Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Churchill, Fulton and the Anglo-American special relationship: Setting the agenda?

(Article begins on next page)

24 April 2024

Draft Paper – Do not cite or re-produce

Anna Marchi and Steve Marsh

Churchill, Fulton and the Anglo-American special relationship: setting the agenda?

Abstract: Churchill is often deemed to have failed at Fulton in delivering 'the crux' of what he came to secure, namely a special Anglo-American relationship based in both interest and 'fraternal association'. As other contributions to this special edition demonstrate, there are good grounds for this verdict. However we ask whether, and if so in what ways, Churchill was actually able in and through the Sinews of Peace speech to set the agenda and frame the terms of discussion for the later emergence of a special relationship. To do this we treat the special relationