. Her children are born and die; yet, France remains alive and progresses through time. Further, she is able to pass on her wisdom to her children and sometimes asks of them to protect her and take into action the ideas taught to them throughout her existence. This is why de Gaulle asks his co-nationals to prove themselves worthy of France (see Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941).

Moreover, to add transcendence to the nation of France de Gaulle uses the words *éternelle* and *salut* (eternal and salvation) when referring to France. If we recall Marianne, the name used to represent the French Republic, it is interesting to note that the Virgin Mary was pure and virtuous, but it was through her Son, Jesus-Christ, that salvation came to mankind. In

the Christian tradition, Christ came to redeem mankind even her mother Mary. In the speeches during the years of the war, a similar imagery is drawn from de Gaulle speeches. Just as redemption came through the Son of Mary, redemption will come to France and mankind, through the children of France , as portrayed in the following quote: “*C’est un fait que la France a su discerner [...], que la seule voie qui mène au salut est celle qu’ont choisie pour eux ceux de ses enfants qui sont libres*” (“It is a fact that France was able to discern [...], that the only path leading to salvation is the path chosen by those of her children who are free”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941). Thus the children of Fance, those who chose to be free, will bring salvation to France, and even perhaps to mankind, since the victory of the Free France will be later be simply called the victory of France (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941)⁵.

To summarize this last point, the reification of France is of great importance in de Gaulle’s speeches. It makes it easier for people to identify ideas, history, morals, and virtues, the French should have. It brings forth the representation of the French Republic embodied in Marianne. Marianne in turn makes the audience think of the virtuous Mary, the mother of Christ, which adds to the description, transcendence, and even to the importance of the role of France and her children. Finally by giving it a body, personality and soul—along with the concepts just mentioned—the reification of France gives a transcending quality to the French nation.

D. Conclusion

In this chapter the second element of nationalism was analyzed in de Gaulle’s rhetoric. It was observed that Charles de Gaulle is usually vague when referring to victories of the French. Further, it was noted that de Gaulle tends to mention more recent victories than victories in a further time in the history of France, but that still, theses references were vague. However, de

Gaulle is proud of his nation and his identity as French, and conveys this in his speeches, oftentimes by ascribing cosmic proportions and given transcendence to the events and people he refers to as victorious. As part of his nationalist symbols, de Gaulle uses the Lorraine Cross and reifies France to further encourage the French to fight for France and preserve their nation and identity. Further, the reification of France adds to values and cultural richness of France, as well as more transcendence to the French national identity.

VII. On de Gaulle's calling for action and change: Reformation and destiny

As stated in the rubric: *Progress is key in reforming the nation, for it takes national values as a rubric and adds some changes made in the modern world to reform, instead of re-create, society or rupturing with the past. The leader envisions the ultimate goal: the nation's destiny.*

Like in the previous elements, Charles de Gaulle addresses the destiny, renewal and reformation of France in a general way. However, there are some things to learn about the reform and ideal destiny de Gaulle pretends for France. In this chapter I will address, first, how de Gaulle addresses France's destiny, and what he means by it; second, how he addresses reformation, which includes de Gaulle's generality and the linking of reformation to morals and values; and third, how de Gaulle acknowledges progress throughout history and the future of France (including its colonies). Finally, I will make a summary of the previous points and make some concluding remarks.

A. Destiny

1. Destiny in nationalism

The element of destiny is key in nationalism. Let us recall the quote by Gilbert: "To look to tradition is to look backward. To look to a mission is to look forward. But for all that, tradition and mission cannot be contrasted as grounds of nationhood, for it can be argued that a nation's mission is precisely to carry forward its traditions" (Gilbert 167) and add to it words from Sun:

[...] we must also assume a great responsibility towards the world. If China cannot assume that responsibility, she will be a great disadvantage not an advantage to the world
[...]

[...] Only if we ‘rescue the weak and lift up the fallen’ will we be carrying out the divine obligation of our nation. [...]

[...] If we want to be able to reach this ideal in the future, we must now revive our national spirit, recover our national standing, unify the world upon the foundation of our ancient morality, and love of peace, and bring about a universal rule of equality and fraternity. This is the responsibility which devolved upon our four hundred million. You, gentlemen, are a part of our four hundred millions; you must all shoulder this responsibility and manifest the true spirit of our nation. [...] (Crosscup 443-4)

Through these quotes, it is evident that to a nationalist leader, his nation has missions to carry out and a grandiose destiny to achieve. In the case of Sun, China is to be an advantage and a light showing the path to the world. Thus, destiny is an important concept in nationalist rhetoric.

2. Destiny in Charles de Gaulle’s speeches

Interestingly enough, the word *destiny* is not as frequent as I thought it would be in de Gaulle’s speeches. It appears once in the speech Appel du 18 juin 1940, once in the speech Appel du 22 juin 1940, twice in the Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941, once in Discours de Brazzaville 30 janvier 1944, once in the Discours radiodiffusé, Londres 6 juin 1944, and *destiné(e)* (“destined”) appears twice in the Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944.

Even though we find occurrence of the words *destin* and *destinée* (“destiny”) in the ten speeches analyzed, not all of them refer to France. For instance, in the speech delivered at the Albert Hall we read, “*C’est qu’en effet l’Angleterre a eu l’incomparable mérite et le magnifique courage de faire face seule, au destin quand il était le plus menaçant*” (“Truly England had the

immeasurable merit and the magnificent courage to face alone, destiny when it threatened the most”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). Evidently, the word destiny is neither applied to the grandeur of France nor to a grand future destined to England. Here, the connotation of destiny is closer to mischance or struggle than a destination or a destiny for any nation.

Even more interesting, De Gaulle’s usage of destiny also applies to France’s enemy: *“L’ennemi va tout faire pour échapper à son destin. Il va s’acharner sur notre sol aussi longtemps que possible. Mais, il y a beaucoup de temps déjà qu’il n’est plus qu’un fauve qui recule [...] il a pris maintenant l’habitude de la défaite”* (“The enemy will do everything to escape its destiny. It will hound our soil as long as possible. But while for now [the enemy] is nothing more than a wildcat moving back [...] he has now taken the habit of defeat”). To de Gaulle, France’s destiny lies in Germany’s defeat. As seen in this quote, de Gaulle paints France’s enemy as one who has the habit of losing, one who, facing a united and resolute France, cowardly draws back and tries to escape its defeat.

It can be said that to de Gaulle, the destiny of France’s enemy is to lose just as France’s destiny is to win. Note how de Gaulle speaks with certitude of a victorious France. In the line following the previous quote he says, *“Cette bataille, la France va la mener avec fureur. Elle va la mener en bon ordre. C’est ainsi que nous avons, depuis quinze cents ans, gagné chacune de nos victoires. C’est ainsi que nous gagnerons celle-là”* (“This battle, France will carry with fury. She will carry it all square. This is the way in which we have, for fifteen hundred years, won each of our victories. This is the way in which we will win this one”) (Discours radiodiffusé de Londres 6 juin 1944). Even though de Gaulle does not use the word destiny, the implication is

that the history of France is connected to the present, that France has won victories in the past and will keep winning them in the future, for this is the destiny of France.

The word destiny is also used in regards to the reformations internally needed in France:

Si la situation de notre patrie écrasée, pillée, trahie, exige que nous nous absorbions dans la tâche de la guerre, nous ne pouvons nous détacher de ce que peut être le destin intérieur de la nation. Nous le pouvons d'autant moins que le désastre momentané de la France a bouleversé de fond en comble les fondements même de son existence, emporté les institutions qu'elle pratiquait antérieurement, altéré profondément la condition de chaque individu [...]. Une nation qui paye si cher les fautes de son régime [...] est nécessairement un foyer couvant sous la cendre. Il n'y a pas le moindre doute que, de la crise terrible qu'elle traverse, sortira, pour la nation française, un vaste renouvellement

(If the situation of our crushed, ransacked, betrayed country demands that we become absorbed in the stain of war, we cannot detach ourselves from what could and should be the nation's internal destiny. We cannot detach ourselves all the less than the temporal disaster of France has completely shattered deep down into the foundations of [France's] existence, carried with her the institutions practiced before, has deeply altered the condition of each individual [...]. A nation that so dearly pays her regime's faults [...] necessarily becomes a home sitting underneath the ashes. Not even the slightest doubt exists that from the terrible crisis France is going through, will come, for the French nation, a vast renewal) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941).

In this long quote, de Gaulle explains that the French government was failing, that it was weak, and that the weakness of the system and the government in place caused France's current suffering. However, he also says that there needs to be a renewal, a renewal which is linked to

the internal fate of France, France's internal structure. In other words, France's institutions and government needed a renewal in order to fulfill France's destiny of protecting its children, its ideals, its sovereignty, and fulfill its destiny in the international area, which last point I will address later in this chapter. Thus, first, and foremost, France needs to fulfill its internal destiny, reform its laws, institutions, and regime. Then, France will be able to achieve its true destiny.

A different use for the term *destin* in de Gaulle's speeches concerns individuals: "*Mais ensuite et surtout parce que cette guerre a pour enjeu ni plus ni moins que la condition de l'homme et que, sous l'action des forces psychiques qu'elle a partout déclenchées, chaque individu lève la tête, regarde au-delà du jour et s'interroge sur son destin*" ("But then and above all because this war has no more and no less the condition of man, and that under the action of psychic forces that [the war] has set off everywhere, each individual raises his head, looks beyond the day and wonders about his destiny") (Discours de Brazzaville 30 janvier 1944). The word *destin* seems ambiguous in this quote. It might refer to the future as of things to come, or fate. It is unclear which of the two interpretations would be more accurate. What is surprising is the application of this term in here, particularly when referring to individuals and not a nation. However, de Gaulle furthers the importance of freeing France and the effects it has on the world.

By claiming that the human condition is at stake in this war, and that each individual wonders about their destiny, de Gaulle is ascribing cosmic proportions to the importance of the liberation of France. The sequence can be understood as follows: France, a nation that has served as a light to the world is now subdued by a foreign country. The war goes beyond territorial, economic, or political disagreement; it is about ideology; thus the war affects not only France, but every individual in the world. Since France, a world leader in ideology, is subdued by machines each individual French and non-French, wonders about his or her future. In order to

reassure individuals, it is expedient that France regain its freedom, regains its liberty, and thus continues leading the world towards progress.

This idea is reaffirmed when reading the sentence following the aforementioned quote, in which de Gaulle seems to acknowledge the crucial role France has in learning, understanding and leading different nations of the world: “*S’il est une puissance impériale que les événements conduisent à s’inspirer de leurs leçons et à choisir noblement, libéralement, la route des temps nouveaux où elle entend diriger les soixante millions d’hommes qui se trouvent associés au sort de ses quarante-deux millions d’enfants, cette puissance c’est la France*” (“If an imperial power in which events would lead to inspire itself from its lessons and to chose nobly, liberally, the path of modern times where she would lead the sixty million men who find themselves associated to the fate of her forty-two million children, this power is France”) (Discours de Brazzaville 30 janvier 1944). This last quote is particularly interesting when considering its context. De Gaulle speaks about French freedom to the French colonies. In this case, truly what would become of France would determine in large part what would become of many other nations—France’s colonies. Thus the link between France’s fortune and the fortune of many others, which in this case, takes cosmic proportions by involving all individuals of the earth.

This leads into my last remark on the word destiny in de Gaulle’s speeches. General de Gaulle uses the word *destin* a few times, yet in the few times he uses it, is able to convey the idea of an important powerful destiny for France; a destiny in which France occupies an important position in the world.

Sentences such as, “*Le destin du monde est là*” (“The destiny of the world is here”) (Appel du 18 juin 1940), “*Si les forces de la liberté triomphaient de celles de la servitude quel serait le destin d’une France qui serait soumise à l’ennemi?*” (“If the forces of freedom would

triumph over those of servitude, what would be the destiny of a France subdued to its enemy?") (Appel du 22 juin 1940) closely link France's destiny to freedom, honor, and France's role as a light to the world. It is evident that de Gaulle is concerned about France's honor in the world. This is why he asks the question of what would become of France if the world would be freed France remaining non-sovereign and subdued to its enemy.

Also, from the previous quotes, the audience can perceive de Gaulle's preoccupation with a free and sovereign France, a France that has and will carry its traditions, including that of being a light unto the world for revolutionary ideas, such as democracy and freedom; a France that has had honor and has stood for freedom in the world. For it is seen that de Gaulle cannot admit that in a free world, France would lose its freedom, its sovereignty, and would be internationally humiliated by losing its culture and traditions (including freedom and sovereignty to a foreign country—especially to its longtime enemy Germany). France cannot become a subject to any foreign rule. The perpetuation of this state would mean the international shame of France and the lack of existence of the nation of France, since her honor, glory, ideals, and traditions would have been trampled.

Through these quotes, de Gaulle asserts that France's destiny is a matter of the French, meaning that the French should act, in this case by taking arms and expelling the Germans from France, but also asserts that France's destiny occupies a global and international position, for the "destiny of the world [lies in the freedom of France]" (Appel du 18 juin 1940). This idea is conveyed in the cosmic proportions in the aforementioned quotes—the destiny of the world lies in the battle for France's freedom, and the implausibility of a free world without a free France—where de Gaulle places France as the leading actor on the world stage.

While de Gaulle does not repeat much words such as *destiny*, it is clear, by the previous quotes, that to him France plays a key part in world affairs, and that its freedom is crucial not only to France's survival, but to the rest of the world. To him, France has played a key role in the past in leading the nations of the world, and it is France's destiny to keep playing a key role in the present and the future in the world. In other words, France in the past has fulfilled her destiny in leading the nations of the world with her culture and the ideas and ideals that came out from her, and will, in the near future, keep fulfilling her destiny as a world leader after she regains her sovereignty.

B. Restoration, renewal and reformation

Reformation is closely linked to the idea of destiny. In nationalism, no destiny can be achieved without reformation. By reformation I mean the referring to old values with modifications or the addition of new values. Since nationalists see time as a progressive line, they need reformations to attain the nation's destiny.

Sun provides a good example of this:

So coming to the root of the matter, if we want to restore our race's standing, besides uniting all into a great national body, we must first recover our ancient morality—then, and only then, can we plan how to attain again to the nation position we once held [...]

To say that ancient loyalty was due to kings and, since now we have no kings, we do not need loyalty and can do as we please is absolutely wrong. Now everybody who talks about democracy breaks down all the old moral standards, and the fundamental reason is right here. In a democracy it stands to reason that we should still show loyalty, not to princes but to the nation and to the people. (Crosscup 438, 439)

Sun asks the Chinese to return to old values, such as loyalty, but to change them to have a better China. He does not ask for loyalty to kings, but to democracy, to the nation of China. Sun Yat-Sen's quote clearly captures what this element of nationalism encompasses: a return to values of the past, yet a recognition of progress from the past, thus calling for reforms or modifications to be made in the nation in order to attain its destiny. More will be explained on the connection of destiny, the future and reformation. For now, the focus will be placed on facet of reformation and its importance as part of the third element of nationalism.

1. Reformation in de Gaulle's speeches

Throughout his speeches, de Gaulle speaks of restoration and reformation. He uses expressions such as *restaurer, restauration, renouvellement, avons rétabli, rénovation, and revivre* (*restore, restoration, renewal, had reestablished, renovation, and live again*). You will find some of these expressions as I proceed to illustrate with quotes my analysis of the presence of this element of nationalism in de Gaulle's rhetoric.

Even though in this set of speeches de Gaulle seldom addresses France's destiny, he does talk with much more frequency about the themes of restoration and reformation. The following are a few examples of how broad de Gaulle is when speaking about reformation from or renewal of the past :

Il n'y a pas le moindre doute que, de la crise terrible qu'elle traverse, sortira, pour la nation française, un vaste renouvellement...la nation ne pourra que revivre que dans l'air de la victoire et subsister que dans le culte de sa propre grandeur. (Not even the slightest doubt exists that from the terrible crisis France is going through, will come, for the French nation, a vast renewal...the nation could not live again but in the air of victory

and remain but in the cult of its own grandeur.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

...vous verrez se lever de nouveau une grande armée française... (...you will see again the rising of a grand French army...) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942)

Car c'est bien de l'avenir qu'il s'agit ! de l'avenir vers lequel des millions et des millions de Français et de Françaises regardent avec ardeur et avec confiance, de l'avenir dont la nation entière veut qu'il soit une rénovation. Oui, certes, une rénovation! (For it is certain that the future is the matter! The future towards which millions and millions of French men and French women look to with ardor and with confidence, the future which the whole nation wants to become a renovation. Yes, certainly, a renovation!) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

As illustrated by these examples, even though de Gaulle does not refer to a specific period of time when France had honor, grandeur, or a grandiose army, it is clear that de Gaulle believes in France: that France has been a great nation, and that France will become again a great nation. The avoidance of naming specific times when France had glory or grandeur seems intriguing.

2. Attempts to explain the lack of references to specific times of grandeur

While I do not claim to have penetrated de Gaulle's mind by studying ten of his speeches, I would like to present a few possibilities as to why de Gaulle would not mention particular times of glory, aside from the possibility that it might just be the way in which he speaks.

First, we know that he was an idealist, dreaming of a greater, more powerful, more glorious, more respected, and more independent France. More than that, he was an educated man.

Since France's education is regulated by the government, the education de Gaulle received might not have been too different than the education many French men and French women received, in regards to history—at least during his years prior to his higher education. Due to the commonality of background in regards to education—particularly in regards to history—and in experiencing two world wars, de Gaulle might have felt no need to refer to a specific time period, since everyone in France shared the same knowledge and feelings in regards to France. Thus, he might have felt that the time periods in which he idealized France were not only idealized by him, but by the rest of the nation because of their common knowledge and experience in French history. Thus it could be that de Gaulle felt it redundant to point out to specific periods of time. De Gaulle takes the shared understanding of France's history for granted.

A second explanation for de Gaulle's lacks of specificity considers the political, economic and social context of France. At the time, France was much divided. After World War I, France's politics, economy and society became unstable. The political coalition formed during the war started to shatter in the years following the war. In 1921, the Socialist Party broke into two factions: those who wanted a communist revolution in France and those who followed the ideas of Jaurès. Around the same period of time, a similar rupture occurred in the movement of trade unions between those who favored a reformation of socialism, those who favored communism, and those who supported the birth of a new union movement called Confédération des Travailleurs Chrétiens (Confederation of Christian Workers or C.F.T.C) (de Bertier de Sauvigny 412-413).

In addition, following the laws of 1904 and 1905 establishing the separation of Church and State, the diplomatic relationship with the Pope was broken, the members of religious congregations were forbidden to teach, also causing much division among the French. This in

turn caused much political instability to the nation, consequently further damaging the political, social and economic situation of France (de Bertier de Sauvigny 415-416).

Even though in the years to come the franc temporarily regained its strength, political divisions prevailed in France. Furthermore, France did not escape the world financial crisis of the 1930s. In addition to these internal problems, the rise of fascism, the success of Hitler in Germany and the success of an opposite ideology in the Soviet Union once again polarized France. While some French rallied for fascism, others did for communism. People started to fear that either of these two extremes would take over France, and thus, according to which they feared the most, they started to gather against it, which gathering was often fueled by which country the French liked the most (de Bertier de Sauvigny, 420).

I point out all of these internal struggles to illustrate the partisan division prevalent in France during the years prior to WWII. France's internal turmoil prior to WWII affected its performance during WWII. Again, there were many partisan divisions in France at the time, and leadership was in need to restore to France its sovereignty, honor and status as a world power. To accomplish this task, a leader needed to unite the French. The political and social divisions of France meant that the French disagreed on what they considered moments of glory or victory, for a moment of victory to some could represent a moment of hardship, reversal, or even a moment of shame in French history to others. Thus, perhaps by caution or astuteness, or even wisdom, it is plausible to think that an educated nationalist leader might refer to past glories without being specific in order to avoid controversies, and achieve his main goal: to unite the French in a common cause—in this case the expulsion of the Germans, winning the war, and later on, restoring France's glory.

Note that in this case, it is not as important that all of the French think similarly, rather, that they unite under the name of France. The ideals of a France filled with honor, glory and grandeur—regardless of what this means to each individual—all the French could identify with, and link it to some moment of the nation’s past (even though the moment may vary according to each individual). In this case, then, the idea of a free, honorable and grandiose France, a France that leads the world into a better world, would be enough incentive for the French to unite under and fight for.

Another possibility, aside from partisan divisions, is that perhaps de Gaulle feels that France’s successes in the past are not evident, and therefore a bit ambiguous. For instance, the French Revolution brought forth ideas of freedom, equality, brotherhood, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen; yet, the period was one of much bloodshed, followed by even more bloodshed. Napoleon brought great honor and glory to France, but was a tyrant suppressing many of the ideals brought forth by the Revolution, such as the freedom of press and democratic elections. La Belle Époque was a time of prosperity in arts and technology for France. However, French society’s structure remained very hierarchical, religious ideals (in face of an increase in positivism) started to be put aside, many peasants were in debt, industrial workers felt alienated from society, and many women felt wronged since they had no voice, and their rights were the same as a child’s in French society (McMillan 9-10). Thus, even though more than ever before France was united and experienced intellectual, technical, and artistic progress during La Belle Époque, there were still some issues dividing the French, reflecting that more needed to be done in order to complete France’s unity, progress, and achievement in its institutions, laws, and in fulfilling the values of the Revolution. Further, the prosperity of La Belle Époque only lasted for a short period of time. In sum, this argument presents the possibility of avoiding mentioning

particular time periods of victories due to the ambiguities these periods of progress and glory present.

Still the question as to why choosing not to point out only the positives in these time periods and overlook the negatives remains. I believe this can partly be understood as a two-fold answer. The first is that perhaps de Gaulle prefers to point out ideals, morals, and values, than certain periods when France had success. This heightens the characteristic of transcendence in his speeches, for ideals, morals and values are above and beyond French divisions. Ideals and values edify, inspire, and elevate people, taking them past values and achievements, passing through the progresses made through time, leading them into a brighter and glorious future. The second part to this answer is that while de Gaulle acknowledges the progress made in different periods of time in French history, by not heightening them, he is actually heightening what is yet to come. Since time is seen as progressive, and France has had periods of honor, glory, world leadership, intellectual, technological, moral, and spiritual progress, it is then easy to conclude that more progress is to be made for France to achieve its true greatness its full potential and fulfill its true destiny. In other words, by acknowledging progress in the past without dwelling on them, de Gaulle is more efficaciously instilling in the minds and hearts of the French people that the best of and for France is yet to come.

3. The use of cosmic proportions in addressing reformation

It is obvious that to de Gaulle, the first and most pressing step to regain France's grandeur is to regain its honor and its independence. Not only has he used cosmic proportions in regards to the destiny of France, but also in the near mission of restoring the sovereignty and honor of France.

In the Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940, De Gaulle involves other countries in the task of returning France its grandeur. He declares, “*En union étroite avec nos alliés, qui proclament leur volonté de contribuer à restaurer l’indépendance et la grandeur de la France, il s’agit de défendre contre l’ennemi ou contre ses auxiliaires la partie du patrimoine national que nous détenons*” (“In strong union with our allies, who proclaim their will of contributing to restore France’s independence and grandeur, the matter is to defend the national patrimony that we hold, against the enemy or their ancillaries”) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940).

In this quote, General de Gaulle involves other nations in helping France regain its grandeur. The implication here is that France’s state affects other nations’ state. In fact, France’s state is so important to the world that other nations “proclaim their will of contributing to restore France’s independence and grandeur” (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940). Note that de Gaulle does not address the state of other nations the importance of their struggle and neither does he mention their state of freedom or bondage. The emphasis is on what happens in and to France. Similar to his statement, “*Le destin du monde est là*” (“The destiny of the world is here”) (Appel du 18 juin 1940), General de Gaulle uses cosmic proportions to emphasize France’s destiny and the key role it plays in the world, for which France needs to be restored to what it was before: a sovereign and respected nation.

To these quotes, we add the expressions such as *grand* or *grandeur*, which, again, do not point to a specific time, but to something of great proportions. De Gaulle’s vague terminology inspires the French, lifts their minds to the cosmos and thus, instills in them the will to work towards a common ideal. This ideal seems to be beyond the material and technological world since, at the end it is the condition of man which is at stake under the physical force of opposing nations (see Discours de Brazzaville 30 janvier 1944). The vagueness of de Gaulle’s terms links

reformation and destiny with the universe, with ideals men aspire to, with morals and values beyond this world, and thus are important in this facet of nationalism. De Gaulle's vagueness helps French men and women transcend, even beyond moments of shame or suffering, from the Third Republic culminating into France's state in WWII. In this case, the emphasis is not on the type of reforms, but on the ideals needed to return to in order to unite the people to act and work for the glory of France.

C. Reformation and destiny linked to morals and values

A characteristic found in the speeches analyzed is the interconnection of several elements of nationalism (for more information please refer to Chapter III On de Gaulle's speeches: an overview, particularly pages 67-71). In this chapter we will see the close relationship between the idea that reformation is linked to a return to certain morals and values. This is also the case in de Gaulle's speeches. To de Gaulle the idea of liberation is closely linked to the restoration of ideals, including honor, unity, order, as well as a restoration of a source of identity, a past which he does not tie to a specific period of time, yet a past glorified. Hence, the ideals linked to the restoration of the grandeur of France correspond to and also belong to the first element of nationalism, which addresses morals and values the nationalist leader addresses to his co-nationals.

I quote from the speech delivered in the Albert Hall on November, 15 novembre 1941:

Nous nous tenons en étroite liaison avec nos alliés [...] solidarité à nos yeux capitale parce que le sort de leur territoire et celui du nôtre présentent les mêmes caractères de résistance nationale et d'inexpiable oppression et parce que nous ne concevons pas la libération de l'Europe sans leur juste restauration et la réparation du martyre qu'ils endurent (We hold strong our bond with our [...] allies, to our eyes, key solidarity

because the fate of their and our territory present the same traits of national resistance and of unexpiatory oppression, and because we cannot conceive Europe's liberation without their just restoration and the reparation of the martyrdom they endure).

As seen in this quote, even in the liberation of Europe and in defending the sovereignty of other nations, de Gaulle links freedom with the idea of restoration. Given that de Gaulle speaks about the liberation of Europe in such terms, we can plausibly assume that those terms equally apply to first and most importantly, to France.

This last idea is supported by the following quotes:

[...] [la nation française] a discerné également les voies et moyens de retourner à sa vocation de liberté et de grandeur[...] ([...] [the French nation] has been able to equally discern the paths and the means to return to her vocation of liberty and grandeur [...])

(Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Rien n'est plus naturel que de s'interroger sur ce que veut [...] cette grande force neuve qui s'appelle la France Libre, en attendant que, par la victoire, elle se confonde avec la France tout court... (Nothing is more natural than to wonder what [...] this grand new strength, which carries the name of Free France wants, while waiting that, for victory, she merges herself simply with France herself...) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941)

Note how close the words *liberty*, *honor*, *common sense* and *the interest of the nation* are to each other. From Appel du 22 juin, 1940 :

Si les forces de liberté triomphaient finalement de celles de la servitude, quel serait le destin d'une France qui serait soumise à l'ennemi ? L'honneur, le bon sens, l'intérêt de la Patrie, commandent à tous les Français libres de continuer le combat, là où ils seront

et comme ils pourront... (If at the end the forces of liberty would come triumphant to those of servitude, what would be the destiny of a France that would be subdued to the enemy? Honor, good sense, the interest of the motherland, mandate all free French to continue the fight wherever they are, in whatever conditions they can.)

Continuing from Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940:

...leur volonté de contribuer à restaurer l'indépendance et la grandeur de la France, il s'agit de défendre contre l'ennemi ou contre ses auxiliaires la partie du patrimoine national que nous détenons, d'attaquer l'ennemi partout où cela sera possible, et de mettre en œuvre toutes nos ressources militaires, économiques, morales, de maintenir l'ordre public et de faire régner la justice. (...their will of contributing to restore France's independence and grandeur, the matter is to defend the national patrimony that we hold, against the enemy or their ancillaries the portion of the national patrimony that we possess, to attack the enemy from every possible front, and to put at work all our military, economic and moral resources, to maintain the public order and of making justice reign.)

Note that De Gaulle does not explicitly say that the ideas of destiny and reformation are connected to morals and values; yet the closeness of these words conveys this meaning to the audience, for in their minds, these words stand so close to each other, that the brain registers them together.

D. Progress and the future

The reformation of the past is key to the nation's future development and achievement of its destiny. The fact that it is a reformation and not a rupture or exact recreation of it, is important for the progressive attribute of this element of nationalism. The fact that the nationalist leader sees key to bring certain elements of the past (being laws, morals and values, or other) yet

adopting them to fit the modern context of the nation and the world, means that the leader values certain changes made throughout time, and acknowledges the need to adapt so that the nation can rise and fulfill its destiny.

De Gaulle points out in his speeches the fact that France has learned from the past, that it has learned valuable lessons, and that it is expedient that France will apply them to herself and her colonies. Alluding to my third explanation as to why de Gaulle might not allude to specific periods of French victory, I would like to emphasize that even though France's institutions or parties were not perfect, there is still progress made in regards to the military or republican values, technology, or institutions. This progress is to continue, in spite of the current reverse France is experienced, so that France can reach its full potential and truly fulfill its destiny. Progress is the reason why France is the way it is, the reason why France has positively changed (through reforms) in the past and will continue to do so in the near future. The sense of progress in France's history is thus present and important in de Gaulle's speeches as in any nationalist speech. Perhaps the link among destiny, morals and values, progress and reformation can be best illustrated by de Gaulle's statement, "...*la France rentre à Paris, chez elle. Elle y rentre sanglante, mais bien résolue. Elle y rentre, éclairée par l'immense leçon, mais plus certaine que jamais, de ses devoirs et de ses droits*" (...France comes back to Paris, her home. She comes back bloody, but very determined. She comes back, enlightened by the immense lesson, but more certain than ever, of her duties and her rights") (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre, 1944).

Interestingly enough, most of the quotes expressing progress, or at least, when the words such as *progress* recur the most, are found in the speech delivered at Brazzaville, Congo's capital, in 1944, probably to make French colonies understand that France is aware of their situation,

their wish for freedom and sovereignty, and to let them know that France will compromise with them after France has won the war. In this section I will mainly address progress as it appears mainly in this speech. I will focus on the usage of the word *progress* in regards to the economic, moral and intellectual, spiritual and institutional matters.

Ce qui a été fait par nous pour le développement de richesses et pour le bien des hommes, à mesure de cette marche en avant, il n'est, pour le discerner, que de parcourir nos territoires et, pour le reconnaître, que d'avoir du cœur. (That which has been done by us, for the development of resources and for the wellbeing of men, while in this forward march, to discern it is sufficient to travel throughout our territories, and acknowledge it, to have a heart.) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

In this sentence we find many allusions to progress, first, by the word *développement* (*development*), then by *marche en avant* (*forward march*), added by the fact that this progress has positively affected mankind (“*pour le bien des hommes*”—“for the wellbeing of men”).

Yet this sentence only serves to introduce de Gaulle’s idea, followed in the next couple of sentences,

Mais de même qu'un rocher lancé sur la pente roule plus vite à chaque instant, ainsi l'œuvre que nous avons entreprise ici nous impose sans cesse de plus larges tâches. Au moment où commençait la présente guerre mondiale, apparaissait déjà la nécessité d'établir sur des bases nouvelles les conditions de la mise en valeur de notre Afrique, du progrès humain de ses habitants et de l'exercice de la souveraineté française. (But in the same way that a rock is thrown down the hill rolls faster at every instance, thus it is with the work that we have undertaken here, which incessantly imposes over us bigger tasks.

At the moment when the current war started, it already appeared the necessity to establish

on new bases the conditions of the enhancement of our Africa, of the human progress of its inhabitants and the exertion of the French sovereignty.) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

Here de Gaulle speaks of progress. Even though his words are often vague, we found in here a more specific meaning of it. To recapitulate, in the quotes already mentioned in regards to progress, we find development of resources or wealth, human progress, and new bases for the enhancement of Africa and the use of the French sovereignty. Thus, de Gaulle refers to a progress that is material, intellectual, moral, and even spiritual. Material because of the resources, the wealth explored in Africa; intellectual because of the cultural interchange made since France has been in Africa—mostly, I believe from the French to Africans, even though, there might have been positive contributions from the exotics cultures of Africa to France. Consider the intellectual progress (science, philosophy, ideas) France has made throughout past centuries and brought to Africa for instance.

The moral contributions are not explicit in the speech, but it is suggested that the moral progress is linked to the intellectual progress brought to Africa. Just as the French Revolution made moral contributions to the world by the defending of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, and the writings of Montesquieu enlightened the world with a new and less oppressive governing system, so does France progress for her good and for the good of other nations, first and foremost including its colonies. Ironically enough, the revolutionary ideals have not been applied yet to the French colonies, since they function under France's rule. Still those ideals, morals, and values have been brought by France.

The spiritual contributions are also linked to the intellectual and moral progresses. I add here spiritual, because, aside from the possible references to any religion⁶ de Gaulle might make

in his speeches, he adds transcendence over this progress, which is more associated with a religious aspect of a culture. For instance, de Gaulle includes mankind when saying that the works of France in Africa have been for the wellbeing of men. This includes people throughout time and space, for the term men is used in a generic way, and in a way that encompass people from different times. Next, de Gaulle's allusion to the tremendous and growing tasks imposed over the French, adds to the importance of France's colonies in Africa and its role in the world. Finally, de Gaulle speaks of *progrès humain* (human progress), alluding again that the realizations France has made in regards to its colonies are an example to humanity, encompassing again human kind, and confirming transcendence over these progress.

But de Gaulle also speaks of progress that will be reflected in governmental and institutional reforms that will be applied to France and its colonies. This is hinted by the words, "*Au moment où commençait la présente guerre mondiale, apparaissait déjà la nécessité d'établir sur des bases nouvelles les conditions de la mise en valeur de notre Afrique, du progrès humain de ses habitants et de l'exercice de la souveraineté française*" ("At the moment when the current war started, it already appeared the necessity to establish on new bases the conditions of the enhancement of our Africa, of the human progress of its inhabitants and the exertion of the French sovereignty") (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944). Later in the speech, de Gaulle confirms the human progress manifested in the implementation of these types of reforms:

...[il] n'y aurait aucun progrès qui soit un progrès, si les hommes, sur leur terre natale n'en profitaient pas moralement et matériellement, s'ils ne pouvaient s'élever peu à peu jusqu'au niveau où ils seront capables de participer chez eux à la gestion de leurs propres affaires. C'est le devoir de la France de faire en sorte qu'il en soit ainsi.

(...[there] would be no progress that would be progress, if men, in their native land

would not take advantage of the moral and material progress, if they could not elevate themselves little by little to the point in which they will be capable of participating at home to the management of their own matters. It is the duty of France to ensure that it will be so.” (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944)

This quote reflects de Gaulle’s realization that men need to participate in their own matters, that they need to have some authority, or at least some say in regards to issues affecting their lives. De Gaulle also links in here human progress to morals and values and material wealth, and again to the realization that France needs to give more autonomy to its colonies. But, again, the emphasis is not on the colonies themselves, on the progress that they have made or will make, but on France’s progress, France’s realization, France’s concessions to its colonies, and France’s duties to show the way to the world.

Further down in the speech de Gaulle states, “...[il] appartient à la nation française, et il n’appartient qu’à elle, de procéder, le moment venu, aux réformes impériales de structure qu’elle décidera dans sa souveraineté” (“...[it] belongs to the French nation, and only to her, to proceed, when the time comes, to the imperial reforms of structure that she on her sovereignty will decide”) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944). Thus again, the responsibility and progress come from France to its colonies. France has sovereignty over those nations, and will concede to make structural or institutional reforms to accommodate human progress that, in its time and wisdom, France considers important to implement.

There are other instances, in other speeches, where de Gaulle addresses progress from the past and lessons learned for the future. However, I feel that the previous discussion enlightens the characteristics found in General de Gaulle’s speeches in regards to progress, and how this idea is closely linked to reforms, destiny, morals, and values. To de Gaulle, the interest of France

goes first. France has learned lessons from the past and has made a lot of progress. This progress referred to is material, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, for it not only touches on France, but transcends through time and space.

To de Gaulle it is important to regain France's sovereignty, so that France may recuperate its honor, glory, and position as a light unto the world, a light of progress. To this aim, he instills pride and unity in the French; acknowledges mistakes made in the past (particularly those of the Third Republic), and that changes need to be made in the governing of its colonies. He draws back on the morals and values of the French nation, and instills the desire in people of moving forward unto a better future, a future in which France's honor and glory would return. The reforms needed to adjust to France's situation (including that of her colonies) are thus needed to bring France to fulfill her destiny as honorable nation, as a nation that brings progress to the world, as the nation who leads progress into the world.

E. Conclusion

In this chapter we explore the presence of the third element of nationalism as described in the rubric. It includes reformation, mission and destiny. It was evident that they were present in de Gaulle's rhetoric, and they were also linked to each other and to morals and values. Even though the word destiny was not found with much frequency in de Gaulle's speeches, in the few instances it appeared, in regards to France, it became evident that de Gaulle dreams of a great, mighty and glorious France. To this aim, he encourages the French, and even all those under the French Empire and out of it, to believe in the values of France and to fight for France. The holistic approach provided insights into the presence of this element of nationalism. Even though the word destiny was not as frequent as one could expect it to be in de Gaulle's earlier speeches, de Gaulle implies that France has a mission and a great destiny. Two examples of this

implication is the linking of defeat to France's enemy, opposing it to France, and the support from other nations into restoring France to the great nation it has been, for the sake of France, and for the sake of the world. Thus by way of implication, France's mission is to be light unto the world; its role is like unto the role of *Marianne*. As *Marianne* who leads her children to light, to knowledge, to freedom to grandeur and inspires them to goodness, virtue and true, culminating in grandeur, France leads the rest of the world to the same. This is France's destiny, and for it to become true, France needs to be restored and reformed.

VIII. On Sacrifice and sorrow

As described in the rubric: *The nation—or the people of the nation—are remembered and required to endure sacrifices and sorrows. Sacrifices and sorrows for the good of the nation serve to create a strong bond and identity, provide role models and highlight the “spiritual qualities” of the nation. They are turned into victories and transcend the struggles the nation faces.*

This is probably the element of nationalism that most clearly stands out in Charles de Gaulle’s speeches. As in the previous chapters and in concurrence with the description of this element provided in my rubric, in this chapter I will address first who seems to sacrifice and endure sorrows: second, the nature (material or moral) of the sacrifices and sorrows endured; third, I will focus on how de Gaulle turns these sacrifices and sorrows into victories; and fourth, I will point out the moral qualities General de Gaulle heightens through sacrifices and sorrows. Additionally, I will comment through the chapter on how this element adds transcendence to the struggles France has had throughout its history, particularly, the ones she faces at that time. Since this chapter has much material, I would refrain from systematically comparing de Gaulle to other nationalist leaders as I have been doing in the past. Quotes from scholars and nationalist leaders will be provided, but perhaps in not the same systematic way as before. Thus this chapter will heavily focus in de Gaulle, even more than the others. If more information is needed, please refer chapter III Elements of nationalism section 4 Sacrifices and sorrows (pages 36 through 48).

A. Who sacrifices and endures sorrows

Sacrifice and sorrows are important in nationalist rhetoric, for it is the other side of the coin of a common source of identity—the first side being the celebration of victorious persons or moments. Recalling the words of Renan, “to have suffered, worked, hoped together; that is worth more than common taxes and frontiers conforming ideas of strategy”; “common suffering is

greater than happiness. In fact national sorrows are more significant than triumphs because they impose obligations and demand a common effort” (Hutchinson and Smith 17). It is not evident that in nationalist rhetoric sorrows would be more prominent than the celebration of victories; however sorrows do create a strong bond, and help unite and provide an identity to a group of people.

In regards to sacrifice, Renan states the following: “A nation is a grand solidarity constituted by the sentiment of sacrifices which one has made and those that one is disposed to make again. It supposes a past, it renews itself especially in the present by a tangible deed: the approval, the desire, clearly expressed, to continue the communal life” (Hutchinson and Smith 17). Thus, as much as the celebration of victories, sacrifice and sorrow constitute an important element of nationalism.

De Gaulle seems to truly believe in the importance of remembering sacrifices and sorrows, for he emphasizes them throughout his speeches. De Gaulle even seems to agree with Renan because he recalls with much more frequency and specificity the sacrifices and sorrows undertaken by the French than the victories or any other element of nationalism. De Gaulle recognizes three main actors and receptors of sacrifices and sorrows. The first is constituted by the French as a people, the second by France as an entity, and the third includes other nations, countries and peoples. I will now discuss each of these actors or recipients of sacrifices and sorrows respectively.

1. The French

Certes, nous avons été, nous sommes, submergés par la force mécanique, terrestre et aérienne, de l'ennemi. (Certainly, we have been, and we are, submerged by the enemy's terrestrial and aerial's mechanical force.) (Appel du 18 juin 1940)

Derrière le nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes voici que reparâit le soleil de notre grandeur. (Behind the heavy cloud of our blood and tears, here reappears the sun of our grandeur.) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

In these sentences, *nous*, *nos* and like pronouns allude to a group of people who share a collective identity and whose bonds have been made tighter by the sacrifices and sorrows they have had in the war. De Gaulle often uses the pronouns *nous* (we), and possessive pronouns related to it. By *nous*, he refers to *us*, *the French* and seems to include all of his co-nationals, the French.

Particularly in the last quote, where de Gaulle talks about “...*le nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes...*” (“...the heavy cloud of our blood and tears...””) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944), de Gaulle establishes a horizontal relationship with his co-nationals. By using words such as *notre* (our) and *nos* (our) de Gaulle empathizes with his co-nationals and is able to turn the pains of many into the pains of all French. Thus, the pains of those who have actually loss a loved one or have shed tears since the German occupation, are shared among all French. *Nous* (We), then, generalizes the sufferings and sacrifices the French collectively have made through the war creating empathy and a horizontal relationship among the French.

The speech delivered on December 24, 1942 presents a peculiarity in regards to the pronouns used to refer to the French. Charles de Gaulle uses two different pronouns, *vous* (you), and *notre* (our).

Mes chers enfants de France, vous avez faim, parce que l'ennemi mange notre pain et notre viande. Vous avez froid, parce que l'ennemi vole notre bois et notre charbon, vous souffrez, parce que l'ennemi vous dit et vous fait dire que vous êtes des fils et des fille de vaincus... (My dear children of France, you are hungry, because the enemy eats our bread

and our meat. You are cold, because the enemy steals our wood and our coal, you suffer because the enemy tells you and makes you say that you are sons and daughters of the defeated...) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942)

In these sentences, de Gaulle is distancing himself from the sufferings the French in France are enduring by using two different possessive pronouns. The use of *vous* (you) and *notre* (our) shows de Gaulle's acknowledgment that while all French men and women have suffered because of the occupation (by force or collaboration) of Germany in France, those living on French soil are carrying the heaviest part of the burden. It recognizes that, though he himself along with other French overseas have suffered much, the people in France carry burdens that those outside of France do not. Yet, by using these words, in particular *notre* (our), de Gaulle unites French in and outside France, and figuratively makes all of them share the burdens of the German occupation. These sacrifices and sorrows thus become the sacrifices and sorrows of all the French, something that they collectively, as French, share.

De Gaulle also unites French by addressing individual sacrifices and sorrows presenting them as if they belonged to the collective national identity. Note how in each of the following quotes every time that de Gaulle emphasizes the individual, he transports the sufferings and sacrifices of individuals into the collective identity. For example, de Gaulle assumes that, as French, each individual has suffered by the occupation of the nation. Note how close the words *Chaque*, *chacun*, and *chacune* (each) are from *nous*, *au total*, and *nos* (us, in sum, and our) in the following quotes. They are important because by using these words de Gaulle transmits an accumulation of individual sorrows and sacrifices, and is able to transform them into sacrifices and sorrows belonging to the collective identity of the nation of France.

Il y a là des minutes que dépassent chacune de nos pauvres vies... (For here there are minutes that exceed each of our poor lives...) (Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris, 25 août 1944)

[Chaque] Français le comprend bien, devant une période difficile où la libération ne nous permet nullement l'aisance matérielle, mais comporte, au contraire, le maintien de sévères restrictions et exige de grands efforts de travail et d'organisation. ([Each] French man understands it well, facing a difficult period where liberation does not allow us the least material ease, but on the contrary, comprises the maintenance of severe restrictions and demands great efforts of work and organization.) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Je ne commettrai pas l'indélicatesse d'insister sur ce que cela représente, au total, de souffrances et de sacrifices. Chacun de nous est seul à connaître, dans les secrets de son cœur, ce qu'il lui en a coûté. (I will not commit the indelicacy of insisting on what this, in sum, represents, to the sufferings and sacrifices. Each of us alone knows, in the depths of his or her heart, the high price he or she paid.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

Like in the use of *vous* and *nos* (*you* and *our*), de Gaulle is successful at making the French share their burdens, thus creating a stronger bond among them, and instilling a deeper sense of unity and identity—the belonging to the French nation.

In the last quote, de Gaulle seems very sensitive about the sufferings the French have endured. De Gaulle respects the pains of his co-nationals—even though he might not have experienced them himself. He talks about these sufferings with the respect a person talks to another mourning the loss of a loved one, with the respect of a sorrow carried deep in the soul, a

sorrow only known to the person experiencing it. It is almost like he would not want stir that pain, and certainly not dwell on it because he does not want to bring back to life the deep emotions that pain left in the person's soul. Yet, the shared pain makes individuals more sympathetic to each other, and a quick and profound reminder of it is what helps each individual empathize, identify, and unite with their co-nationals.

Another way in which de Gaulle refers to and unites the French people is by calling them “*enfants de France*” (“France’s children”). This is tied with the discussion on France’s reification carried out in VI On de Gaulle’s celebration and remembrance of French victories as a source of national identity (101-112), and the concept of a father or motherland. The term “*enfants de France*” is not prominent in de Gaulle’s speeches. It is interesting to note, however, that one of the two times he addresses French in this manner, he mentions another patriotic symbol—the flag—in the same sentence: “...*trouverai parmi ses enfants des hommes assez résolus pour ramasser son drapeau...*” (“...would find among her children, men sufficiently determined to pick up her flag...”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941). In this case, de Gaulle is alluding to symbols and feelings of patriotism. Yet a few sentences later in the same speech, he talks about the nation, thus cutting the ties with patriotism and coming back to nationalism. Indeed, this is one of the few times de Gaulle alludes to patriotic symbols, and yet quickly comes back to nationalism.

Patriotism and nationalism can be easily confused when the limit of the territories and most of the history of the fatherland coincides with those of the nation. Yet, as stated in Chapter II, a patriotic leader would often refer to the fatherland and its symbols (constitution, laws, borders, flag, etc.) more than to the nation and its symbols just as de Gaulle has done throughout

his discourse. Since de Gaulle quickly comes back to his nationalist rhetoric, this example then is thus an exemption that proves the rule that de Gaulle is truly a nationalist.

Since I have based my rubric on Dr. Hawkins' work on populism, I would also like to point out that de Gaulle does use the term *peuple* (people) a few times in his speeches. However, please note that this term is used scarcely, and with a different meaning than the one carried in populist discourse. The following are some quotes showing the usage of this term:

Mais, si un peuple tel que le nôtre, accoutumé aux grands malheurs comme aux grandes gloires, sait reconnaître que chacun des États qui forment, avec lui, l'équipe de la liberté a noblement mérité son amitié et son estime, il sait aussi se juger lui-même et mesurer, sans s'en faire accroire, le rôle qu'il aura joué dans la prochaine victoire commune.

(But if a people as ours, used to great misfortunes as much as great glories, is able to recognize that each of the States that with him constitute the team of liberty, has nobly deserved his friendship and esteem, is also able to judge himself and to measure, without aggrandizing himself, the role that he would have played in the next joint victory.)

(Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

...il s'est formé dans notre peuple, au milieu des épreuves, une extraordinaire unanimité nationale... (...there has been developed, in our people, in the middle of our ordeals, an

extraordinary national unity...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

...en dépit de ce [que la nation] a souffert, à supporter noblement ces épreuves, comme

un grand peuple qui refuse de gaspiller le présent, afin de mieux bâtir l'avenir... (...in

spite of what [the nation] has suffered, she has nobly endured her ordeals, as a great

people that refuses to waste the present in order to better build the future...) (Discours du

palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

To recall, a populist would pick a group of people within the state, romanticize it, and portray it as the embodiment of the national ideal. This is not happening in de Gaulle speeches. Note in the last quote how de Gaulle exchanges “*la nation*” (“the nation”) with “*grand peuple*” (“great people”). He interchanges them as if they were synonyms, thus suggesting that the people are the nation, that the nation is composed of all those, who by birth or adoption, identify themselves with, or as part of, the French nation, rather than selecting a group of people within the nation, romanticize it and make it the embodiment of good, as a populist would do.

Moreover, similar to David Ben Gurion in his speech “Road of Valor”, when Ben Gurion thanks the soldiers, workers, engineers and others who helped win the battle and make the road (Crosscup 20), de Gaulle is inclusive in his term “*peuple*” or “*Français*”, which comprises all those identify themselves as such. General de Gaulle even states, “*Nous sommes des Français de toutes origines, de toutes conditions, de toutes opinions, qui avons décidé de nous unir dans la lutte pour notre pays*” (“We are French of all origins, of all conditions, of all opinions, who have decided to unite ourselves in the fight for our country”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). Thus, opposed to populism, de Gaulle does not pick on a lower class, romanticizes it and makes it the embodiment of noble virtues or the ideal; but incorporates French from all social and economic classes, of all different opinions, of all regions—perhaps even, those born overseas or in the colonies.

2. France

France also sacrifices and suffers in de Gaulle’s speeches. De Gaulle often mentions France as “*la nation*” (“the nation”), “*France*” and tends to reify it:

La France traverse la plus terrible crise de son Histoire. (“France is going through the most terrible crisis in its history.”) (Appel du 22 juin 1940)

...la France a su discerner, au travers du nuage de sang et de larmes dont on tentait de l'aveugler, que la seule voie qui mène au salut est celle qu'on choisie pour elle ceux des ses enfants qui sont libres... (...France was able to discern, through the cloud of blood and tears on which was attempted to blind her, that the only path that leads into salvation is the path that those of her free children chose for her...) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

S'il était encore quelque part des gens qui doutaient de ce que voulait réellement la nation opprimée et de sa capacité de se dominer elle-même, je suppose qu'ils sont, à présent, définitivement éclairés. (If there were anywhere people who doubted of what the oppressed nation really wanted and of her capability of self-dominion, I suppose that they are, now, set straight.)

...au fond de l'océan des douleurs et des outrages où elle fut plongée depuis plus de quatre ans et dont elle émerge aujourd'hui, la nation française a mesuré les causes de ses malheurs provisoires... (...at the bottom of the ocean of grief and the offenses where she was plunged for over four years and from where she emerges today, the French nation has assessed the causes of her momentary misfortunes...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

These quotes show two important characteristics of France (or the nation) in de Gaulle's rhetoric. De Gaulle uses the nation in an inclusive way, including all French in it. Yet, he also uses France and the nation as if referring to a person: a person who has grieved, a person who has endured sorrows, a person who has sacrificed. Again we see the importance of the reification of France in de Gaulle's speeches (for more details on this see VI On de Gaulle's celebration and remembrance of French victories as a source of identity, pages 102-113). The fact that the

French have suffered during the years of German occupation, makes the reification of France easier to relate to, and consequently, easier to unite to each other in order to fight for the suffering France—the woman who has given birth, values and identity to the French, and who now is in need of help and protection.

However, de Gaulle also talks about France as a land where the nation lives. He acknowledges that the territory has also suffered in the following way:

S'il est de fait qu'en beaucoup de régions du territoire la grande bataille de libération a passé sans entraîner de ruines massives, il ne l'est pas moins que certaines autres ont subi de terribles ravages. D'ailleurs, l'ennemi tient toujours dans tout ou partie de quinze de nos départements et, en particuliers, dans un grand nombre de nos ports. (If it is a fact that in many regions of the territory the great battle of liberation has gone through without leading to massive ruins, it is not less certain that others have suffered terrible ravages. For that matter, the enemy still has in all or in part fifteen of our departments, and, particularly, in a high count of our ports.) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

De Gaulle mentions the losses of territory and the effects these losses have on the French. In fact, in the next couple of sentences following this quote, he addresses the material sufferings due to the “paralyzation” of the French infrastructure, and consequently the setback and difficulties the French faced during the war.

3. Others

Even though the France's territory suffers, the territorial sufferings are not limited to it. The territorial sufferings encompass the lands of the Empire and of other nations.

In the speeches delivered in Brazzaville, Congo, de Gaulle includes the French African colonies: “*La France traverse la plus terrible crise de son Histoire. Ses frontières, son Empire, son indépendance et jusqu’à son âme sont menacés de destruction*” (“France is going through the most terrible crisis in her history. Her borders, her Empire, her independence, even her soul are threatened by destruction” (Discours de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940). In this quote, de Gaulle is trying to recruit people to add to his fight, and thus, by mentioning France’s borders, and Empire, he is urging the people in Africa to take action or else, they, as part of the French Empire will also lose the war, the rich legacy France has left in them, and lastly—as belonging to France—will be destroyed.

Another example from the speech delivered in Brazzaville in 1944: “*C’est qu’en effet, loin que la situation présente, pour cruelle et compliquée qu’elle soit, doive nous conseiller l’abstention, c’est au contraire, l’esprit d’entreprise qu’elle nous commande*” (“It is in fact, as far as the current situation, as cruel and complicate as it may be, should advise us non-participation, on the contrary, it is the spirit of undertaking that it demands from us”) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944). Again, note how de Gaulle includes those in the French colonies in taking action in the fight to free France by using the words, “...*la situation présente [...] nous commande*” (the current situation [...] commands us”).

“*Cette guerre n’est pas limitée au territoire malheureux de notre pays*” (“This war is not limited to the wretched territory of our country”) (Appel du 18 juin 1940). As indicated by the previous quote, aside from alluding to the French colonies, De Gaulle also mentions people from other nations enduring, as the French, sacrifices and sorrows. This shows particularly in Appel du 18 juin, the Discours de l’Albert Hall (1941), and the Discours du palais de Chaillot (1944). In the last two speeches, de Gaulle especially refers to those who have been subjugated and have

suffered under Germany's rule and mechanical force. He names them mainly for two purposes: first to give the French hope in knowing that they are not alone in their sufferings and perhaps even to reassure them of the harshness of the situation and their role in saving France and the world; second to highlight the spiritual qualities of those nations allied to France in the war, qualities akin to those valued and possessed by the French. This latter remark will be more fully addressed later in the chapter.

B. The nature of sacrifices and sorrows

De Gaulle often times refer to sacrifices and sorrows, at times being specific to the kind of sacrifices and sorrows that are being endured. The sacrifices and sorrows can be categorized in two: material and moral. Material sacrifices and sorrows include hunger, destruction of buildings, lands, lack of money, in sum, sacrifices and sorrows that are visible and quantifiable. Moral sacrifices and sorrows deal more with the emotions and traumatism of the war; they pertain more to the domain of the abstract and the non-quantifiable. Even though a material defeat carries a moral effect—it is enough to recall the moral implications and emotional responses of Waterloo to the French, the ending of WWI with the treaty of Versailles to the Germans, and Pearl Harbor, Vietnam and most recently 9/11 to the people of the United States—de Gaulle would sometimes point at both of them at the same time by using words that would carry both connotations at the same time but would also differentiate them at different times. Later in the chapter I will briefly expose some of the words that carry material and moral connotations. For now, I would like to focus on expressions reflecting material sacrifices and sufferings.

1. Material sacrifice and sorrow

One of de Gaulle's most used expressions in referring to the material losses is "*la force mécanique*" ("the mechanical force"). This expression is present three times in Appel du 18 juin 1940, and once in Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944—"...*nous nous trouvâmes submergés par la force mécanique allemande...*" ("...we found ourselves submerged by the German mechanical force..."). Material losses include France's inferiority in weaponry in air and land—"...*submergés par la force mécanique, terrestre et aérienne de l'ennemi...*" ("...submerged by the enemy's terrestrial and aerial mechanical force...") (Appel du 18 juin 1940) - the destruction of French territories—"...*au territoire malheureux de notre pays...*" ("...to the wretched territory of our country...") (Appel du 18 juin 1940)—the German occupation (previously exposed in the Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944), the pillage of the nation's resources—"...*notre patrie écrasé, pillé...*" ("...our country crushed, pillaged...") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)—, and the privation of material needs—"Chacun peut imaginer les difficultés matérielles et morales que nous avons dû surmonter..." ("Each one can imagine the material and moral difficulties that we had to overcome...") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941).

The losses of lives are also taken into account in these sufferings. However, de Gaulle uses the word *sang* (blood) containing both the material and the moral connotations of these sufferings. He uses it in expressions such as the following: "*le nuage de sang*" and "*le nuage si lourd de notre sang*" ("the cloud of blood" and "the so heavy cloud of blood") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941 and Discours radiodiffusé, Londres 6 juin 1944). To be more specific in the material losses—those that are quantifiable—de Gaulle could have stated the

number of men or French that had been killed or had died during the German occupation. Instead, he chose the word *sang* (blood) embracing the material a moral loss in one word.

While *sang* (blood) alludes to the loss of a life, it is a more general term and is not as quantifiable as the number of French who have perished during the occupation. Furthermore, the word *sang* (blood) creates a more visual account of the loss. Moreover, *sang* (blood) makes the loss more personal. Since this word is used when establishing a relationship with direct relative, here it emphasizes the fraternal bond French have with each other. Hence, by using this expression, de Gaulle creates a stronger bond and unity among the French. Also, the use of this word also indicates de Gaulle's sensitivity to the loss of human life, particularly of one of his brother or sister in nation. Thus, by using *sang*, de Gaulle not only conveys a horizontal relationship with his co-nationals, but also creates a strong bond, the fraternal bond, with and among the French.

Returning to the subject of material sacrifices, de Gaulle states, “...*chaque Français le comprend bien, devant une période difficile où la libération ne nous permet nullement l'aisance matérielle, mais comporte, au contraire, le maintien de sévères restrictions et exige de grands effort de travail et d'organisation*” (“...each French person understands it well, facing a difficult time where the liberation does not allow us at all material ease, but, on the contrary, comprises the maintaining of severe restrictions and demands great efforts of work and organization”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944). It is clear here that de Gaulle reiterates the importance of sufferings and sacrifices, particularly material ones (such as limiting their material ease, to work and to being organized) to be able to restore and reform France.

Perhaps one of the most explicit and outstanding quotes about sacrifices and sorrows is found in the concluding remarks of the speech entitled Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942,

Mes chers enfants de France, vous avez faim, parce que l'ennemi mange notre pain et notre viande. Vous avez froid, parce que l'ennemi vole notre bois et notre charbon, vous souffrez, parce que l'ennemi vous dit et vous fait dire que vous êtes des fils et des filles de vaincus. (My dear children of France, you are hungry, because the enemy eats our bread and our meat. You are cold, because the enemy steals our wood and our coal, you suffer because the enemy tells you and makes you say that you are sons and daughters of the defeated.) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942)

Note the material privations: hunger and cold; the pillage of food and natural resources belonging to France executed by the foreigners. However this quote also links the material to the moral suffering. In fact, material privations and material unfulfilled needs exist due to the German occupation. But along that there is moral suffering because of the emotions those privations caused by the German occupation—on top of being occupied—brings to French nation.

2. Moral sacrifice and sorrow

The moral implications of these material losses are reflected throughout de Gaulle's rhetoric. Aside from using expressions that allude both to the material and moral sacrifices and sufferings as previously discussed, de Gaulle uses strong words with strong sounds, such as “malheurs”, “cruelle”, “ravages” and “outragé” (“misfortunes”, “cruel”, “ravages” and “insulted”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944, Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944, Appel du 18 juin 1940, Discours radiodifusé, Londres 6 juin 1944, Discours du

palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944, Discours de l'hôtel de Ville de Paris, 25 août 1944) to emphasize the harshness of the sacrifices and sorrows French endure. He also uses words carrying strong moral conations, such as “*défaite*” and “*battue*” (“defeated” and “beaten”) (Appel du 18 juin 1940, Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942).

Further, throughout de Gaulle’s speeches we find expressions and omissions of quantifying French losses, to emphasize the impossibility of quantifying the sufferings and thus the heaviness of the burdens bear. Among them are “*submergé*” (“submerged”) and “*opprimé*” (“oppressed”) (Appel du 18 juin 1940, Discours radiodifusé, Londres 6 juin 1944, Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944, Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944).

As far as making the burdens unquantifiable de Gaulle uses words that convey a sense of vastness and depth, such as in

...des pertes gigantesques...quels perils et quelles pertes! (...of gigantic losses...many perils and losses!) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

...misère douloureuse and imperméable... (...painful and impervious misery...) (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944), and

...indicibles difficultés... (...unspeakable difficulties...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Thus the struggles the French face are gigantic, impervious and unspeakable.

Again to emphasize the non-quantifiable aspect of these sacrifices and sufferings and to make them transcendent over common people and time, de Gaulle uses figure of speech. For example, he alludes to the depth of the ocean, to the skies, to values, and to the foundations of existence. The last example, along with the following examples, illustrate how de Gaulle ascribes cosmic proportions to the sacrifices and sufferings the French endure at the time:

Au fond de l'océan des douleurs et des outrages où [la France] fut plongée depuis plus de quatre ans... (In the depth of the ocean of grieves and insults where France was plunged for over four years...) (Discours de palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Derrière le nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes. (Behind the heavy cloud of our blood and tears, here reappears the sun of our grandeur.) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

...le désastre momentané de la France a bouleversé le fond en comble les fondements même de son existence... (...the momentary disaster of France has shattered the depths of even the foundations of her existence...) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

Through these examples, we then see how de Gaulle refers to a force beyond human power to point out the difficulties the nation is going through. The depth and vastness of the ocean, the heavy and unquantifiable number of clouds and the depth of the values upon which France was founded appeal to cosmic proportions and provide transcendence to the moments, sacrifices and sufferings France lives.

In addition, General Gaulle uses religious words to convey the depth and the transcendence of sacrifices and afflictions. He uses words such as *inexpiable oppression* (inexpiable oppression), and alludes twice to martyrdom - *martyr, martyrisé* (martyr, martyred) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941, Discours de l'hôtel de Ville de Paris, 15 août 1944). Even though not all of the French practice the Catholic religion, this religion has been present for centuries in French culture. Thus the French would understand religious references and vocabulary, and would understand the connotations they possess.

"Paris! Paris outragé! Paris brisé! Paris martyrisé! mais Paris libéré!" (Paris! Insulted Paris! Broken Paris! Martyred Paris! But liberated Paris!) (Discours de l'hôtel de Ville de Paris,

15 août 1944). De Gaulle refers to Paris that has suffered, a Paris that has been a martyr. Martyr is a word that carries a strong meaning. A martyr is a person who bears much suffering, who is unjustly wronged, and a person who has suffered torture or death for its strong conviction or religious belief (Le Dictionnaire, Centre national de ressources textuelles et lexicales).

At the beginning of Christianity, many of the faithful believers became martyrs. A classic example is Stephen, the Christian disciple who denied not his faith (found in the Bible, in the book of Act chapter 7 verses 54 to 60) and was stoned for it. All of the early apostles and disciples of the Church of Christ endured persecution and sacrificed for their faith. Their martyrdom inspires believers throughout the world to press on regardless of sacrifices and sorrows to be made and endured, and to remain true to the faith. A martyr is the peak of enduring sacrifices and sorrows. A martyr is admired, provides unity among the believers and becomes a role model for the believers. Thus the importance of the strong connotation comprised in this term. With it, de Gaulle is then comparing Paris to a martyr, and hence, showing a noble quality Paris has that mainly the French (even though it can be inclusive of all the people in the world) should admire and emulate, at the same time that he is uniting the French through the sorrows of their nation's capital.

Note also that this quote carries a crescendo: De Gaulle mentions Paris, then qualifies, reifies and by calling it "*Paris outragé*" ("insulted Paris"); but Paris has been more than insulted, it has been "*brisé*" (broken), and "*martyrisé*" ("martyred"). The word "Paris" is repeated every time de Gaulle attempts to describe it and its sorrows, and each adjective used to describe it carries a moral connotation of sorrow. Each adjective is also more illustrative and in a sense, carries a heavier connotation of the outrages Paris has suffered, culminating in its martyrdom.

Looking back to the cosmic proportions and figures of speech used by de Gaulle in

stating the inhumanity and unquantifiable sacrifices and sorrows France has bear it is interesting to see that sorrows usually come because of humiliation due to their powerlessness to prevent the enemy from harming and conquering them, and consequently, damaging their national image and identity. This applies to the reified France, the reified Paris, the territories of France, and the people of France. For instance, in the previous quote from the Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942 de Gaulle states that the French suffer because “...*l’ennemi vous dit et vous fait dire que vous êtes des fils et des fille de vaincus...*” (“...the enemy tells you and makes you say that you are sons and daughters of the defeated...”). Contrary to nationalist rhetoric, where heroes and victorious moments are brought into remembrance, the Germans mock the French by telling them that they are “...*des fils et filles de vaincus...*” (“...sons and daughters of the defeated...”). This quote makes it clear that the suffering is mostly emotional because the enemy is constantly diminishing the image and identity of the nation of France, for the enemy is constantly abasing the French by reminding them of their defeat.

The “...*inexpiable oppression...*,” the “...*misère douloureuse et impermeable...*” (...painful and impervious misery...)” (Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944), the “...*pertes gigantesques...*” (“...gigantic losses...”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944), the “...*indicibles difficultés...*” (“...unspeakable difficulties...”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944), and the “...*nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes...*” (“...heavy cloud of our blood and tears...”) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944) all take root in the loss of French freedom and the trampling of French values executed by a foreign nation.

Consequently the sorrows referred to in these speeches, for the most part, have the roots in the lack of freedom, the trampling of the French identity, to which history, morals, and values, particularly those of grandeur and freedom, play a key role in defining. However, the sacrifices

and sorrows used in a nationalist speech provide strength, unity and a role model to the people of the nation, and help them transcend over the challenges they face. Moreover, the humiliation suffered point to future and greater victories, and highlight human sensitivity and spiritual qualities the suffering nations possess, as I will expose in the next sections of this chapter.

C. Sacrifices and Sorrows turned into victories

Nationalist discourse tends to be idealistic. For that reason, it does not matter how many sacrifices and sorrows are mentioned in the speeches because at the end these sacrifices and sorrow will work for the greater good—the nation’s good. Sacrifices and sorrows are seen with contrition and respect, and are regarded as defining moments of the nation. They are to unite, uplift, inspire and edify the people of the nation. For this reason, sacrifices and sorrows are turned into past, present or future victories.

1. Providing hope, values (such as unity), and inspire to victory in the near future

De Gaulle provides hope to the French in the hard conditions they currently live in. He says,

Foudroyés aujourd’hui par la force mécanique, nous pourrons vaincre dans l’avenir par une force mécanique supérieur. (Striken today by the mechanical force, we will

overcome in the future by a superior mechanical force)

...rien n’est perdu pour la France. Les mêmes moyens qui nous ont vaincus peuvent faire venir un jour la victoire... (...nothing is lost for France. The same means that defeated us

can one day make victory come...) (Appel du 18 juin 1940)

In these quotes, de Gaulle addresses the defeat France has succumbed against the technology of the Germans; however, he talks about the future, a future in which France will have defeated the

Germans by a superior technology. De Gaulle then is giving the French encouragement and hope by providing the image of a future and victorious France. In this case, France's victory comprises the development of an advanced and superior technology and the effort put by the French to achieve such advancement.

De Gaulle inspires the French to unite and to strive for victory. Even though he recognizes that France has made mistakes, which have led to its defeat, he also states that it is “...*absurde de considerer la lutte comme perdue...*” (“...absurd to consider this fight as lost...”) (Appel du 22 juin 1940). After listing some of France's strategic and institutional mistakes leading into the German occupation, he declares: “*Mais il nous reste un vaste Empire, une flotte intacte, beaucoup d'or. Il nous reste des alliés, dont les ressources sont immenses et qui dominant les mers. Il nous reste les gigantesques possibilités de l'industrie américaine*” (“But there is still a vast Empire behind us, an intact fleet, much gold. There remains for us the gigantic possibilities of the American industry) and then adds, “*Les mêmes conditions de la guerre qui nous on fait battre [...] peuvent donner, demain, la victoire*” (“The same war conditions that beat us [...] can give us, tomorrow, the victory”) (Appel du 22 juin 1940). Again, de Gaulle speaks of victory in material terms for he enumerates an intact fleet, gold and industry, all resources France can dispose of to win the war.

The following words serve also to inspire the French and point them to victory:

Des milliers de Français ou de sujets français ont décidé de continuer la guerre jusqu'à la libération. Des milliers et de milliers d'autres n'attendent, pour le faire, que de trouver des chefs dignes de ce nom. (Thousands of French or subjects of France have decided to continue the war until liberation. Thousands and thousands of others are only

waiting for worthy leaders of this name to do so.) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940).

In these quotes, de Gaulle alludes to the material resources that will lead to France's success by using expressions such as *vaste* (vast), *immenses* (immense), *gigantesques* (gigantic), and *milliers de milliers* (thousands of thousands). These expressions convey the idea that these resources are unlimited. Moreover, expressions like *beaucoup d'or* (much gold), *dominant* (dominate), and *flotte intacte* (intact fleet) connote prestige and power. With this, de Gaulle is assuring the French that the war is not over and that it will be won by France. So, even though Germany had a good technology de Gaulle shows that France has unlimited resources and can win the war.

The previous expressions also fit what I have described as cosmic proportions (see III Elements of nationalism, pages 30-35, and IV On de Gaulle's speeches: an overview, pages 68-71), for it states in a very broad way the resources that France can dispose of. These expressions make it seem like France can dispose of the best and all the resources the world can give to it. In the Appel du 18 juin 1940 de Gaulle states: "*Toutes les fautes, tous les retards, toutes les souffrances n'empêchent qu'il y a dans l'univers, tous les moyens nécessaires pour écraser un jour nos ennemis*" ("All of the mistakes, all of the setbacks, all of the sufferings cannot prevent that there is in all of the universe, all the means necessary to one day crush our enemies") (Appel du 18 juin 1940). Again, de Gaulle uses cosmic proportions to appeal to a supreme power (in the universe) to help the French come out victorious from this war. The universe contains all of the necessary means to win the war, and return France its sovereignty, honor, and grandeur, and de Gaulle implies here that it will provide the necessary to do so, and again.

The previous quotes rather emphasize the material means needed to win the war, yet the last quote also alludes on a moral side of the victory. It seems like in the sufferings France will find its strength to bring forth its victory.

“Paris! Paris outragé! Paris brisé! Paris martyrisé! mais Paris libéré!” (Paris! Insulted Paris! Broken Paris! Martyred Paris! But liberated Paris!) (Discours de l’hôtel de Ville de Paris, 15 août 1944). Aside from emphasizing the sorrows France has endured, this quote also turns sacrifices and sorrows into victories. The sentence does not end with a martyred Paris, but with a freed Paris, a victorious Paris. The crescendo I previously referred to does not end with the sorrows Paris has endured, but after it has faithfully and nobly endured them, culminates with Paris’ freedom and victory. As freedom from the burdens of this world is promised to religious martyrs, at the end Paris becomes free from its burdens—in this case the German oppression—and is saved by France’s children. Thus, the crescendo of Paris’ sufferings, culminating in its qualification as a martyr, becomes even more important for they are turn for its good; they are turned into France’s victory.

2. Emphasizing sacrifices and sorrows to highlight achievements and victories

The idea here is linked to an old idea consisting of making the enemy (or in de Gaulle’s case sufferings) overwhelming and inhuman, and then, after overcoming the enemy (or sufferings), the subject becomes even greater than the great and overwhelming enemy or obstacles that the subject overcame. The person who overcame his overwhelming enemy, obstacles or sufferings becomes more praise worthy, and is regard with a higher esteem, for this person defeat an unbeatable opponent rather than if he had overpowered a feeble enemy or a common obstacle. This is why Plutarch makes the Gallic so challenging to Caesar, and describes their leader, Vercingetorix, as “putting his most beautiful armor and decorating his horse” to

surrender his armor and seat at Caesar's feet as a symbol of his recognition of Caesar's supremacy (Plutharc, The Parrallel Lives). In a like manner, de Gaulle describes the deep, vast, and indescribable sufferings that have been overcome by the French, which resulted in Paris' freedom. In this context, after enduring much suffering, Paris is free, Paris is saved, and all, the French, Paris, and France, are held in higher esteem.

The following quotes illustrate well this point:

...qui pourrait contester, qu'en dépit des terribles conditions intérieures et extérieures où la France s'est trouvée réduite, elle aura voulu et elle aura su signer, elle aussi, la victoire ? (“...who could question that in spite of the terrible internal and external conditions where France has found herself reduced, she would have wanted and she would have been able to sign, also, victory?”)

[Au] fond de l'océan des douleurs et des outrages où elle fut plongée depuis plus de quatre ans et dont elle émerge aujourd'hui... (At the bottom of the ocean of grief and the offenses where she was plunged for over four years and from where she emerges today...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

And, perhaps the most illustrative example of turning the endurance of sacrifices and sorrows into great and exemplary victories: “*Derrière le nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes, voici que reparait le soleil de notre grandeur!*” (“Behind the heavy cloud of our blood and tears, here reappears the sun of our grandeur!”) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944). These quotes show the pattern of emphasizing the sorrows and sacrifices endured to turn them into more glorious victories to the French, which renders them more respected and admirable to themselves, their co-nationals, and other peoples of the world.

At other instances, de Gaulle is not specific about what type of victory he refers to, but his words refer the passion he has for a victorious France.

Allons ! Voici le grand moment ! Voici l'heure du bon sens et du courage. Partout l'ennemi chancelle et fléchit. Français de l'Afrique du Nord ! que par vous nous rentrions en ligne, d'un bout à l'autre de la Méditerranée, et voilà la guerre gagnée grâce à la France! (Let's go! This is the great moment! This is the hour of good sense and courage. Everywhere the enemy wobbles and weakens. French of North Africa! That for you we enter in line from end to end of the Mediterranean, and lo and behold the war is won because of France!) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942)

In here de Gaulle does not mention specific battles, regions to be freed, or means to win the war. He just mentions victory, victory thanks to France.

The nature of sacrifices and sorrows apply to the nature of the victories. So far, I have exposed more the material side of it, yet, bear in mind that as a defeat brings both material and moral suffering, victory brings both material and moral rejoicing and development. Included in these moral victories, are the spiritual qualities that the suffering people develop. This point will be discussed briefly in this chapter. However, before discussing this matter, I will like to point out that de Gaulle, as probably any nationalist leader, sees his nation's defeat, sacrifices and sorrows as temporary.

D. The temporality of sacrifices and sorrows

There are different reasons why a nationalist leader would acknowledge defeat, yet will paint this defeat as temporary. The main reason is obvious: a nationalist is proud of his or her nation and believes the nation can and will overcome whatever obstacle is on the nation's path.

In the case of de Gaulle, we find several explanations he gives in his speeches as to the temporality of the French defeat.

First, the defeat will only be temporary because France will find the material means to overcome it. As evidenced by the quotes on this section France's superiority will be shortly revealed to the world once again. France has allies, willing men, and other resources (including that of a supreme power in the universe) behind it, so there is no question that it will win the war.

Second the defeat will be temporary because of the determination and ardor the French feel to defend France and its traditions (such as freedom, honor and grandeur) and its unity. This is partly reflected in the words: "*Nous étions une poussière d'hommes. Nous sommes maintenant un bloc inébranlable*" ("We were a dust of men. We now are an unshakeable block") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941).

At last sacrifices and sorrows will be temporal because there seems to be no other logical outcome for France than to come out victorious in this war. De Gaulle conveys this certainty in the last three sentences of his addressed entitled Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942: "*Eh bien ! moi, je vais vous faire une promesse, une promesse de Noël. Chers enfants de France, vous recevrez bientôt une visite, la visite de la Victoire. Ah ! comme elle sera belle, vous verrez !*" ("Well, I will make a promise, a Christmas promise. Dear children of France, you will soon receive a visit, the visit of Victory. Ah! How beautiful she will be, you will see!").

The resolution, means, and qualities that France holds will bring forth France's greatness and victory in the war. The temporary sacrifices and sorrows serve to contrast their temporary nature against the lasting victories the French nation has and will have. Moreover, the sacrifices

and sorrows are seen with respect but in a positive manner as they serve to make reforms and improve the nation, and they point to a better institutionalized, a more technological advanced, overall, a more powerful and victorious France.

E. The highlighting of spiritual qualities through sacrifice and sorrow

In connection with the previous point, sacrifices and sorrows in a nationalist speech highlight the ‘spiritual qualities’ of the people of the nation. To recall the words of Margalit, “People who have [endured sorrow] see themselves as representing some sort of ‘great spirituality’ [...]. Humiliated people see themselves as spontaneous, generous, and capable of intense emotions and bold gestures, as opposed to the calculating, intellectualizing character of the oppressors” (McKim and McMahan 77). The victory then not only involves a material victory, but also a moral one that includes the retention and further development of spirituality, which is closely linked to the morals and values the nation owns. This is probably the reason why de Gaulle does not emphasize the material victories, but rather the qualities or moral victories the French possess and will further developed after these challenging times.

Margalit’s second part of the quote is particularly interesting due to its applicability to de Gaulle’s rhetoric. As a brief review, de Gaulle uses cosmic proportions and some words with strong emotional connotations to describe the sacrifices and sufferings the French have. Furthermore, he often likes to refer to the Germans—France’s enemies—as “*la force mécanique*” (“the mechanical force”), which perfectly coincides with Margalit’s description of intense emotions and human sensitivity by the French (the suffering nation) opposed to the cold, “calculating, intellectualizing character of the oppressors” (“*la force mécanique*”, Germany or the enemy) (McKim and McMahan 77).

Among the moral values and spiritual qualities de Gaulle celebrates are courage, willpower or determination, resistance to occupation or lack of freedom, honor, discernment, unity and hope. Just as de Gaulle talks about France, the nation and the French, as the characters who have sacrificed and endured sorrows, de Gaulle refers to them as characters holding higher spiritual qualities, and who will bring forth France's freedom, grandeur and, in a sense, France's salvation.

“[Malgré] le tumulte de la guerre, jamais encore nous n'avons plus clairement discerné ce que nous sommes, ce que nous voulons et pourquoi nous sommes certains d'avoir choisi la meilleure part pour le service de la France” ([In spite] of the war's turmoil, never have we most clearly discerned who we are, what we want, and the certainty of having chosen the best part to the service of France” (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941). In this quote, de Gaulle alludes to the great sorrows French had to bear. However, he highlights the fact that the French never lost sight of their mission to help the nation and restore its freedom and grandeur. Moreover, it is more remarkable that even in the turmoil of the war the French never lost sight of their sense of love and duty for the service of France.

A similar meaning appears in the following sentence: *“C'est un fait que la France a su discerner, au travers du nuage de sang et de larmes dont on tentait de l'aveugler, que la seule voie qui mène au salut est celle qu'ont choisie pour elle ceux de ses enfants qui sont libres”* (“It is a fact that France was able to discern, through the cloud of blood and tears on which was attempted to blind her, that the only path that leads into salvation is the path that those of her free children chose for her”) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941). Note that the sacrifices and sorrows in this quote surpass the description of the same in the previous quote. But also notice that the ability to discern in the midst of so much sorrow becomes greater, more

admirable, more commendable, and more praise-worthy. The emphasis on the depth and harshness of the sacrifices and sorrows emphasize France's quality of discernment. As explained before under the concept of sacrifices and sorrows being turned into victories, the deeper the sorrow, the most significant and profound the victories or spiritual qualities become.

“The effects of national [sorrow] include both compensatory illusions and sensitive insights. People who have [endured sorrow] see themselves as representing some sort of ‘great spirituality’ [...] As they see it, they themselves embody human sensitivity, warmth, a poetic soul, and spiritual closeness to ‘what really is important in life’, and so their inferiority is artificial and transient” (McKim and McMahan 77). Again the deeper the sorrow, the most significant and profound the victories or spiritual qualities become. This forms part of the “compensatory illusions and insights” Margalit refers to. Keep in mind these concepts as I describe the quotes reflecting France's spiritual grandeur.

“Nous sommes des Français de toutes origines, de toutes conditions, de toutes opinions, qui avons décidé de nous unir dans la lutte de notre pays. Tous l'ont fait volontairement, purement, simplement” (“We are French of all origins, of all conditions, of all opinions, who have decided to unite ourselves in the fight for our country. All have done it voluntarily, purely, simply”) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). Note how de Gaulle reaffirms what the French identity consists of, including the morals and values comprised in it. De Gaulle highlights the spiritual qualities of unity, purity, and simplicity, all qualities voluntarily developed for the good of France.

As a side note, it is interesting that these qualities are often spoken of in religious contexts, for in a religion one can voluntarily choose to be pure, simple, and united with other people of the same faith. These virtues still stand in the Catholic religion, where monks and nuns

voluntarily choose to make vows of simplicity, purity, and unity with Christ and His Church. In a like way, even though perhaps not in a direct way, de Gaulle attribute these important spiritual qualities to his co-nationals to unite and inspire them to be better and work together towards the re-building of France.

I will now draw attention to the second to last sentence of this quote: “...*qui avons décidé de nous unir dans la lutte de notre pays...*” (“...who have decided to unite ourselves in the fight for our country...”). For a few centuries now, France has stood as a self-proclaimed leader and defender of freedom. Freedom to elect the regime and the governors has been important to the French, particularly to those belonging to modern France. In fact, many conflicts recorded in French history come to be struggles for freedom. Some of these conflicts include freedom from foreign rulers, freedom to choose rulers, freedom of and from religion, and freedom from other societal constraints—such as the movement to give rights to the women.

The fact that the French have the ability to choose speaks highly of them, for it means that they are a sovereign nation, a nation empowered by its members, and that they have won the battles for freedom. But this ability to choose grows in significance because, even though in bondage, the French “[ont] décidé de [s’] unir dans la lutte pour [leur] pays...” (“[have] decided to unite [themselves] in the fight for [their] country...”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). This speaks highly of the French. It shows that the French are fighters who do not give up when obstacles arise, but rather, that when obstacles do arise, their identity as French, treasuring freedom, re-emerges in a more resolute manner. In other words, French do not let circumstances decide who they are and what they value, rather, their identity is carried through good and bad times, and even in bondage, they are still able to make decisions and unite to fight

for France. The value of the ability to choose becomes more significant because of the harsh circumstances the French are in.

The quality and value of unity is again emphasized in de Gaulle's rhetoric:

Mais c'est d'une telle abnégation, autant que d'une telle cohésion, que nous tirons notre force. C'est de ce foyer qu'a jailli, chaque jour plus haute et plus ardente, la grande flamme française qui nous a désormais trempés. (But, it is of such abnegation along with such cohesion that we draw our strength from. It is from this hearth that has emerged each day more burning and high, the great French flame that has from now on soaked us.)

(Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

Abnegation ties in with devotion, or the values of loyalty and duty. Further, abnegation carries a spiritual connotation, thus emphasizing the spirituality of the quality of loyalty and willingness to sacrifice for France in the French. Cohesion refers to a strong unity among the French, regardless of their origins and of their current geographic position or situation. Additionally, the word *foyer* in French means hearth but also home; consequently it re-emphasizes the sanguine relationship that ties all French and the unity that should exist among them. Finally, the qualities of courage and freedom are portrayed in the great French flame, which alludes to the flame of resistance, particularly to foreign rulers, and overall, the flame of perseverance and freedom.

In speaking about the armed forces, de Gaulle states:

Pour nos armées de terre, de mer, de l'air, il n'y a point de problème. Jamais elles ne furent plus ardentes, plus habiles, plus disciplinées. L'Afrique, l'Italie, l'océan et le ciel ont vu leur force et leur gloire renaissantes. La Terre natale les verra demain! (In

regards to our armed forces of land, sea and air, no problem exists. Never have they been

more fervent, more agile, more disciplined. Africa, Italy, the ocean and the heavens have seen their renascent strength and glory. The homeland will see them tomorrow!)

(Discours radiodiffusé, Londres 6 juin 1944)

The qualities highlighted in here are the passion they feel for their cause (“*ardentes*” or “fervent”) (which word can also carry a connotation), their agility, and their discipline.

But even more than these qualities, de Gaulle emphasizes the strength and glory the armed forces have and will bring to France by overemphasizing their performance in Africa and Italy. De Gaulle clearly uses cosmic proportions when stating that the continent of Africa, the country of Italy and the oceans and skies have seen their renascent performance. It would seem as if de Gaulle wants to portray an idea of the resurrection of France through the renewal of the spiritual qualities of the nation, including its territories, the French in France, and those fighting overseas.

In challenging times relationships are usually either broken or strengthened. De Gaulle emphasizes the “human sensitivity, warmth, [poetic soul], and spiritual closeness to ‘what really is important in life’” (McKim and McMahan 77). To him, what really matters is freedom, the legacy the French have inherited from their ancestors and the continuity of this legacy and identity. What matters is reforming a broken France into a free and exemplary France. What matters, is the unity the French have among themselves, for that is part of their legacy and that is how they will achieve their goals. The warmth, sensitivity, closeness to other people and to what is important in life, and even the poetic soul are clearly present in de Gaulle’s speeches as illustrated in the previous examples.

As I pointed out at the beginning of the chapter, General Gaulle also addresses the sufferings and highlights the spiritual qualities of other nations. In the speech of 1941 at the

Albert Hall de Gaulle describes Russian resistance as “*heroïque*”, and reasserts France’s alliance with the Polish, Greeks, Belgians, and others under the Germans’ “*inexpiable oppression*” and “*martyre*” (“martyrdom”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941). The sorrows that these nations are suffering are parallel to the ones France suffers, and thus, de Gaulle also builds a bond between the French and other peoples under similar circumstances. The fact that these other nations have endured that sorrow and are still resisting the Germans, qualifies them as worthy French allies for they share the passion for liberty.

The speech at the Chaillot Palace better describes the qualities these other nations possess. In it de Gaulle declares:

De toute notre âme nous entendons rendre hommage aux braves et chères nations qui sont en train de la remporter avec nous. (With all of our soul we hear homage being rendered to the brave and cherished nations that are carrying it with us.)

Notre hommage s'adresse à l'Empire britannique, qui, comme nous, tira l'épée le 3 septembre 1939, qui subit à nos côtés les revers de 1940, qui ensuite, presque solitaire, sauva l'Europe par sa résolution et qui triomphe maintenant avec nous. (Our homage is addressed to the British Empire, that like us, drew sword on September 3, 1939, that suffered by our sides, the setbacks of 1940, and next, almost solitary, saved Europe due to its resolution, and that triumphs with us now.) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, we septembre 1944)

De Gaulle also pays tribute to the Soviet Union who under the German aggression of 1941

...sut trouver dans l'admirable courage de son peuple, les vertus de ses combattants et l'organisation de ses vastes richesses, l'énergie et les moyens nécessaires pour chasser l'envahisseur et briser dans de terribles batailles l'essentiel de sa force guerrière...

(...was able to find in the admirable courage of its people, the virtues of its combatants and the organization of vast richness, the energy and necessary means to haunt down its invader and to break, in the terrible battles, the essential of its warrior's strength...)

Further, de Gaulle renders tribute to the United States of America who after the attack (the suffering)

*...ont su devenir une grande puissance militaire et réaliser par-delà les mers les immenses entreprises qui ramènent l'Europe à la vie, tout en arrachant au Japon les bases qui bientôt le menaceront au cœur... (...*knew how to become a great military power and accomplish beyond the seas the immense undertakings that bring Europe back to life while tearing down Japan the bases that will soon threaten its heart...).

Finally,

Notre hommage s'adresse aux vaillantes nations [...] qui furent entièrement submergées par l'abominable marée mais qui, comme nous-mêmes, ne désespèrent jamais et voient paraître, à leur tour, l'aube de la libération. (Our homage is addresses to the valiant nations [...] that were entirely submerged by the abominable tide, but like us, never despaired and saw, in turn, the apparition of the dawn of liberation.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941).

The above quotes are about other nations (or their peoples), the wrongs they have received, but also about the good that they have, and the similarities both in the sufferings as in the qualities, they share with the French. The British drew sword the same day the French did, and fought and overcame, almost alone, against the enemy, just as France has done. The Soviets, in the midst of affliction, showed their admirable courage, virtues of its people and resources to defeat the Germans. After suffering a terrible blow, the United States was able to become a military power

and have been able to bring Europe back to life in the combat for freedom, and even more, its power will be also felt in Japan, part of the Asian continent.

It is interesting that de Gaulle, being a nationalist, consequently mostly concerned with his nation, would acknowledge spiritual qualities other nations possess. However, note that the spiritual qualities spoken of, such as endurance, tenacity, bravery and solidarity, are brought forth in a similar manner to the ones used to describe the brave French united in the fight for their nation possess. In a way, the sufferings are also turned into victories, but furthermore, they highlight the spiritual qualities these nations have. They also make the French feel more empathic towards their allies, and accept their temporary help, seeing the commonalities of their sufferings and qualities, until France is free and regains its grandeur. Thus these acknowledgements serve to thank France's allies, but more importantly, they reaffirm, inspire and further emphasize the resources and spiritual qualities the French hold, for they become equal, if not superior, to their allies'.

One last but important quote that I would like to touch on is found in the speech spoken at the Albert Hall on November of 1941. In it de Gaulle addresses the French and states:

Au moment où tout paraissait crouler dans le désastre et dans le désespoir, il s'agissait de savoir si ce grand et noble pays livré à l'ennemi par la plus atroce trahison de l'Histoire, trouverait parmi ses enfants des hommes assez résolus pour ramasser son drapeau. Il s'agissait de savoir si un Empire intact de 60 millions d'habitants ne contribuerait d'aucune manière à la lutte pour la vie ou pour la mort de la France. Il s'agissait de savoir si, aux côtés de nos braves alliés, qui poursuivaient le combat pour leur salut et pour le nôtre, il ne resterait pas un seul morceau belligérant de nos terres. Il s'agissait de savoir si la voix de la France allait entièrement s'éteindre ou, pire

encore, si le monde pourrait penser la reconnaître dans la détestable contrefaçon qu'en font l'ennemi et les traîtres. Il s'agissait de savoir enfin si, dans la nuit de la servitude, la nation ne verrait plus briller aucune lumière d'espérance française pour soutenir son esprit de résistance et faire la preuve qu'elle restait solidaire du parti de la liberté. [Tel fut, au premier jour, notre but, tel il demeure aujourd'hui, sans que rien en soit changé. Vers ce but, nous avons marché sans hésiter et sans fléchir]. (At the moment where everything seemed to crumble into disaster and hopelessness, it became a matter of knowing if this great and noble country delivered to the enemy by the most atrocious treachery of History, would find among its children men resolute enough to pick up the its flag. It became a matter to know if an intact Empire of 60 million habitants would not contribute in any way to the fight for France's life or death. It became a matter to know if, on the sides of our allies, who continued the combat for their and our salvation, not a single belligerent piece of our lands would remain. It became a matter of knowing if the voice of France would completely fade or, worse even, if the world could think of recognizing it in the hateful counterfeit in which the enemy and the traitors do. At last, it became a matter of knowing if in the night of servitude, the nation would not see shine the light of French hope anymore to sustain its spirit of resistance and make proof that she [the nation] remained solidarity to the party of liberty. [Such was, from the first day, our goal, such it remains today, with no changes made. Towards this goal we marched without hesitating and without bending.] (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941)

This is a long quote, but I think that it serves to show the emphasis on the spiritual qualities de Gaulle instills in and emphasizes to the French. This quote reflects de Gaulle's passion and the

inspiration he provided to the French. It emphasizes the heroic resolution, in the midst of so much sacrifice and suffering, the French had to free France. In spite of France's current conditions, de Gaulle describes her as "*grand et noble*" ("great and noble"), emphasizing that this perilous and gloomy situation is only temporary because he believes in the grandeur and nobility of France, and the bravery and determination of France's children.

General de Gaulle also addresses the qualities of resistance, solidarity, and perseverance by using expressions such as "*résolu*" ("resolute"), "*soutenir son esprit de résistance*" ("sustain its spirit of resistance"), stating that the goal has been the same from the first day, and that they have moved forward "*sans hésiter et sans fléchir*" ("without hesitating and without bending").

In addition, the bravery, spirit of freedom and resistance, as well as the determination, all spiritual qualities, are present in the many images de Gaulle appeals to, such as picking up the flag after it has fallen and in the midst of the heartbreaking panorama de Gaulle depicts, and the un fading of the light of hope in the gloomy scenery de Gaulle portrays.

Like the quote where Paris is depicted as insulted, broken and martyred, de Gaulle shows his mastery of the language in that with his words he describes the war, the sorrows and sacrifices with a crescendo. De Gaulle speaks of the country of France then of the French, next of the French Empire adding 60 million people to the cause of France, then he adds France's allies who are followed by the voice of France; finally he jumps into the most abstract concepts such as the flame of the French hope, the spirit of French resistance, and the solidarity to the party of liberty. Not only does he includes more and more people and territory in this quote, but also values and qualities that pertain particularly to the French. The encompassing of more people and more territories, even of abstract notions, is part of ascribing cosmic proportions

and giving transcendence to these events, nations, and people—in particular to the French who are the key actors in this war.

Like in the crescendo describing Paris' sufferings, de Gaulle ends this crescendo on a bright side: the French are brave, determined, unmovable to their righteous cause, and will remain, as he declares at the end of this speech, with no other "*raison, d'autre intérêt, d'autre honneur, que de rester, jusqu'au bout, des Français dignes de la France*" ("reason, no other interest, no other honor but to remain, until the end, French worthy of France") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941). Thus, again, the deeper the sorrows and sacrifices endured, the deeper the spiritual qualities the French develop. The deeper spiritual qualities they possess the more admirable they become, and consequently the brighter the light becomes for others to follow.

F. Conclusion

In conclusion, we see that de Gaulle's discourse is highly nationalistic, at least in what regards this element of sacrifices and sorrows. Important things were discussed in this chapter, such as to who endures sacrifices and sorrows, the material and moral sacrifices and sorrows endured, the temporality of them, and how sacrifices and sorrows are turned into victories. Furthermore, just as stated by Renan and Margalit, it was exposed in this chapter that the remembrance and requisition of sacrifices and sorrows are revealed in a positive way. Without diminishing them, these sacrifices and sorrows help to inspire and unite the people of the nation. They also are often turned into moral and material victories, and, to highlight the identity and spiritual qualities of the people of the nation. Through this element, de Gaulle also emphasizes the moral values of his nation, the identity of the nation, the importance of the good of the nation and magnitude of reforming for a better and brighter outcome of the nation. Consequently,

through this element of nationalism, Charles de Gaulle reinforces other elements of nationalism, while fulfilling the function and importance of the element of nationalism of sacrifices and sorrows.

IX. On enemies

As described in the rubric: *Though not fundamental to nationalism, enemies are constituted exclusively by foreigners. The baseness of the enemies serves to contrast and glorify the goodness of the people of the nation.*

As previously explained in this work, enemies and the treatment of opposition are not an essential characteristic of nationalism because a nation is not negatively defined against others, but rather celebrates its heritage, virtues, victories and identity. However, enemies, absent and present, do provide insights into the type of speech the audience deals with. So far, it is one of the distinctions between populist, pluralist and nationalist rhetoric. To recall it briefly, a pluralist has no enemies, a populist has enemies both within and outside the limits of the country or nation, and a nationalist has enemies outside of the nation. In the latter case, the enemies will be foreigners trying to invade, conquer, diminish or subdue the nation the speaker belongs to or speaks of.

A. The importance of context

It is likely that the presence of enemies in this type of speeches is conditioned to the nation's context. For instance, in the inaugural speech by Ben Gurion, "Road of Valor", he does bring out Israel's enemies. At this point in time Israel had just finished a war with the Arabs and Ben Gurion is opening "the road to Jerusalem" and commemorating Israel's victory (Crosscup 17). Since a war has recently taken place, it seems logical to point out enemies in here. Franklin Delano Roosevelt's speech was also given at a difficult time. However, this difficult time had to do with the economy and no particular war or conflict against foreigners. Therefore, it seems logical that there is no mention of enemies in FDR's speech.

For Sun Yat-Sen, China was struggling internally. Sun wanted China to overcome its internal struggles and rise to become democratic and a world power. Since Japan was in the process of modernization, leaving China behind, and had won the First Sino-Japanese War, Japan remained China's main rival. However, probably because China was not then in direct conflict with Japan, Japan is scarcely mentioned in Sun Yat-Sen's speech. The mention of enemies serves to contrast the foreigners to the Chinese, which emphasizes the qualities of the Chinese.

The history of Ireland is one of conflict. In 1922 most of the island gained its status as the Republic of Ireland. It is important to stress that the story of Ireland is one of resistance against foreign rule, and that even though most of Ireland was recognized as a state in 1922, it was still not completely independent from foreigners. Therefore, due to the island's context, enemies will more likely appear in a nationalist Irish speech. However, Ireland is not going through war at this point in time, and coincidentally, even though enemies are present in de Valera's speech, they are not central to his speech, nor is there mention of one particular modern nation as Ireland's enemy in it. Enemies appear here to celebrate Irish's victories, and like in Sun's speech, enemies serve to highlight the qualities and identity of the Irish.

The context of speeches selected to analyze for Charles de Gaulle is thus important, for it brings the element of enemies in de Gaulle's speeches and might shed some light into the description of this element that I have so far provided. It is important then to remember that at this time, France was a struggling nation, weakened and occupied by the Germans, and that the Vichy government was collaborating with the foreigners—the Germans. Evidently this will make an impact on any nationalist person and it is to be expected that a nationalist leader would then be outraged and would address this in his rhetoric as de Gaulle does.

Ennemi is a recurring word in de Gaulle's speeches, as demonstrated in the following quotes:

...les conditions dictées par l'ennemi... (...the conditions dictated by the enemy...)

(Appel du 18 juin 1940)

...utilisé par les ennemis de la France... (...used by France's enemies...) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940)

...les efforts de désagrégation physique et morale que déploient contre elle l'ennemi...

(...the efforts of physical and moral disaggregation that the enemy deploys against [France]...) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

...Partout l'ennemi chancelle et fléchit... (...Everywhere the enemy wobbles and weakens...) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942)

...la terrible épreuve que constitue l'occupation provisoire de la Métropole par l'ennemi... (...the terrible ordeal that constitutes the provisional occupation of the Metropolis by the enemy...) (Discours de Brazzaville 30 janvier 1944)

...l'ennemi qui écrase et souille la patrie, l'ennemi détesté, l'ennemi déshonoré... (...the enemy who crushes and soils the country...)

...L'ennemi va tout faire pour échapper à son destin... (...The enemy is going to do anything to escape its destiny...) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

...puisque l'ennemi que tenait a capitulé dans nos mains, la France rentre à Paris, chez elle... (...since the enemy who had control has fallen into our hands, France comes back home through Paris...) (Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris 25 août 1944)

...nous vaincrons l'ennemi qui prétendait nous asservir... (...we will vanquish the enemy who pretended to enslave us...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot 12 septembre 1944).

As illustrated by these examples, de Gaulle refers to his enemy repeatedly throughout these ten speeches.

It is interesting that de Gaulle mentions *ennemi* in the singular form and not in the plural form, indicating that France has one enemy in this world: Germany. Only once he used this term in plural form, and, due to its context, it is likely that he used it to refer to the people of the enemy nation. It is possible to include other peoples in this quote, but it is likely that de Gaulle refers to the people of the German nation. Thus, the reference to enemies in the plural form can be interpreted as the exemption that proves the rule that France has only one enemy.

In this chapter I will examine who France's enemy is, what this enemy does to become such, how this enemy is portrayed both materially and morally, and finally, how the enemy's baseness serves to highlight and glorify the goodness and virtues of the French nation.

B. Who is the enemy?

France's enemy is Germany. This is not only evident in the context of World War II, but it is manifested throughout de Gaulle's speeches: "*Ce gouvernement, alléguant la défaite de nos armées, s'est mis en rapport avec l'ennemi pour cesser le combat*" ("This government claiming the defeat of his armies, has come to an agreement with the enemy to stop the fight") (Appel du 18 juin 1940). By context we know that the nation France lost to was Germany. Further, it is also known that the government of Vichy became a collaborator of Germany during WWII. Thus part of France was occupied by Germany, and the other part of France was administered by the Vichy

government, which was collaborating with Germany. Since Germany was occupying France, it is only natural to understand that by *ennemi* de Gaulle means Germany.

While de Gaulle alludes to Germany in his speeches by the name *ennemi*, he also explicitly names Germany as France's enemy. In the same speech, de Gaulle affirms, "*Infiniment plus que leur nombre, ce sont les chars, les avions, la tactique des Allemands qui nous font reculer. Ce sont les chars, les avions, la tactique des Allemands qui ont surpris nos chefs au point de les amener là où ils en sont aujourd'hui*" ("Infinitely greater than their number, it is the tanks, the airplanes, the tactic used by the Germans that make us move back. It is the tanks, the airplanes, the tactic used by the Germans what surprised our leaders to the point of bringing them there where they are today") (Appel du 18 juin 1940). More than by context, this quote explicitly names the Germans as France's invader and enemy.

De Gaulle explicitly points to the Germans—people belonging to the German nation—as France's enemies in other speeches as well. He uses expressions such as *Allemagne, Allemands, allemande, allemandes* (Germany, Germans, German woman, German women) nineteen times in the ten speeches analyzed for the period during the war. The following are a few examples of how de Gaulle refers to these expressions:

C'est pourquoi nous combattons pour que cette guerre de trente ans, déchaînée en 1914 par l'agression allemande. (This is why we fight this thirty years' war, triggered in 1914 by the German aggression.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

Mais la France a une voisine brutale, rusée, jalouse: l'Allemagne. L'Allemagne, enivrée d'orgueil et de méchanceté, a voulu, un beau jour, réduire en servitude les nations qui l'entouraient. (But France has a brutal, cunning, jealous neighbor: Germany. Germany, inebriated with pride and malice, wanted, one beautiful day, to reduce to servitude the

nations that surrounded it.) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres 24 décembre 1942)

...la marée de l'oppression allemande... (...the tide of German oppression...)

...nous nous trouvâmes submergés par la force mécanique allemande... (...we found ourselves submerged by the German mechanical force...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Interestingly, even though, apparently, France has only one enemy in this war, de Gaulle acknowledges that Germany is not alone, and mentions Germany's allies in his speeches, in particular one: Italy (comprising its leader and people). He does so in a strong way: "*...que le Gouvernement français tomberait sous la dépendance de l'Allemagne et de l'Italie...*" ("*...that the French government would fall under the dependence of Germany and Italy...*") (Appel du 22 juin 1940); "*...nos alliés britanniques, secondés par les troupes françaises, viennent de chasser d'Égypte les Allemands et les Italiens et pénètrent en Cyrénaïque...*" ("*...our British allies, seconded by the French troops, have just driven out of Egypt the Germans and the Italians, and they penetrate Cyrenaica...*") (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 8 novembre 1942). In these quotes, de Gaulle equates Germany's and Italy's losses. It seems like the two nations become one: France's enemy. However, note that in mentioning Italy, de Gaulle always mentions Germany, an indicator that Germany, France's main enemy, is not forgotten, and is not innocent for Italy's actions. Rather Germany's presence in these quotes indicates that the German present exists and is felt in a prominent way. Note also that there are no differences or separation between France's victories, and France's victories over the Germans, for every time France wins, it wins against its main enemy, Germany.

In this set of ten speeches, de Gaulle refers to Italy in two more occasions. In these two instances, surprisingly, he even seems harsher on the Italians than on the Germans. In reference to the final battle won by the French he declares, “[En] trois ans, [la France] liquida l’Empire de Mussolini et chassa les Allemands de la Libye et de la Tunisie” (“[In] three years [France] liquidated Mussolini’s Empire and drove the Germans out of Libya and Tunisia”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944). In another speech de Gaulle states, “*Peut-être l’Allemagne commence-t-elle à subir, à son tour, la fascination du désastre qui n’avait, longtemps, paralysé que ses ennemis ? Peut-être l’Italie sera-t-elle bientôt, une fois de plus, suivant le mot de Byron : "La triste mère d’un empire mort ?"*” (“Perhaps Germany has begun to suffer, in its turn, the fascination of the disaster that had only, for a long time, paralyzed its enemies? Perhaps Italy will soon be, once again, following the words of Byron: ‘The sad mother of a dead empire?’”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941).

A proper question to ask here is why de Gaulle seems to address Italy in such hard terms, perhaps even more so than the way he addresses to Germany. A very plausible answer is that de Gaulle speaks boldly against the Italians because de Gaulle likes freedom and despises servitude or submission, especially when it is to a foreigner. In this case, de Gaulle sees Italy in servitude of and submission to Germany. Germany is still the enemy that threatens France and the world, and Italy is just its puppet.

Since Italy has not been able to stand up for itself against Germany, since Italy lacked the will to be sovereign and free from the rule of foreigners, Italy deserves its losses, and deserves a harsh treatment. Thus the contrast between Italy, and those nations who have stood up against the enemy of freedom—Germany: “*Peut-être l’Italie sera-t-elle bientôt, une fois de plus, suivant le mot de Byron : "La triste mère d’un empire mort ?"*” (“Perhaps Italy will soon be, once again,

following the words of Byron: ‘The sad mother of a dead empire?’”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941), and “*Notre hommage s’adresse aux vaillantes nations [...] qui furent entièrement submergées par l’abominable marée mais qui, comme nous-mêmes, ne désespèrent jamais et voient paraître, à leur tour, l’aube de la libération*” (“Our homage is addressed to the valiant nations [...] that were entirely submerged by the abominable tide, but like us, never despaired and saw, in turn, the apparition of the dawn of liberation”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres 15 novembre 1941).

In this case, therefore, the harsh treatment to Italy lies in de Gaulle’s personal view of freedom, and it is linked to the lack of freedom and Germany than to the danger Italy poses to France or other nations. Consequently, even though this exception might provoke a second thought on who are France’s enemies, it actually confirms that Germany remains France’s main and only threat and enemy, as well as the enemy and threat to the world. Germany embraces those who want to take away freedom and sovereignty (which I will discuss in the next section of this chapter when exposing what the enemy does).

To further support the argument that France has only one enemy, I include some quantitative data. While de Gaulle is strong when referring to Italy (by using *Italy* as a noun or adjective, or alluding to its leader) the number of references to it are scarce—six times in ten speeches totaling 10,525 words (disregarding speech headings)—and pale before the references the general makes to Germany (also by using *Germany* as a noun or adjective, or alluding to its leader)—twenty-five times in ten speeches totaling 10,525 words. Further, the expressions to identify the nation of Italy are located three times close (within four sentences next to each other) to the expression *ennemi*, while the same proximity of words exists between the expressions *ennemi* and “Germany” twelve times in these speeches.

The frequency of appearances of the expression *ennemi* in proximity to *Germany* or *Italy* can also be put into percentages. The proximity of the words *ennemi* and a direct reference to Germany total 25 % out of the total number of times General de Gaulle uses *ennemi*. In the same manner the proximity of the expressions *ennemi* and *Italy* represents 6.5 % of the time the word *ennemi* appears in de Gaulle's speeches. Therefore, not only the references to Italy are significantly less than the ones to Germany (6 to 25), but also on a percentage basis, the number of times the references to enemies in proximity to references to Italians is significantly less—almost by a fourth less—than the number of times the references to enemies close to the references to Germans appear on the speeches (6.5% to 25%).

While this analysis does not take into account the number of references to expressions such as *force mécanique*, *envahisseurs* (mechanical force, invaders), and the sufferings of the French nation due to the invasion of Germany (which further allude to Germany as the enemy), this data puts forward that the importance or weight given to Germany and Italy are different, and that Germany remains France's enemy. Italy, and other nations are more like subordinates of Germany; in a way they are present in the battle, but only in the background scene, as secondary or tertiary characters; characters with little or no relevance. In contrast Germany's role is predominant and is the antagonistic character to France, thus remaining key in the narrative of the history of the war.

C. Doings of the enemy

In populist rhetoric, the enemy can take the form of a movement, such as capitalism, neo-capitalism, or the elite—like people belonging to the upper class. Thus, the enemy in populism can be an outsider, but also someone—or a group of people—from the same country or nation. In contrast, as discussed in the chapter III, On Elements of Nationalism, in nationalism enemies are

invaders, people from other places taking away the sovereignty of the speaker's nation (to recall more on this discussion, refer to pages 48 to 51 of this work). In this section I will concentrate on what these enemies do to deserve this term, and see if the presence and actions of enemies in de Gaulle's speeches correspond to the ones already seen in Ben Gurion's, Sun Yat-Sen's, Franklin Delano Roosevelt's, and Eamon de Valera's speeches.

According to the speeches that served as a basis to create the rubric describing the elements of nationalism, the enemy invades and occupies others' territories. From David Ben Gurion: "the Army and champions of Israel [...] set the schemes of Babylon and Ammon at naught; they broke through to right and left, they thrust back the invaders and scattered them" (Crosscup 19). From de Valera: "The invaders who came to Ireland in the twelfth century belonged to a race that had already subjugated England and a great part of Western Europe" (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 466).

De Gaulle refers to the Germans in similar terms:

C'est ce qu'attendait l'Allemagne. Profitant de cette naïveté, elle s'est organisée pour de nouvelles invasions. (This is what Germany was waiting for. Taking advantage of this naivety, she organized herself for new invasions.) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres 24 décembre 1942)

[...] la terrible épreuve que constitue l'occupation provisoire de la Métropole par l'ennemi [...] ("the terrible ordeal that constitutes the provisional occupation of the Metropolis by our enemy")

[...] l'ennemi qui tenait Paris [...] ("[...] the enemy that held Paris [...]") (Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris, 25 août 1944)

...l'ennemi tient toujours dans tout ou partie de quinze de nos départements et, en particulier, dans un grand nombre de nos ports... (...the enemy still has in all or in part fifteen of our departments, and, particularly, in a high count of our ports...)

...l'envahisseur... (...the invader...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Additionally, in de Gaulle's speeches, the enemy also oppresses and submerges:

[...] l'opresseur armé jusqu'aux dents [...] ([...] the oppressor armed to its teeth [...])

[...] la marée de l'oppression allemande [...] ([...] the tide of the German oppression[...]) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

Certes, nous avons été, nous sommes, submergés par la force mécanique, terrestre et aérienne, de l'ennemi (Certainly, we found ourselves submerged by the German mechanical force) (Appel du 18 juin 1940)

La France, submergée depuis quatre ans, mais non point réduite (France, submerged since four years ago, but not at all reduced) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

...submergées par l'abominable marée...nous nous trouvâmes submergés par la force mécanique allemande... (...submerged by the abominable tide...submerged by the German mechanical force...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

As de Valera's quote illustrates, the enemy also captures, subjugates and enslaves. He seeks to take away the freedom of other nations. In de Valera's speech the nations of Western Europe have been subjugated, and the enemy tried to subjugate Ireland, but was unsuccessful. In de Gaulle's speeches, the enemy has invaded different countries, and has temporarily succeeded in taking away their freedoms. Particularly in France, the enemy has succeeded through tactics and technology, in temporarily imposing its will over the French. Thus in France, Germany—as a despicable ruler—has been able to dictate its conditions—“[...] les

conditions dictées par l'ennemi [...] (“[...] the conditions dictated by the enemy [...]”) (Appel du 22 juin 1940) — has subdued the French government -

[...] que le territoire français serait occupé et que le Gouvernement français tomberait sous la dépendance de l'Allemagne et de l'Italie ([...] that the French territory would be occupied and that the French government would fall under the dependence of Germany and Italy) (Appel du 22 juin 1940)

...cet armistice serait, non seulement une capitulation, mais encore un asservissement... (...this armistice would not only be a capitulation, but moreover, a subjugation...) (Appel du 22 juin 1940)

— and treats the French as its slaves—

...l'affreuse tyrannie des maîtres esclaves de l'ennemi... (“...the hideous tyranny of the enemy’s master slaves...”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

L'Allemagne, enivrée d'orgueil et de méchanceté, a voulu, un beau jour, réduire en servitude les nations qui l'entouraient. Au mois d'août 1914, elle s'est donc lancée à l'attaque. (Germany, inebriated with pride and malice, wanted, one beautiful day, to reduce to servitude the nations that surrounded it. In the month of August 1914, she therefore launched herself to attack.) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres 24 décembre 1942)

...nous vaincrons l'ennemi qui prétendait nous asservir... (...we will overcome our enemy who pretended to enslave us...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Through these quotes we see that the enemy seeks to occupy and subdue other nations, as the enemies from other nationalist leaders are described in their respective rhetoric.

The enemy is vicious in seeking to destroy materially. Further, he seeks to morally destroy the occupied nation by destroying and mocking the nation's symbols of identity and the nation's inhabitants. Ben Gurion is very bold expressing this:

Our enemy knew the mortal stroke he might with ease deliver was to seize and destroy this city of ours.

...the wrath of the enemy was vented upon Jerusalem, as it was in the days of the Prophet Ezekiel...

...the enemy rained his fiercest blows indiscriminately, viciously, night and day without surcease. (Crosscup 18-19)

The moral destruction is heavily present in these speeches.

Perhaps in no such bold terms, but similar in content, de Gaulle portrays France's enemy, Germany. Notice the similarities in the portrayal of the terrible violence the enemy exerts upon the nation as well as the material privations due to the material destruction the enemy has inflicted upon the French:

...malgré la pression de l'ennemi, exercée [...] sous la forme de violences sans nom...

(...in spite of the enemy's pressure, exerted under the form of violence without name...)

(Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

...l'ennemi mange notre pain et notre viande [...] l'ennemi vole notre bois et notre

charbon [...] l'ennemi vous dit et vous fait dire que vous êtes des fils et des filles de

vaincus... (...the enemy eats our bread and our meat [...] the enemy steals our wood and

our coal [...] the enemy tells you and makes you say that you are sons and daughters of

the defeated...) (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942)

Even though the terms to describe the enemies in Ben Gurion and de Gaulle's speeches are different, the content is similar, particularly in the way both of them describe the violence and destruction exerted over their corresponding nation. Ben Gurion describes it with expressions such as *fiercest blows*, *indiscriminately* and *viciously*; de Gaulle uses the words *la forme de violences sans nom* (the form of violence without name) to describe the same type of destruction and violence of the enemy towards the French. More on this subject will be depicted in the next section of this chapter.

The enemies in Charles de Gaulle speeches correspond to the rubric describing the elements of nationalism. Enemies in this case, as in the previous, are foreigners who invade and seek to take away the sovereignty of the people of the nation spoken of. The context matters since France at this point has been invaded by and is under the rule of Germany. The actions of the enemy are very well described. They correspond and even add to what the enemy does to become such.

D. De Gaulle's portrayal of the enemy

General de Gaulle portrays the enemy both in a material (tangible and quantifiable) and moral (dealing more with feelings and values) way. Some of these descriptions have been present in previous chapters. However, I would like to refer to them in order to bring them together in here.

1. The enemy's material description

The enemy's material description includes the allusion to the German technology found in expressions such as *force mécanique* (mechanical force), used three times in Appel du 18 juin 1940 and once in the Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944;

...cette puissance militaire allemande... (...this powerful German military...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

...tout ce que l'Allemagne possédait de chars, de canons et d'avions s'acharnait à nous abattre, ces chars, ces canons, ces avions, qui taillaient dans notre chair...(...all that Germany possessed tanks, cannons and airplanes fiercely persisted to beat us, these tanks, these cannons, these plains, that carved into our flesh...) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944)

Infiniment plus que leur nombre, ce sont les chars, les avions, la tactique des Allemands qui nous font reculer. Ce sont les chars, les avions, la tactique des Allemands qui ont surpris nos chefs au point de les amener là où ils en sont aujourd'hui. (Infinitely more than their number, it is the tanks, the airplanes, the tactic of the Germans that make us move back.) (Appel du 18 juin 1940)

Interestingly, in the last quote, de Gaulle not only refers to the German technology, but also to the number of German soldiers fighting in the war.

I find this last quote particularly interesting because de Gaulle provides a material account of the war. This quote emphasizes the military superiority of the Germans, but also points out that the Germans are not great in numbers to fight this war. De Gaulle states that the number of German soldiers is not important because the Germans have had success at this point due to their technological advancement not because of the number of German soldiers fighting in the war, and even more, he does not even address qualities these soldiers could have to win the battles already fought.

With the help of the word “*Infiniment*” (“Infinitely”), De Gaulle seems to emphasize the lack of men Germany has to fight this war and that Germany needs to compensate this lack of

man power with a mechanical power. In other words, due to the few number of men willing to fight for Germany, Germany has to rely on its *force mécanique* (mechanical force) to wage war and get some temporary positive result on other nations.

Note also, that it is the German's superiority in tactics and technology that intimidated the French government, and not their words their personalities, or man power, which impressed and scared the people in the French government to the point of making an truce treaty with the enemy.

All of the previous quotes in this section carry as a common theme the portrayal of Germany in a material way. The military advancements, mechanical force, the tanks and the plains all are material objects through which Germany is depicted. Consistent with Margalit's idea of how the enemy is portrayed, through these mechanical and material descriptions, Germany is in fact portrayed as cold and calculating, momentarily materially superior to France (McKim and McMahan 77). Furthermore, it seems like with these descriptions de Gaulle is dehumanizing the Germans, for they are only a mechanical force, and ennobling the French since they oppose the Germans and are thus human. Even though France will gain material superiority over Germany, it seems implied that France will not loose its humanity, but that the mechanical advancements France will obtain will be an addition (and not a replacement) to the humanity and good attributes it already possess.

2. The enemy's moral description

Not surprisingly De Gaulle also describes Germany in a moral way, particularly the lack of moral qualities the enemy has. While some descriptions contain only material or moral depictions of Germany, others contain both. For instance the last quote from Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944 reads: "...ces chars, ces canons, ces avions, qui taillaient dans

notre chair...” (“...these tanks, these cannons, these plains, that carved into our flesh...”). This quote contains both material and moral meanings because it contrasts Germany’s technology or mechanical force, a material description, to a material and yet the connoting to a moral suffering. Besides from the graphic and gruesome image this quote evokes with the word *chair* (flesh), de Gaulle refers to both a material and moral suffering the Germans have inflicted upon the French. In this case, de Gaulle describes the loss of French lives, which loss has affected the moral of the people of France. Further, de Gaulle chose to use the word *chair* (flesh) over soldiers, people, or over providing a statistical number of the losses France has had at this point of the war. Because *chair* (flesh) is not quantifiable and connotes the importance and sanctity of human life, its use adds to the moral suffering and destruction the Germans impose over the French.

Another example is found on a quote I have already addressed in previous chapters. It comes from the speech entitled Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres 24 décembre 1942. The quote reads:

Mes chers enfants de France, vous avez faim, parce que l’ennemi mange notre pain et notre viande. Vous avez froid, parce que l’ennemi vole notre bois et notre charbon, vous souffrez, parce que l’ennemi vous dit et vous fait dire que vous êtes des fils et des filles de vaincus. (My dear children of France, you are hungry, because the enemy eats our bread and our meat. You are cold, because the enemy steals our wood and our coal, you suffer because the enemy tells you and makes you say that you are sons and daughters of the defeated.)

Even though I have previously discussed this quote throughout this work, I would like to bring attention to it one last time in this chapter to expose a different perspective, this time focusing on the moral description of Germany.

From this quote we learn that the enemy (Germany) not only invaded other nation's ground, but is also a thief. Germany steals wood and coal of the French, and has no heart for it eats the bread and meat of the French, nourishments essential to their physical survival. The bread, in particular, is considered essential to life in France. As a cultural note, the French always have bread in their homes. Bread is used almost in every meal. Even if the French baguette becomes hard and not eatable in a few days, the French have recipes to soften the bread and eat it for in traditional France, throwing away bread is wrongdoing, an improper behavior, an outrageous violation of respect and gratitude for food. Bread is simply an essential part of the French identity. In this sense, it is a material substance reflecting a moral or spiritual one. Thus the material doings of the enemy carry over the morality of the French, but also speaks of the lack of moral values in the enemy. For the enemy steals, which in deed is a material action that reflects the moral faults of the enemy's character. Moreover, by depicting the Germans as robbers of bread, de Gaulle is not only describing a material action, not even the moral action of stealing, but further, the moral baseness of the enemy of being disrespectful, insolent, and even blasphemous towards humans, a moral code, towards the spiritual and sacred, physically attacking the material and moral components of the French identity.

From the quotes in here analyzed as well from those analyzed in previous chapters, Germany is portrayed as violent, cold, calculating, insensitive and rude invader, and an oppressor who seeks to materially and morally destroy other nations. However, this description would be incomplete if we would not add de Gaulle's famous portrayal of Germany in his Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942. In it, de Gaulle personifies Germany in the following way:

Mais la France a une voisine brutale, rusée, jalouse: l'Allemagne. L'Allemagne, enivrée d'orgueil et de méchanceté, a voulu, un beau jour, réduire en servitude les nations qui l'entouraient. Au mois d'août 1914, elle s'est donc lancée à l'attaque. (But France has a brutal, cunning, jealous neighbor: Germany. Germany, inebriated with pride and malice, wanted, one beautiful day, to reduce to servitude the nations that surrounded it. In the month of August of 1941, she therefore launched herself on the attack.)

Through the personification of Germany, de Gaulle describes the corruptness of the enemy. The enemy is jealous, cunning, brutal and aggressive, filled with pride and malice and the desire to bring the nations around it to servitude. Since she has these low and undesirable characteristics, she unsurprisingly attacked others when they least expected it.

As an enemy, Germany possesses material and moral characteristics. As previously seen, Germany is portrayed as having a temporally superior in technology to France, yet the advantage is supposed to be only temporary. Also, the enemy is portrayed as a heartless or insensitive character. However, Germany is also portrayed as a threat to French morals and values, and consequently to the French national identity. The quote where de Gaulle accuses the Germans to eat the food of the French and steal the coal of the French shows also that Germany seeks to destroy the moral of the French by telling them that they are the “...*filles and filles des vaincus...*” (“...sons and daughters of the defeated...”). Thus, it is evident through this quote that Germany is an invader, a thief, insolent, disrespectful and heartless for it leaves the French with little to no material resources to survive. Furthermore, Germany seeks to destroy the moral of the French, their values and identity so that it may finish its destruction and become completely victorious.

3. Moral baseness—seeking to morally destroy France

Moral baseness reflected in the desire to morally destroy the nation of France is showed in the following statements:

Il s'agissait de savoir si la voix de la France allait entièrement s'éteindre ou, pire encore, si le monde pourrait penser la reconnaître dans la détestable contrefaçon qu'en font l'ennemi et les traîtres. (It was a matter of knowing if the voice of France was completely going to fade, or even worse, if the world would think of recognizing France's voice in the hateful counterfeit in which the enemy and the traitors do.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941)

Il s'agit de détruire l'ennemi, l'ennemi qui écrase et souille la patrie, l'ennemi détesté, l'ennemi déshonoré. (The matter is to destroy the enemy, the enemy who crushes and soils the country, the despised enemy, the dishonored enemy.) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944)

Dans son état de servitude, cet organisme ne peut être et n'est, en effet, qu'un instrument utilisé par les ennemis de la France contre l'honneur et l'intérêt du pays. (In its state of servitude, this body cannot be and it is in fact but an instrument used by the France's enemies against the honor and interest of the country.) (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940)

...une nation qui subit si cruellement les efforts de désagrégation physique et morale que déploient contre elle l'ennemi et ses collaborateurs... (...a nation that so cruelly is subjected to the efforts of physical and moral disaggregation deployed against her by the enemy and its collaborators...) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

While some of these quotes allude to the collaborators and the government of France, I would like to focus on the moral description de Gaulle provides of its enemy: Germany.

The previous quotes contain three main ideas dealing with the attacks the enemy executes against the moral of France. The first one is that Germany attacks the honor of France. By boasting of its temporary victory against France, by stepping over France's sovereignty and ideals of freedom, Germany seeks to morally humiliate the French and finally to morally devastate them. De Gaulle alludes to this notion a few times throughout his speeches during the time of the war. Honor was an important notion in France at the time, much more than other cultures and today's values. Honor was especially important to Charles de Gaulle, since he was raised in a traditional way, and was a military man. Thus, the attack on France's honor took more depth and personal meaning to de Gaulle and the French back in 1930s and 1940s, than it would in modern France. To take the honor and respect from France or the French was morally devastating to de Gaulle, idea that he was able to convey to the French and the world with these types of references in his speeches. The feeling de Gaulle had in regards to this attacks clearly emerged in expressions such as "...*l'ennemi détesté, l'ennemi déshonoré...*" ("the despised enemy, the dishonored enemy") (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944) and "[*reconnaître la France*] dans la *détestable contrefaçon qu'en font l'ennemi et les traîtres...*" ("[recognizing France's voice] in the hateful counterfeit in which the enemy and the traitors do...") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941). Note the words de Gaulle uses to express himself about Germany in regards to its attacks to the morals and values of France: *détestable* (hateful), *détesté* (despised) and even *déshonoré* (dishonored).

Secondly, General de Gaulle speaks of France as one receiving cruel efforts of physical and moral disaggregation, in other words, a nation that is been fiercely attacked and one whose enemy has put much effort in divide, separate or break into different parts. This idea is completely against nationalist discourse, for in national discourse, and nationalism, the idea is to

bring together the people of a nation to celebrate their victories, identity and common cause. Unity is a recurring theme in de Gaulle speeches, therefore, an important one in the morals and values he holds dear on the French nation. Thus the efforts to break the French into different factions constitutes a moral attack of Germany over France, for France must remain one, united in its identity and in defending it, including its values of freedom and sovereignty from the rule of foreigners. The fact that Germany is using the current French government as an instrument to rule France speaks of this division, for ideally, French should have never make a deal or allow Germany to rule French soil. The second idea is then the moral attack on the unity of the French.

The third idea introduced in these quotes is that the enemy soils France. This idea is linked to the two previous ideas. With its occupation, Germany is soiling France, its territory and mostly its ideals. As previously indicated the enemy lacks moral values and now tramples over the values France has. Germany attacks the honor and the interest of France because it violates France's ideals, speaks evil or portrays France in a despicable manner, and because it (the enemy) lacks moral values and seeks to divide the French (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). Furthermore, the verb *souiller* brings about the imagery of rape, thus further showing the damage suffered by France but also the despicable baseness of France's enemy. Adding this to the whole discussion of the actions of the enemy, it is easy to understand why de Gaulle depicts Germany as "*l'ennemi détesté, l'ennemi déshonoré*" ("the despised enemy, the dishonored enemy") (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944).

E. Contrasting the baseness of the enemy with the spirituality of the nation

Even though nationalism is not negatively defined against an ideology or other peoples, as we have seen in de Gaulle's speeches, the presence of an enemy can be strong. However, it is

important to remember that the presence of enemies is not essential to nationalism. Unlike populism, nationalism is not negatively defined, meaning that in populism, *the people* are defined as to what they are not. For instance, *the people* are neither rich, opportunistic nor thieves because those characteristics belong to their enemies. In populism, the enemy can be from without or within the same country or nation, and is often brought to stir negative emotional responses from *the people*. The language is highly bellicose and the enemy is demonized and becomes an object to which *the people* come to resent, hold grudges against, and hate. These feelings are often brought back and thus perpetuated in the audience in populist rhetoric. Because of its defining nature and the bellicosity this element brings, enemies thus become an essential part of the populist rhetoric.

In nationalism, even though harsh vocabulary can be used against enemies denoting hostility towards them—as seen especially in the speeches of Ben Gurion and de Gaulle—enemies are often brought to further inspire the people of the nation to higher values and goals, in other words, to remind, inspire and instill the nation to grandeur. In nationalist discourse, enemies are also brought to contrast their baseness or lack of moral qualities to the high and strong moral values or spiritual qualities the nation in turn possesses. Since the presence of enemies is not an element that defines the nation, its occurrence is not crucial in nationalist rhetoric. The examples provided below will support as they help clarify this last point.

In the previous chapter, I discussed the contrast between the mechanical force of the Germans, and the spiritual qualities of the French. This is a stark contrast between the virtues of the French and the baseness or lack of virtues of the Germans (for a more developed discussion, refer to pages 164-176). However, there are other instances where de Gaulle contrasts the enemy to the French. I would like to focus particularly on the contrast de Gaulle makes between France

and Germany particularly in the speech entitled Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1944, because it contains many clear and concise contrasts between Germany and France. Due to the powerful imagery juxtaposing France's qualities and the baseness of France's enemy this speech will be the focus of this section. This is not to say, however, that the contrasting of the baseness of France's enemy to France is only present in this speech, but rather, that because it comes about in such a clear and concise way, it will help illustrate how de Gaulle expresses himself in a negative way of France's enemy to highlight France's qualities.

In Message adressé aux enfants de France, de Gaulle personifies both France and Germany. To France he ascribes the best of qualities, by using expressions such as *dame* (lady), *belle, meilleure, brave* (beautiful, best, courageous). Contrary to this description de Gaulle refers to Germany in the following with expressions such as : “...voisine brutale, rusée, jalouse...” ; “...enivrée d'orgueil et de méchanceté, a voulu, un beau jour, réduire en servitude les nations qui l'entouraient. Au mois d'août 1914, elle s'est donc lancée à l'attaque...” (“...brutal neighbor, astute, jealous”; “inebriated with pride and maliciousness, she wanted, a beautiful day, to reduce to servitude the nations that surrounded it. On the month of August 1914, she therefore launched herself to attack...”).

The first stark contrast de Gaulle makes between France and Germany is that even though he personifies both nations, he refers to France as a lady. This term already speaks well of France. However, de Gaulle does not apply the same term to Germany; in fact he leaves this term out when speaking of Germany. Rather than addressing Germany as a lady, de Gaulle describes her as a neighbor, a neighbor who is brutal, astute and jealous. These characteristics are in sharp contrast to the attributes of a lady who is generally thought of as refined, kind, intelligent, and generous. This contrast is particularly true when considering the chivalrous view de Gaulle

draws on from the French traditions dating back to the Middle Ages. I have already exposed this view on chapter VI when discussing the importance of France's reification in de Gaulle's speeches (see pages 100-112), yet since it is on another chapter, I will briefly address this traditional view in here because it helps to understand the importance of the imagery de Gaulle evokes in this speech.

To recall briefly then, the literature on Courtly Love recounts the love stories of a knight to a lady that is superior both materially (in wealth and social position) and morally. Often the quest of the knight is to acquire those attributes needed to become closer to being equal to his lady or at least, to merit the love of his lady. I draw again from the story of Lanval found in the *Lais de Marie de France*. In this story the lady is described as “...*un modèle de générosité, de sagesse et de beauté...*” (“...a model of generosity, wisdom and beauty...”) (149). De Gaulle describes France in a similar manner by stating that above the many nation-ladies no other has ever been more beautiful, better, or more courageous than France. Thus, like in many stories pertaining to Courtly Love, de Gaulle describes France as an ideal lady, both in beauty and qualities. Consequently the reification of France into a lady is not accidental or taken light, but rather, emphasizes the quality that she possesses in beauty, wealth and moral values or spiritual qualities. Interestingly, in the literature of Courtly Love, not much description of traits or deeds is given on the lady. The literature just states that the main characters are beautiful and good in a vague way. Note that de Gaulle does not either spend time describing why France is so beautiful, courageous or the best. These qualities are inherent, assumed to be part of the French identity as much as the qualities of beauty, wealth, moral qualities are attributed to the protagonist ladies in the literature of Courtly Love.

In contrast to this description of France, de Gaulle depicts Germany by omitting the use of the word lady, for a lady would not be as low in ugliness or qualities as Germany appears in de Gaulle's speeches. The absence of the word lady already indicates juxtaposition between France and Germany. A lady or a maiden conveys a certain idea of beauty in conjunction with moral ideals, overall, considered already as an inspiration, as it is the case with France in the aforementioned quote. The idea of *neighbor* is uninspiring. Furthermore, it directs thoughts towards the common. This in itself is a contrast between France and Germany.

As the antithesis of the lady of France, Germany, France's enemy, is not a delicate or refined lady, but rather brutal neighbor; Germany is not intelligent, but astute, she is not generous, but jealous. Furthermore, Germany is filled with pride and malice in opposition with the traditional representation of a woman who is pure, meek and humble; she attacks, thus not only revealing its lack of refinement and delicacy again, but also its aggressiveness, which juxtaposes the imagery of the delicacy and peacefulness that should exist in a lady. Thus by putting these sentences next to each other de Gaulle succeeds at describing the identity of France and highlighting France's virtuous by contrasting it with the baseness of its enemy.

Again I would like to insist that Germany's baseness is not brought out to define France. Neither is it brought to instill a sense of vengeance or hatred towards the Germans in the French or other nations. From the first sentence it is clear that France already has personality, character, and an identity, and that it has achieved—through its own merits—becoming the beautiful, wise, and courageous nation in her own eyes as of those of the rest of the world. This France has achieved with no connection to its enemy, the brutal and vicious neighbor of Germany.

De Gaulle could have easily stopped his remarks about France after this description. However, by adding a strong contrast to the character of the French nation, he is able to further

underline the attributes and character of the nation of France. The fact that after this pejorative description of Germany, de Gaulle comes back to the subject of France, supports this view, for the reader is not left with a feeling of hatred, but a feeling of respect and admiration for France and those who have supported it. Even though a few sentences later in the speech, de Gaulle describes Germany once more, the feelings of the feelings of hostility and outrage, that the first description of Germany might have brought upon the audience, are soothed and replaced with feelings of pity for Germany, and moreover, of hope, pride, inspiration, and admiration for the nation of France. Such are the feelings at the end of the speech when de Gaulle declares, "*Chers enfants de France, vous recevrez bientôt une visite, la visite de la Victoire. Ah ! comme elle sera belle, vous verrez!*" ("Dear children of France, you will soon receive a visit, the visit of Victory. Oh! how beautiful it will be, you will see!") (Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942).

Other contrasts exist between France and Germany throughout de Gaulle's speeches. Some of them overlap with previous chapters, such as the discussion of the opposition between superior technology and coldness with the highlighting of spiritual qualities (see pages 164-176) or the discussion of sacrifices and sorrows turned into victories (see chapter VIII On sacrifices and sorrows pages 158-177). To briefly recall one of these examples, I will use a quote from the speech delivered at the Albert Hall in London, on November 15, 1941:

Car, c'est un fait que la France, malgré la stupeur d'une défaite militaire méritée par ses chefs [...] malgré la pression de l'ennemi, exercée tantôt sous la forme de violences sans nom, tantôt par offres doucereuses d'allégements et de collaboration [...] c'est un fait que la France ne s'est nullement abandonnée. C'est un fait que la France a su discerner, au travers du nuage de sang et de larmes dont on tentait de l'aveugler, que la

seule voie qui mène au salut est celle qu'ont choisie pour elle ceux de ses enfants qui sont libres. (It is a fact that France, in spite of the stupor of a military defeat, merited by its leaders [...] in spite of the pressure of the enemy, exerted under the form of violences without name as well as by sweet offerings of the lightening of burdens and of collaboration [...] it is a fact that France did not abandoned herself at all. It is a fact that France was able to discern, through the cloud of blood and tears on which was attempted to blind her, that the only path that leads into salvation is the path that those of her free children chose for her.) (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941)

In this passage, de Gaulle highlights the ability of discernment and the firmness France has. He does so by bringing sorrows the French have endured by the hand of their enemy. For instance, he claims that the enemy attempted to blind France in tears and blood, yet, France as discerned and firm as it is, did not succumb. Moreover, not only did France stay resolute, but her children followed the path leading to salvation. The focus in this case is not on the German oppression or its lack of qualities. However, the lack of qualities contrasted to the qualities of the nation of France, further emphasize the abilities and qualities the French, or nation of France, possess.

F. Conclusion

As discussed throughout this chapter, the presence of enemies is not an essential element of nationalism. Contrary to populism, enemies do not provide an identity to a nation, which is one of the main reasons why its presence is not essential in nationalism. The presence of enemies is also conditioned to the time period the nation is going through. There are no enemies present in FDR's speech, and in the speeches of Sun Yat-Sen and Eamon de Valera, their presence is mild. In contrast the presence of enemies in Ben Gurion's and de Gaulle's speeches is of more

importance and the language to refer to them turns to bellicose. The presence of enemies in nationalism seems to concur with different periods of times the nation goes through. In the case of the last two speakers, their nations were going through—or had barely finished—a war. This likely is the motive of why the enemies of France and Israel are described in such hard terms.

To de Gaulle there exists one enemy: Germany. This can be inferred by the historical context. It was widely understood in Europe that in WWII the enemy was Germany. Italy and other allies were secondary, were pitiful nations that joined Germany in the war, yet they did not pose a threat as Germany. Still, even though through context we can infer that when de Gaulle refers to *ennemi* (enemy), I provided numerical data to corroborate the times when de Gaulle names Germany (nation or people) in close connection to the word enemy. This data helps to support the assumption that Germany is France's enemy.

France's enemy is portrayed as brutal, cold, astute, and as a character of much baseness. The portrayal of France's enemy has not as purpose to promote or prolong feelings of shame, outrage or hatred, as a populist discourse would do. Despite the bellicosity in the language and the harsh terms used against Germany, de Gaulle always comes back to France. There is always a but when de Gaulle refers to Germany as a conqueror, or a nation superior in technology. De Gaulle always brings back the honor and grandeur of France, the hope and values the French as a nation possess, and thus instills hope and inspires the French to rise and overcome their enemy. Furthermore, de Gaulle also uses Germany's baseness to contrast it with France's qualities. He does so not to define France, for France already has a place in the world, but rather, to emphasize the French identity and the values they, as a nation, possess.

In naming enemies in his speech, de Gaulle's rhetoric does not differ from the nationalist speeches used as to describe nationalism in chapter III (pages 48-51). As a matter of fact, this

usage helps clarifying the purposes of this element in nationalist rhetoric, confirms what has been stated in the rubric and by scholars such as Margalit who explain the juxtaposition of the oppressed to the oppressors (McKim and McMahan 77).

At the same time, for those interested in de Gaulle's rhetoric itself, the presence of enemies sheds light on what General de Gaulle considered important and his discourse style. For instance, we find that he only considered Germany as France's enemy, yet, it is evidenced that he despised those who acquired a servile attitude with the enemy, who do not defend their nation, their traditions, their identity, and values such as freedom, as in the examples given on Italy.

Furthermore, we see that General de Gaulle still uses cosmic proportions and reifications when highlighting France's qualities by contrasting it with German's baseness. At last, the carrying of traditions, knowledge of language, and the chivalrous view de Gaulle holds, clearly stand out in his speeches, particularly when considering the reifications of France and Germany.

X. On the presence and the treatment of the opposition

As described in the rubric: *Opposition is generally treated with respect. Focus is more on unity with co-nationals than partisan divisions.*

The term opposition is meant to include people or organizations, usually of the same nation, holding different political beliefs than the speaker's. Since nationalism tends to call for unity and to inspire the nation, opposition is not always present in nationalist speeches. For this reason the treatment of opposition is not an essential element of nationalism. In addition, the presence and treatment of opposition will likely be conditioned to the nation's historical context, just like the presence and treatment of enemies. Since nationalist rhetoric is focused on uniting the nation, it is likely that if the nationalist leader brings up the opposition, he or she treats the opposition with respect, or at least, that the nationalist leader does not promote violence against his co-nationals. Since this was the least elaborated point on my chapter on Elements of nationalism, I will compare the presence and treatment of the opposition in pluralist, populist, and nationalist discourse. I will then specifically focus on its presence in de Gaulle's speeches. This exercise will provide us with insights on the three types of speeches, particularly on nationalism, and of de Gaulle's speeches during the years of the war.

A. The treatment of opposition in pluralism and populism

According to Dr. Hawkins' rubric in pluralism "Formal rights and liberties are openly respected, and the opposition is treated with courtesy and as a legitimate political actor. The discourse will not encourage or justify illegal, violent actions. There will be great respect for institutions and the rule of law. If data is abused, it is either an innocent mistake or an embarrassing breach of democratic standards" (1064).

Ricardo Lagos, former president of Chile provides an example of tolerance towards others in a speech delivered at the Universidad de Chile in 2005, “*me comprometo por una cultura libre y al alcance de todos, es fundamental para que chilenos y chilenas piensen por sí mismos, desarrollen su capacidad creativa y su voluntad innovadora*”, “*me comprometo a una democracia plena, iguales derechos, mejor trato. La Concentración nació para recuperar la libertad, para que se respetaran los derechos humanos, para que la justicia prevalezca para todos por igual*”, “*Un Chileno seguro y generoso. Abierto y tolerante*” (“My commitment is towards a culture that is free and accessible to all, fundamental in the own thinking of all male and female Chileans, so that they can develop their creative capacity and their innovative will”, “my commitment is to a full democracy, with equal rights, with better treatment. The “Concentración” was born to recover freedom, so that human rights were respected, so that justice would equally prevail to all” “A sure and generous Chilean. Open and tolerant”) (Speech in the author’s possession). These quote illustrate the openness and respect Lagos has for diverse opinions among his co-nationals and towards the rule of law, just as described in Dr. Hawkins’ rubric.

Populism stands in stark contrast with pluralism, particularly in regards to the treatment of opposition. According to Dr. Hawkin’s description,

“[b]ecause of the moral baseness of the threatening minority, non-democratic means may be openly justified or at least the minority’s continued enjoyment of these will be seen as a generous concession by the people; the speech itself may exaggerate or abuse data to make this point, and the language will show a bellicosity towards the opposition that is incendiary and condescending, lacking the decorum that one shows a worthy opponent”

A good example of this attitude is found in one of Fidel Castro's early speeches, "*Hemos sido más que generosos: no se han fusilado chivatos [...]; a los chivatos no hay que fusilarlos, hay que mandarlos a trabajar, hay que condenarlos a trabajos forzados [...]; Ya que querían ganarse la vida de la delación y de la traición, pues que trabajen para el pueblo! ¡que trabajen!*", "*Estamos fusilando a los esbirros para lograr la paz, y estamos fusilando a los esbirros para que el día de mañana no nos asesinen otra vez a nuestros hijos, y que al fin y al cabo, los esbirros que fusilemos no van a pasar de 400 [...]*" ("We have been more than generous: we have not executed the stool pigeons, [...]; we don't have to execute the stool pigeons, but send them to work, we have to condemn them to forced labor [...]; Since they wanted to win their bread by tipping of or by treason, then let them work for the people! ¡let them work!", "We are executing thugs to attain peace and we are shooting at the thugs so that the day of tomorrow they will not murder our children again, and after all, the thugs we execute will not go beyond 400 [...]" (Discurso pronunciado en la Magna Concentración Popular, en el Palacio Presidencial, el 21 de enero de 1959). These previous quotes by Castro show the hostility and bellicosity encountered in populist leaders when referring to the opposition. Perhaps not all populist leaders will be so blunt when attacking the opposition, nevertheless, it is clearly seen that the attitude is one of the superiority, lack of respect and hostility of "the people" towards the opposition—this being again from the same nation as the leader's.

B. The treatment of opposition in nationalist speeches

In the speeches selected to find elements of nationalism, references to organizations, parties, or people (from the same nation) with different views are hardly ever present. References to this kind of opposition are not present in Ben Gurion's or de Valera's speeches.

References to opposition are barely present in Sun Yat-Sen's speech. Even in this case, the references to the opposition in Sun Yat-Sen's speeches is so vague and short that is easily forgotten soon after these references are made Sun puts the emphasis on the loss of moral values and not the opposition, "since our domination by alien races and since the invasion of foreign culture which has spread its influence all over China, a group intoxicated with the new culture have begun to reject the old morality, saying that the former makes the latter unnecessary" (Crosscup 438). Notice that Sun Yat-Sen does not name any parties nor people in particular. The wrong in this case comes from forsaking old values important to Chinese national identity. Additionally, Sun Yat-Sen emphasizes high values of China by contrasting with the low qualities of foreigners. The opposition then is just mistaken, mislead, or simply wronged by following the foreigners rather than their own Chinese rich traditions.

A similar concept is found in FDR's speech, in which FDR talks about greedy, "incompetent, stubborn" and "unscrupulous money changers" (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 509) who have provoked the economic crisis. These adjectives are applied to them, as implicating that in the aim of making money and prospering, these people have forgotten their values. We could go as far as asserting that these people have forgotten the national values of Christianity, such as helping and being generous to others, vision, moral work and creative effort. Even though FDR is not too specific about the values the US as a nation possess, he states that people in the US needs to be restored to "social moral values" (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 509).

Even though these references are bold, and have a populist tone, it is important to know that they are the stronger references FDR makes to the opposition. And even though the references to the opposition constitute a few paragraphs in the speech, they are brief and do not form part in the core of the speech. The references are so vague and abstract leaving it to the reader to wonder

if FDR is even talking about people of the same nation. But even more than this, these references are overwhelmed by inspiring references to the goodness of the land and the people of the land in the United States of America, found throughout the speech. Such references include expressions such as: “we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty and human effort have multiplied it” (Copeland, Lamm, and McKenna 509), “a recognition of the old and permanently important manifestation of the American spirit of the pioneer” (511). Since the references to the opposition are found in the middle of the speech and are surrounded by remarks of values, goodness, reformation and destiny, and specific issues, the tone tends to lessen and the remarks tend to be forgotten by the audience. Furthermore, as in the case with Sun Yat-Sen, and unlike populist rhetoric, FDR does not promote hatred or violence against people from other parties or who simply, have different views and opinions than him or those who agree with him.

References to opposition seem contrary to the nature of nationalism, since nationalism tends to unite the people of a nation. Thus, it would seem contradictory for a nationalist leader to focus on internal enemies. However, special circumstances may draw a nationalist leader to refer to the opposition. As illustrated by the speeches of Sun and Roosevelt, opposition may be present in nationalist rhetoric; the references to it might even be bellicose. However, in spite of the bellicose references to the opposition, a nationalist will not call for violence against or diminish the opposition, as a populist leader (as reflected by Castro’s quotes) would. Additionally, one must bear in mind that the presence of the opposition will not form part of the speech’s core and easily becomes forgettable material.

Lastly, the references to the opposition are conditioned to the historical context of the nation: special circumstances call for special exceptions. In the case of Sun Yat-Sen, the only remarks made about the opposition were those against the Chinese, who had forgotten or even forsaken

their national values, in other words, their identity. FDR remarks towards the opposition are an exception and are made again, against those who have forgotten their national values.

In the case of France, during the early 1940, we should suspect that de Gaulle would launch remarks against the opposition, which opposition would be then defined as those who gave up France to the Germans, those who surrendered without fighting, those who betrayed French national identity. However, the reader should also expect that these remarks will not be too long, nor that they should be the focus of de Gaulle's speeches.

C. The presence of opposition in de Gaulle's speeches

In de Gaulle's speeches, references to the opposition appear in six out of ten speeches. The speeches in which the opposition is absent are: Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942, Discours de Brazzaville, 30 janvier 1944, Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944, and the Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville, Paris, 25 août 1944.

While the majority of the speeches that lacked this element of nationalism were graded as one, I emphasize that the absence of this element was not the defining factor in grading the speeches as a one or a two. An evidence of this is that one of the most nationalist speeches de Gaulle delivered is the Discours de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris, in August 1944, and does not contain any remarks in regards to the opposition.

As explained in the chapter On de Gaulle's speeches (17-18), either the speeches graded as one lack consistency, the presence of other elements of nationalism—such as the remembrance of victories, of sacrifices and sorrows—and most of all, they lack transcendence.

For example, the speech delivered on the night before Christmas in 1942, the speech starts as highly nationalistic, yet, by the end of it, the reifications of France and Germany, the speech did not contain many more elements of nationalism. The speech thus lacked consistency in the

presence of elements of nationalism, particularly those of destiny and reformation, and the specific mentioning of morals and values.

The speech of Brazzaville in 1944 lacks the romantization of France, and an emphasis on the future or destiny of both France and its African colonies. In this speech, even though de Gaulle speaks about a better future, a reformation in French laws regarding its colonies, the future seems uncertain, and not as bright and glorious as the destiny described for France in other of de Gaulle's speeches. De Gaulle focuses more on reforms, including legal reforms, than on the aspect of Africa's destiny. In any case, de Gaulle's passion for the future of Africa is less than that of the future of France. There is also a lack of sacrifices and sorrows in this speech.

The speech delivered on June 6 1944 has no references to the nation's destiny, progress or reformation. The reference to duty and loyalty only appears once (to duty), and there is a lack of emphasis on moral values. The speech is also deficient in highlighting French national values, morals or spiritual qualities when referring to sacrifices and sorrows. Lastly, this speech lacks transcendence.

Finally, the speech given at the Hôtel de Ville in Paris on August, 25, 1944, lacks the element of treatment of opposition, and while it also lacks the sense of destiny or reformation, it is a passionate speech, conveying the emotion and pride of being French. It has all of the other elements of nationalism in it and these elements are consistent through all of the speech. Furthermore, de Gaulle ties the past, the present and the future in this speech and gives transcendence to the nation of France as well as the struggles and victories the French are having at this point of the war.

The lack of consistency, presence or emphasis on moral values, spiritual qualities, and transcendence is more likely to distinguish an ideal nationalist speech from a semi or none

nationalist speech. However, even though the presence of opposition is not a defining feature of nationalism, it provides the reader an interesting point of comparison with other types of speeches, belonging to populism and pluralism. In addition, for this thesis' purposes, the treatment of the opposition enhances our understanding of nationalism and of de Gaulle himself.

The opposition does not necessarily consist of people from different parties in de Gaulle's speeches during the years of the war. More than anything the opposition in de Gaulle's speeches is comprised by those who betrayed France's sovereignty and surrendered to the Germans. Of these de Gaulle speaks harshly. The following are expressions General de Gaulle used to refer to them: "l'esprit d'abandon du Gouvernement" ("the government's spirit of abandonment") (Appel du 22 juin 1940), "*Cédant à une panique inexcusable, des dirigeants de rencontre ont accepté et subissent la loi de l'ennemi*" ("Yielding to an inexcusable panic, the leaders at the meeting accepted and submit the law to the enemy") (Manifeste de Brazzaville, 27 octobre 1940), "nous nous trouvâmes submergés par la force mécanique allemande et précipités brutalement dans un désarroi matériel et moral qui permit au défaitisme et à la trahison de paralyser chez beaucoup la volonté de vaincre" ("we found ourselves submerged by the German's mechanical force and brutally precipitated in material and moral distress which allowed defeatism and treason to paralyze in many people the will to fight for victory"), "La voilà donc enfin refoulée et humiliée cette puissance militaire allemande [...] aidée par le défaitisme et, parfois, la trahison de certains dirigeants des nations qu'elle voulait asservir" ("Here it is then, this German military power, [...] assisted by defeatism and, sometimes, by the treason of certain leaders of nations that she wanted to enslave, finally suppressed and humiliated") (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944).

It is important to notice that de Gaulle does not refer to a party or parties in particular. Those who de Gaulle consider traitors and the opposition are those who surrendered to the Germans, particularly those in the government who agreed to give up French territory and sovereignty to the enemy. Perhaps de Gaulle language seems too harsh when referring to the opposition, especially because the opposition and de Gaulle are from the same nation. However this language should not be of much surprise to the reader, especially when considering the treatment de Gaulle gave to the Italians when saying: “Peut-être l'Italie sera-t-elle bientôt, une fois de plus, suivant le mot de Byron: *"La triste mère d'un empire mort ?"*” (“Perhaps Italy will soon be, once again, following the words of Byron: ‘The sad mother of a dead empire?’”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941). As explained in the previous chapter, these statements shed light on de Gaulle’s personality, perhaps even more than on his type of rhetoric.

De Gaulle attacks both Italy and those in the French government who surrendered to Germany. As a matter of fact, de Gaulle’s passion against them comes similarly strong in both cases. While there are differences in the nationalities in the previous quotes, de Gaulle holds them equally guilty and abases them both. The pattern in here is that both the French government and the Italians gave up their sovereignty and identity to the Germans. They both surrendered instead of resisting, fighting against Germany.

In a way, de Gaulle is doing something similar to Sun Yat-Sen, when mentioning opposition. It is not the political ideology that bothers these nationalist leaders, but the fact that the people they refer to, have given up values crucial to their national identity, and even, in de Gaulle’s case, they even gave up France’s sovereignty to foreigners.

Being such a defender of France, due to his idealistic nature and his pride in the French tradition of freedom, de Gaulle despises those who violate or give up national sovereignty.

Consequently and unsurprisingly then, the terms to address these types of people are likely to come out as bold and harsh. At the time, this is the only opposition de Gaulle sees in France, the only opposition that seems to matter, the only opposition that has worsen France's situation.

D. Purpose for the treatment of opposition in nationalism

As a contrast to populist rhetoric, de Gaulle seeks not and provokes no retaliation against the opposition. He lets them be, and asks the French to fight for their soil, their identity, their France against the Germans, not against the government.

As a matter of fact, de Gaulle uses the bad example of those who gave up France to contrast it with the qualities the French, as a nation, have to further inspire the French to regain their liberties, their sovereignty. He states:

“Il n'y a pas, à cet égard, la moindre distinction à faire entre les Français de Brazzaville, [...] de Strasbourg. Sauf une poignée de malheureux et une chambrée de misérables qui, par panique, folie ou intérêt, ont spéculé sur la défaite de la patrie et qui dominant provisoirement par la tromperie, la prison ou la famine, la nation n'a jamais marqué une pareille unanimité. On peut dire, littéralement, que ceux des Français qui vivent ne vivent plus que pour vouloir la libération nationale. Et l'on peut dire aussi que, pour 40 millions de Français, l'idée même de la victoire se confond avec celle de la victoire des Français Libres”

(“In this respect, there is not even the slightest distinction to be made between the French of Brazzaville, [...] of Strasbourg. Except a barrackroom and a handful of miserable, who, by panic, madness or interest, speculated on the country's defeat, and who by deceit, prison or famine temporarily dominate, the nation has never signal an equal unanimity. It can be literally said, that those of the French who are alive, live only to want national liberation. It can also be said, in regards to the 40 million French, that the idea of victory itself is confused

with that of the victory of the Free French”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941). Note how in spite of his harsh treatment to those French who surrendered to the Germans, the emphasis is placed on the French who fight for the freedom of France, on celebrating the near victory of a Free France. Thus, in this quote, de Gaulle emphasizes the unity and the strong desire and resolution of the French for freedom.

“Tous ceux qui ont le courage de se remettre debout, malgré l'ennemi et la trahison, sont d'avance approuvés, accueillis, acclamés par tous les Français Combattants” (“All of those who have the courage to stand up again, in spite of the enemy and treason, are in advance approved, welcomed, acclaimed by all Combatant French”) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londre, 8 novembre 1942). In here de Gaulle contrast those who are willing to stand up for the value of freedom, for French sovereignty, against those who quickly surrendered to the Germans. He thus highlights the combatant spirit of the French for freedom.

In the following quote, de Gaulle speaks harshly against the opposition, yet again, is able to inspire his co-nationals by highlighting French values and victories:

“[Aidée] par le défaitisme et, parfois, la trahison de certains dirigeants des nations qu'elle voulait asservir, favorisée par la dispersion des États du parti de la liberté, [l’Allemagne] avait tenté de saisir la domination du monde ! L’édifice, battu en brèche depuis des mois et des années mais attaqué cette fois avec force et avec audace, paraît ébranlé jusque dans ses fondements. L’horizon se dore des lumières de la victoire” (“assisted by defeatism and, sometimes, by the treason of certain leaders of nations that she wanted to enslave favored by the dispersion of the States of the party of liberty, [Germany] attempted to seize world domination! The building, broken in breaches for months and years, nevertheless this time attacked with strength and audacity, seems to

shake even to its foundations. The horizon gilds with the lights of victory”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944),

Even though this quote speaks harshly against German collaborators, this quote actually does not focus on the treason of the opponents of freedom; it rather focuses on the victories the French have had in expelling the Germans from French soil, and in regaining the courage to defend their nation and identity. Hence the quote finishes by the beautiful imagery of the gliding horizon, of hope because of French victory.

The last quote I present on this subject comes from the same speech of the previous quote. It reads: “dans un désarroi matériel et moral qui permit au défaitisme et à la trahison de paralyser chez beaucoup la volonté de vaincre. Tout de même ! nous étions en ligne dès le 3 septembre 1939” (“in material and moral distress which allowed defeatism and treason to paralyze in many people the will to fight for victory. All the same! We were in line from September 3, 1939”) (Discours du palais de Chaillot, 12 septembre 1944). This last quote emphasizes and celebrates the resolution of the free French, of the French who did not succumb nor abandoned their roots as the hopelessness government did. De Gaulle emphasizes and celebrates the French Resistance by stating that even though the French seem to have everything against them, they still arose, and fought on September 3, 1939, the day when Paris and London declared war on Germany.

It is interesting to notice the similar treatment de Gaulle gives both the enemy and the opposition. To him, the enemy seizes world domination and the diminishing of other nations. The opposition did nothing but surrendering to the enemy, and with that threw France into material and moral distress. With the submission to the enemy, the French government is partly responsible for the decline in the moral of the French. However, the allusions to the opposition

are brief, and de Gaulle quickly switches the focus to the goodness of the French and to the victories or qualities they, as a nation, possess.

E. Conclusion

Even though six of the ten speeches analyzed contain the element of treatment of opposition, as supposed for its lack of presence in the speeches served as base to find the elements of nationalism, this element is not crucial to nationalism. It is not a defining characteristic of nationalism. In fact, references to opposition seems contrary to the nature of nationalism, since nationalism is a celebration of the nation's identity and the unity the people of the nation feel because of their national identity. However, special circumstances may draw a nationalist leader to refer to the opposition. In this regards, de Gaulle seems to be the exception that proves the rule.

The analysis of this element of nationalism, particularly in comparison with the equivalent element of pluralism and populism has brought up important insights on both nationalism and de Gaulle.

First, as seen in FDR and de Gaulle's speeches in a nationalist speech the opposition can appear and moreover, it can be treated in a harsh way. However, we need to keep in mind that France's circumstances were special at the time, and that being such a defender of France, it is expected that de Gaulle would mention the opposition.

Second, even though the treatment of the opposition comes out strongly, contrary to populism, de Gaulle does not instill enmity or hostility against the opposition. He is not too incendiary against the opposition and does not take an 'anything-goes' attitude against French from different parties or opinions. Rather, even though de Gaulle seems to harshly treat the

opposition, he does not dwell on their ‘treason’, but shifts back the focus on the values, qualities, identity, and victories of the French, to further inspire them to unite and fight for France.

In a way, his focus is similar to what he does when speaking about the enemy: de Gaulle mentions the badness of those invading foreign soil and of those people not fighting for freedom; however, he proceeds then to emphasize the victories and qualities of the nation of France. It is also interesting to note that de Gaulle did not divide the French into parties, even though there were diverse political inclinations in France, or favored a particular party or ideology above others. His ideology and preference lies in the nation of France, and as a nationalist leader he put the values and identity of his nation well above anything else. The only defect mentioning in de Gaulle’s speeches in regards to the opposition is that the opposition surrendered French sovereignty to Germany.

The opposition’s political beliefs, laws, or other doings not related to the surrendering of France, are not dealt with. De Gaulle probably avoided this in order to create more unity among the French, but also possibly because he respected other political beliefs even those contrary to his own, as long as these beliefs did not include giving up French sovereignty or values of France’s national identity. In other words, as long as France remained sovereign, de Gaulle was willing to respect French holding different opinions. Thus, it can be stated that de Gaulle’s bold words against the opposition come not from the party he or they belonged to, but rather because of the outrage the opposition brought to France when subjecting itself to a foreign country.

The presence of enemies in de Gaulle’s speeches, as in any of the other nationalist speeches so far analyzed, does not define the nation. In the case of de Gaulle, like in the case of Sun—as seen at the beginning of this chapter—the opposition served to highlight the values,

qualities, and victories of the nation. The qualities and victories of the nations have been—and could have been brought—to light without mentioning the opposition.

The treatment of opposition and the presence of enemies bring interesting points when compared to populism. They also bring interesting insights about the speakers. For example, more emphasis is placed, and more understanding is gained on de Gaulle's character, including his loyalty to France by analyzing the treatment of the opposition. However, because they do not help define the nation, they should not be considered as essential elements of nationalism.

XI. Conclusion

The purpose of my thesis was to study nationalism in the speeches of Charles de Gaulle. For this purpose, I had first to define nation and nationalism. Since scholarly work made it almost impossible to stand by a definition that properly fit nationalism (often confusing nationalism to other movements such as populism and patriotism), I created a rubric describing six elements of nationalism. The six elements of nationalism are: morals and values, the celebration of victorious moments or characters of the nation, the notion of reformation and destiny, the remembrance and calling of sacrifices and sorrows for the nation's good, the presence and treatment of enemies, and the presence and treatment of opposition.

The idea of creating the rubric came from the rubric Dr. Hawkins produced to describe and contrast populist and pluralist rhetoric. My descriptive rubric is based on some theory, but mostly from the observation of pattern present in the speeches of four leaders generally considered as nationalists: David Ben Gurion (from Israel), Eamon de Valera (from Ireland), Sun Yat-Sen (from China), and Franklin Delano Roosevelt (from the United States of America). Since nationalism is a term that is often mistaken with others such as populism and patriotism, it became evident that when categorizing such movements, it is important to look at people's rhetoric, and through it, find out their populist, nationalist or pluralist inclinations.

The creation of the rubric proved to be helpful in categorizing speeches as nationalists, semi or non-nationalists. It also helps to more clearly distinguish leaders as populist, pluralist or nationalist. Further, it gave us insights on de Gaulle's rhetoric and beliefs. This thesis then contributes to the fields of social sciences—particularly to political sciences—and humanities—particularly to the studies made on Charles de Gaulle, and to the field of speech analysis.

In regards to nationalism, it was evidenced through this work that there are six elements present in nationalist rhetoric, four of which are considered essential and two of them optional.

The first element of nationalism considers the vision of the world and of the nation the leader has. It incorporates morals and values fundamental to the national identity. Duty and loyalty are particularly addressed and often referred to in nationalist discourse. Morals and values can be addressed as issues or can be implied and be ascribed cosmic proportions and transcendence over time and space, depending on the redemptive or pragmatic tone of the leader. The important matter is that morals and values will be present and an important part of nationalist discourse. Even though morals and values are present in nationalist rhetoric it is important to emphasize that they are not necessarily framed as a struggle between good and evil as they are in populism. This is a first contribution to the fields of social sciences and speech analysis.

In the case of Charles de Gaulle, morals and values were for the most part, vaguely addressed, and yet, they were very present and consistent throughout de Gaulle's speeches. In the chapter on the first element of nationalism, I attempted to explain why de Gaulle is so vague when addressing those morals and values, opposed to the specificity of Sun and concluded in my preliminary results, that this might be de Gaulle's style or that this vagueness might be subject to context: the closer a nation is to a war, the more vaguely values will be addressed. However, I would also like to point out that de Gaulle's vagueness helps to bring a redemptive tone to his speeches. In the case of the values of duty and loyalty, and analysis was carried out to determine the proximity of these values and words such as "France", "Français", etc. The results were outstanding. There was a strong proximity among the above words, suggesting that these values are inseparable from and innate in the French. It was also noted that nationalist leaders can instill

morals and values into their co-nationals both by explicit and implicit statements, and by adding cosmic proportions and transcendence to both the values and the nation without framing them in a larger struggle of good vs. evil.

The findings on the second element of nationalism—the celebration of victorious moments or characters of the nation—were similar to those of the first element in that victorious characters or moments can be, or not, elaborated in the speeches. Usually cosmic proportions and transcendence are ascribed to victorious characters or moments of the nation. The victories referred to can be from a long and distant past as well as from a recent past. The victories celebrated would focus on symbols of the nation rather than symbols of the republic, state, or country. In other words, in these celebrations the nation is favored over symbols of the “father/motherland”.

The preference of nationalist over patriotic symbols became evident in de Gaulle’s speeches. In his speeches de Gaulle alluded to the values of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which served as a banner in the French Revolution. Yet de Gaulle alluded to the values, not the Revolution itself, and while he did mention the French flag, he quickly came back to nationalist symbols, and dismissed other symbols immediately connected to the French Revolution, the new Constitution or the Republic.

Another interesting observation on this subject is that while de Gaulle reified France, he did not mention once the name by which she is usually recognized: Marianne. This is likely because the name Marianne is closely linked to the French Revolution. The reification of France, however, is not necessarily linked to the French Revolution, but can reach further down in the culturally rich past of nation of France. The distinction between symbols of the republic and of the nation, confirmed the distinction previously made in regards to nationalism and patriotism.

Additionally, the presence of the second element of nationalism confirmed so far, the idea that Charles de Gaulle was a nationalist. The presence of this element in de Gaulle's speeches is another contribution to the fields of social sciences.

In regards to the third element of nationalism—the calling for action and change, particularly to bring to pass reformations and achieve the nation's missions and destiny—it was observed that de Gaulle used again an implicit approach. The word destiny was not mentioned as one would have expected; yet it was also evidenced that to de Gaulle France has played an important role in the past, and that it is destined to keep playing the role of a world leader. For this purpose French and non-French need to unite in the cause of France, and restore it to freedom, freedom from Germany, freedom from foreign rule. De Gaulle alludes to reforms: the firm and strong return to morals and values, to a sovereign France, but also to a France that would allow changes in its government, laws, and institutions. He mentions reforms in particular to the French colonies, given them incentive to fight for France, so that by fighting for France they can gain a better position in their status with France and the world. Even though de Gaulle implies it, the idea that France is a key actor in the world stage strongly comes out in his speeches. France's destiny then has been and will be to lead to world towards progress, towards light, France being the one holding the light. This again contributes to the understanding of nationalism, and contributes different fields of social sciences and studies of rhetoric and of De Gaulle.

The fourth element of nationalism, sacrifices and sorrows is the other side of the coin of creating a national identity—the first side being the second element of nationalism or celebration of victories and national heroes. The fourth element is the element that most clearly stands out in de Gaulle's speeches. This might be because of the hard times the French are going through at

this particular point in history. French, France, and even other peoples sacrifice and endure sorrows, mostly though the main actors are the French and France. Through his speeches, and his style, de Gaulle is able to allude to sacrifices and sorrows of particular French, but make them part of all of the French, of France herself, conveying a sense of transcendence of personal sacrifices and sorrows over the individual, over time and space.

De Gaulle shows respect, contrition and admiration for the sacrifices and sorrows endured, and later, is able to turn them into past, present, and even future victories. This is opposed to populist discourse, where a sense of sorrows is portrayed, but in such manner that it instills indignation and negative feelings towards the oppressors, who reside either inside or outside of the country or nation. Another important contrast was made between the use of *the people* in populism and nationalism. In populism, this term is very exclusive. It refers to a particular group of people that usually belongs to a low social-economic class, with scarce resources and that has been immiserated or oppressed for a long time. In nationalism, as evidenced in Charles de Gaulle's speeches, *the people* is not a frequently used term as it is in populist rhetoric. Additionally, it is an inclusive term. In nationalism this term includes all those who, by birth or adoption, identify themselves with, or as part of, the French nation, thus including people from all different social and economic status, and of different ideologies.

Sacrifices and sorrows can be both material—tangible or quantifiable, such as hunger or the destruction of buildings, lands or the lack of material resources—and moral—intangible or unquantifiable, as in dealing more with the emotions, values and morale of those enduring them. Both facets of sacrifices and sorrow can overlap in nationalist rhetoric, and in fact, they often do in de Gaulle's speeches. At times de Gaulle was specific when mentioning sacrifices and sorrows, particularly the material ones. The quotes alluding to the lack of bread, and fuel are very explicit

in this regards (Message adressé aux enfants de France, Londres, 24 décembre 1942). Yet at other times, he is again vague and ascribing to these sacrifices and sorrows cosmic proportions, as seen in the quotes, “*Derrière le nuage si lourd de notre sang et de nos larmes...*” and “*Je ne commettrai pas l’indélicatesse d’insister sur ce que cela représente, au total, de souffrances et de sacrifices. Chacun de nous est seul à connaître, dans les secrets de son cœur, ce qu’il lui en a coûté*” (“Behind the heavy cloud of our blood and tears...”, “I will not commit the indelicacy of insisting on what this, in sum, represents, to the sufferings and sacrifices. Each of us alone knows, in the secrets of his or her heart, the high price he or she paid”) (Discours radiodiffusé, Londres, 6 juin 1944 and Discours de l’Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941 respectively).

As previously stated, de Gaulle, as supposed a nationalist would, used sacrifices and sorrows and turns them into or points out with them to material and moral victories. First, all of the sacrifices and sorrows would work for the greater good: the nation’s survival and emergence as a world power. Through sacrifices and sorrows de Gaulle was able to inspire the French to unite, to hope, reaffirm ‘French values’, and inspire them to victory. Furthermore, by emphasizing sacrifices and sorrows endured by the French, de Gaulle elevates them to a higher level and further emphasizes their victories: the French become more praiseworthy for overcoming gigantic obstacles. Additionally sacrifices and sorrows highlight the morals and values of the French, fulfilling Margalit’s statement: “People who have [endured sorrow] see themselves as representing some sort of ‘great spirituality’ [...]” (McKim and McMahan 77). An example of this is found in the sentence, “*Nous sommes des Français de toutes origines, de toutes conditions, de toutes opinions, qui avons décidé de nous unir dans la lutte de notre pays. Tous l’ont fait volontairement, purement, simplement*” (“We are French of all origins, of all conditions, of all opinions, who have decided to unite ourselves in the fight for our country. All

have done it voluntarily, purely, simply”) (Discours de l’Albert Hall, 15 novembre 1941), where de Gaulle highlights the will, unity, purity and simplicity inherent in the French identity.

The presence of enemies constitutes the fifth element of nationalism. This element is not fundamental to nationalism because nationalism is not negatively defined against other nations or peoples. However, enemies might be present in nationalist rhetoric. Due to the nature of nationalist rhetoric, the presence and bellicosity towards enemies is likely conditioned to the nation’s context. If enemies are present in nationalist speeches, they will always be foreigners who are trying to or have invaded the nation, and seek to exert dominion over it. Thus the bellicose descriptions found in Ben Gurion and de Gaulle’s speeches.

De Gaulle gives a material and moral description of France’s enemy, and an account of the enemy’s actions. He states that it is a *force mécanique* (mechanical force), temporarily superior in technology, but not in values or ‘spiritual qualities’. It was pointed out that General de Gaulle usually referred to enemy in the singular form and not the plural form, indicating that France has only one main enemy: Germany. A correlation of the words such as *ennemi* (enemy) and *Allemand* or *Allemagne* (German or Germany) was made and found a strong proximity between these expressions, more so than with *ennemi* and *Italiens*, or *Italie*. These results confirmed that France had only one main enemy, and that the rest of Germany’s allies, were only appendages to Germany, but non-important in the fight for France. The exception to this assertion is when France wins to the Italians, in which case the battle is important, and yet, it follows the rule, for right next to Italy, Germany appears in the sentence, indicating that battling and winning over any of the Axis powers is fighting and winning against Germany. Lastly, it was also made note that de Gaulle uses the presences of enemies to further ennoble the French, by highlighting their ‘spiritual qualities’ in opposing them to the baseness of the enemy.

The last element of nationalism—the presence and treatment of the opposition—is also very likely conditioned to the nation’s context. Interestingly, de Gaulle seems bellicose to the opposition. However, it is important to notice who is the opposition. The only true opposition appearing in de Gaulle’s speeches consists of those who sided with Germany, who surrendered French territory and institutions and collaborated with France’s invader—Germany. Of them de Gaulle speaks in a pejorative manner. Yet, in principle (even though it might not be the case in tone), it is similar to how Sun Yat-Sen spoke of the Chinese who forsook their Chinese values. A few distinguishing features from populism in this element: first, de Gaulle does not make the opposition an extremely important part of his speech. He addresses the opposition in a brief way, and moves on to other themes. Second, de Gaulle does not mention parties or ideologies, or even alludes to all of those who are not with him or share his political opinions; in other words, he does not divide the French into political parties or ideologies. Third, and most importantly, de Gaulle does not promote retaliation or violence against the opposition. Even though he uses strong words against them, de Gaulle does not take an ‘anything-goes’ attitudes towards them. What matters the most to de Gaulle is saving the nation of France. The different political factions at the time as not as relevant to him, as the task of saving France, restoring its dignity and sovereignty is. Finally, when mentioning the opposition, de Gaulle quickly switches the focus to the goodness and values the French (those fighting for France) have, turning the speech into an uplifting and inspiring rhetoric again.

The creation of the rubric is a contribution to the fields of social sciences and others interested in nationalism, and speech analysis. Further, the analysis made of de Gaulle’s speeches shed more light on nationalism and the type of leaders it can include and exclude. But these exercises also give more information on Charles de Gaulle himself.

The first observation concerns the focus on this thesis: de Gaulle is a nationalist. The presence of all of the elements of nationalism, particularly of the four fundamental ones, in his rhetoric, evidence that, at least during the years of the war, de Gaulle is a nationalist. Even the presence of enemies and opposition reaffirm this claim, for de Gaulle does not seek retaliation or vengeance or violence to those who gave in France's sovereignty (at least not in his speeches). De Gaulle's speeches are uplifting and inspiring. They are a celebration of the French identity, in spite of the hardships they at the time endure. Further, de Gaulle instills courage and important values in the French to help them fight for France's freedom, and gives transcendence and cosmic proportions to French values, victories, over time and space. Even though de Gaulle heavily focuses on sacrifices and sorrows, he is able to turn them into victories and through them, highlight the spiritual qualities the French possess.

Throughout this work it was noted that de Gaulle is very vague when speaking. He does not address morals and values as issues, nor does he elaborates on passed victories, and even is not specific when addressing France's destiny. De Gaulle was more specific when talking about reforms and a few of the challenges the French faced at the time, but even in this last point, he was very broad. I presented several reasons why de Gaulle could be very broad, among them his style, ambiguities in French history, and the focus on unity. Mostly though, de Gaulle's vagueness contributes to the tone of the speech: it gives the speech a redemptive tone. De Gaulle's vagueness is often accompanied by a sense of cosmic proportions and transcendence, which gives the speech a redemptive tone. Along with this, it was noted how de Gaulle works by way of implication, which in turn can give more power than an explicit manner of presentation. An example of this power behind implications, is the strong proximity of nationalist words such as *France*, *Français*, etc. (France, French, etc.) and *devoir*, *loyal*, etc. (duty, loyal, etc.). The

high frequency of proximity among these words, convey in the audience the idea that these values are innate in the French, that one does not go without the other. Even in the speeches when the words are not too close, the audience having received these words, would likely subconsciously associate the values to the French national identity.

De Gaulle was a very educated, eloquent, cultured and idealistic man. This is seen in his style and the references he makes to French history. This is partly reflected in the following quote: “Paris ! Paris outragé ! Paris brisé ! Paris martyrisé ! mais Paris libéré !” (“Paris ! Insulted Paris ! Broken Paris! Martyred Paris! But liberated Paris!” (Discours de l’hôtel de Ville de Paris, 15 août 1944) where he builds his sentences in a crescendo highlighting the oppression Paris was under, but also the qualities of Paris, since it is compared to a martyr. Furthermore, the crescendo ends in a Paris that has been freed, liberated from its oppressor.

De Gaulle’s idealism is also reflected in the reification of France. Through it, the reader can perceive a chivalrous notion in de Gaulle, a notion that has been present in France since the Middle Ages. De Gaulle describes France as a woman, full of virtues, and calls for its protection in a similar way in which a medieval knight in Courtly Love literature would protect his mistress. To de Gaulle, France is the embodiment of all that is beautiful, pure and virtuous, and admires, respects and pledges to it, as a knight would to his mistress. The speech in which this comes out most clearly is in the Message adressé aux enfants de France, yet, this notion is present throughout de Gaulle’s rhetoric. In his speeches it appears that de Gaulle is as proud of being French as a Courtly Love knight is proud of having the love of his mistress.

Lastly the speeches of de Gaulle show that he was a lover of France and all that France represents, in particular freedom. De Gaulle’s bellicose remarks are only extended to those who violate the sovereignty of other nations. Germany is the main actor in this description. However,

Italy and the French government who gave up sovereignty are also included in this category. De Gaulle's makes harsh statements against those who surrendered to Germany, France's main enemy. By reading these remarks, the reader can sense de Gaulle's outrage at them, precisely because these people were not willing to fight for their sovereignty, for their nation, for their identity. The pattern is clear in de Gaulle's speeches and applied to the Italians and French who surrendered to and collaborated with the Germans. Thus de Gaulle comes as a defender of nations, their sovereignty and identity, in particular of the nation of France, emphasizing the value of freedom, that to him is innate in the French nation.

The analysis of de Gaulle's speeches made with the rubric in the holistic approach shows that de Gaulle's rhetoric during the years of the war is nationalistic. The analytical approach, meaning the close analysis of de Gaulle's speeches by element, supported this initial assessment, adding to it, some of de Gaulle's personality. In a sense the results are reassuring, since they concur with many people (scholars and non-scholars) in that de Gaulle is a nationalist leader.

However, my results also add to the polemic discussions on nationalism and contradict the posture that nationalism is bellicose in nature. As demonstrated throughout this work, nationalism is not bellicose. It rather focuses on the celebration, unity and destiny of the nation—a group of people sharing a communal sense and who believe in the right of being self-governed. A nationalist discourse will be positive and inspiring, hardly leading towards violence against others, including other nations, except in times where the nation's sovereignty has been violated. Even though this evidence is small in the number of speeches analyzed, it should be enough to make scholars re-think about nationalism, and to take a closer look at speech analysis before cataloguing leaders or movements. If nationalism has a sin, so far as the speeches show, it is of

egocentrism not of promoting wars. More research could be done to further assert this, but for now, we will limit ourselves to the current results.

Nationalism is highly present in de Gaulle's speeches during the years of the war. In order to better determine his nationalism, it would be important to look at speeches delivered during the Fourth and Fifth Republic and see his consistency and changes through his speeches. Yet, the objective of my thesis was fulfilled: nationalism was described, the findings on de Gaulle's speeches went according to the descriptive rubric, which increases the understanding of nationalism, and confidence to claim that Charles de Gaulle was a nationalist from a rhetorical point of view. With this, I hope to have contributed to the works on nationalism, speech analysis, and Charles de Gaulle.

Works Cited

- Atkin, Nicholas. European History in Perspective: The Fifth French Republic. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities. London: Verso, 1983.
- Beiner, Ronald, ed. Theorizing nationalism. New York: State University of New York, 1999.
- Berstein, Serge, and Peter Morris. The Republic of de Gaulle, 1958-1969. New York: the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1993.
- Copeland, Lewis, Lamm, Lawrence, and Stephen McKenna. The World's Great Speeches. 4th ed. Dover Publications, Inc., 1999.
- Crosscup, Richard. Classic Speeches: Words that shook the world. New York: Philosophical Library Inc., 1965.
- Crozier, Brian. De Gaulle. Especial Ed. Norwalk: The Easton Press, 1990.
- de Bertier de Sauvigny, Guillaume. Histoire de France. France: Flammarion, 1977.
- de Lorris, Guillaume. Le roman de la rose. Trans. Armand Strubel. Paris: Brodard & Taupin, 2001.
- DePorte, A. W. De Gaulle's Foreign Policy 1944-1946. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Fondation Charles de Gaulle. Charles de Gaulle: La Jeunesse et la Guerre 1890-1920. Paris: Plon, 2001.
- Gellner, Ernest. Nations and Nationalism, Blackwell, Oxford, 1983.
- Gilbert, Paul. The Philosophy of Nationalism. Colorado: Westview Press, 1998.
- Guibernau, Montserrat. Nationalisms: The nation-state and nationalism in the twentieth century. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
- Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith ed. Nationalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Labrune, Gérard. and Phillipe Toutain. L'histoire de France. France : Nathan, 1986.
- Lais de Marie de France. Flammarion, 1994.

La Chanson de Roland. Trans. Jean Dufournet. France: Flammarion, 1993.

McMillan, James. Modern France. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

McKim, Robert, Jeff McMahan. The morality of nationalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Miller, D., Citizenship and National Identity. Blackwell, Oxford, 2000.

Peterson, Houston. A Treasury of the World's Great Speeches. New York: Houston, Simon and Schuster inc., 1954.

Uribe, Álvaro. Discurso de Lanzamiento de Candidatura, Bogotá, 21 de marzo de 2002. Speech in the author's possession.

Yuval-Davis, N. Gender and Nation. Sage Publications: London, 1997.

Online sources

“Colombia: Presidencia de la República.” Presidencia de la República. 2007. 24 November 2009 <http://web.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/discursos2008/julio/congreso_20072008.html>

Cornier, Jeffrey and Philippe Couton. “The Ernest Gellner Resource Site.” 1999. 24 November 2009 <<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/gellner/Quotes.html>>

“Discurso de Augusto Pinochet a un mes de la constitución de la junta de gobierno.” May 2009. Wikisource <http://es.wikisource.org/wiki/Discurso_de_Augusto_Pinochet_a_un_mes_de_la_constituci%C3%B3n_de_la_junta_de_gobierno#Discurso_pronunciado_por_el_se.C3.B1or_presidente_de_la_jjunt_de_gobierno.2C_general_de_ej.C3.A9rcito_don_Augusto_Pinochet_Ugarte.2C_al_cumplircu_un_mes_desde_la_fecha_de_constituci.C3.B3n_de_la_junta_de_gobierno>.

“Discursos e intervenciones del Comandante en Jefe Fidel Castro Ruz, Presidente del Consejo del Estado de la República de Cuba.” 25 November 2009 <<http://www.cuba.cu/gobierno/discursos/1959/esp/f210159e.html>>

“El Manifiesto de Franco en las Palmas Ante el 18 de julio.” Generalísimo Francisco Franco. November 2003-2009. 24 November 2009 <http://www.generalisimofranco.com/18_julio/003.htm>

France in the United States: Embassy of France in Washington. “Marianne”. 24 November 2009 <<http://www.ambafrance-us.org/spip.php?article619>>.

Fondation Charles de Gaulle. “Discours.” 24 November 2009 <<http://www.charles-de-gaulle.org/>>.

Hawkins, Kirk. “Is Chávez Populist: Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative Perspective.” Comparative Political Studies 42 2009: 1040-1067. SAGE Publications. 25 November 2009 <<http://cps.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/42/8/1040>>

Hooker, Richard. “Modern China> Sun Yat-Sen.” 1996. Washington State University. 2 April 2009 <<http://wsu.edu/~dee/MODCHINA/SUN.HTM>>.

“I Believe Only In the Power of the People.” Countercurrents.org. 20005. 24 November 2009 <<http://www.countercurrents.org/bolivia-morales221205.htm>>.

King James Version Bible. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. 2006. 21 January 2010 <<http://scriptures.lds.org/en/acts/7>>.

King James Version Bible. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. 2006. 21 January 2010 <<http://scriptures.lds.org/en/matt/25>>.

Martyr. Centre national de ressources textuelles et lexicales. 2009. 26 January 2010

<<http://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/martyr>>.

Martyr. Le Dictionnaire. 26 January 2010 <<http://www.le-dictionnaire.com/definition.php?mot=martyr>>.

Misevic, Nenad. "Nationalism." Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. November 18, 2008 <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nationalism/>>.

Renan, Paul. "What is a nation?" Tamilnation.org. 2009. 24 November 2009 <<http://www.tamilnation.org/selfdetermination/nation/renan.htm> >.

Sánchez, Nestor. "President Chavez's speech to the United Nations". 16 Sept. 2005. Venezuelanalysis.com. 2009. <<http://www.venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/1365>>

Thayer. "Plutarch, The Parallel lives" 2008. 24 November 2009 <http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Caesar*.html#25>.

Turino, Thomas. "Nationalism and Latin American Music: Selected case studies and theoretical considerations." 2003 Texas: Latin American Music Review. 24 November 2009 <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/latin_american_music_review/v024/24.2turino.html>

Zuelow, Eric G. "The nationalism project: Quotes." October 2009. 24 November 2009 <http://www.nationalismproject.org/books/g_h.htm#Anchor-Gellner-39029>

Endnotes

¹ Gaulle, Charles de. *Discours et messages*, vol. 1-5. Paris: Plon, 1970-1971

² Since the day I took the speeches off this website, the information on this site has changed. This site now contains the speeches mentioned but also more speeches and documents. The current address as of January 26 2010 is: <http://www.charles-de-gaulle.org/pages/l-homme/accueil/discours.php>.

³ Let us recall de Gaulle's words, "parmi mesdames les nations, aucune n'a jamais été plus belle, meilleure, ni plus brave que notre dame la France" ("among the nation-ladies, none has ever more beautiful, brave, nor better than our lady of France") (Message adressé aux enfants de France, 24 décembre 1942), and the references he makes regarding salvation, "Il s'agissait de savoir si, aux côtés de nos braves alliés, qui poursuivaient le combat pour leur salut et pour le nôtre, il ne resterait pas un seul morceau belligérant de nos terres. Il s'agissait de savoir si la voix de la France allait entièrement s'éteindre ou, pire encore, si le monde pourrait penser la reconnaître dans la détestable contrefaçon qu'en font l'ennemi et les traîtres" ("The matter became to know if, by fighting side by side with our brave allies who pursued the combat for their salvation and our salvation, no belligerent piece of our soil would remain. The matter became to know if the voice of France would completely fade, or even worse, if the world would think of recognizing it after the heinous manner in which the enemies and traitors have portrayed it") (Discours de l'Albert Hall, Londres, 15 novembre 1941); "Le salut devait venir d'ailleurs. Il vint, d'abord, d'une élite [...] qui, bien au-dessus de toute préoccupation de parti ou de classe, se dévoua au combat pour la libération, la grandeur et la rénovation de la France. Sentiment de sa supériorité morale, conscience d'exercer une sorte de sacerdoce du sacrifice et de l'exemple [...] fut la psychologie de cette élite partie de rien et qui, malgré de lourdes pertes, devait entraîner derrière elle tout l'Empire et toute la France" ("Salvation had to come from elsewhere. It came first from an elite [...] who, well over all concern from party or class, devoted itself to the fight for the liberation, the grandeur and the renovation of France. Feeling a superior morality, conscious of the exercise a kind of priesthood and example [...] was the psychology of this elite who started from nowhere and that, in spite of all losses, should lead behind her all of the Empire and all of France") (Discours de Bayeux, 16 juin 1946). Note the proximity of the words France or any of its derivatives, and salut (salvation). Even though de Gaulle might make reference to groups of people who fought for France or the salvation of France, the medieval and chivalrous idea of protecting France and by it gaining salvation is strongly present in de Gaulle's rhetoric.

⁴ See endnote 1

⁵ This element also shows in the *Discours du palais de Chaillot*, 12 septembre 1944 when de Gaulle states: "Et vous, hommes et femmes de la Résistance française, vous tous croisés à la croix de Lorraine, vous qui êtes le ferment de la nation dans son combat pour l'honneur et pour la liberté, il vous appartiendra demain de l'entraîner, pour son bien, vers l'effort et vers la grandeur. C'est alors, et alors seulement, que sera remportée la grande victoire de la France!" ("And you, men and women of the French Resistance, all of you crossed to the Loraine Cross, you who are the nation's closure in its combat for honor and liberty, yours is the task of leading it, for its good, to effort and grandeur. It will be then, and only then, that the victory of France will come forth!"). This imagery also appears more clearly in later speeches of de Gaulle. While the focus is not placed on them, the concept is hinted in the early years of de Gaulle's appearance as a public figure. For more examples of this concept, please refer to endnote 1.

⁶ The reference to a stone rolling down hill makes one well-acquainted Christian think of the Biblical passage in Daniel chapter 2, particularly from verse 36 to verse 46. In these verses, the prophet Daniel reveals and explains to King Nebuchadnezzar his dream. As part of this dream the king sees a stone that was cut out without hands going down the mountain and breaking the statue made of silver, clay, brass, iron, and gold.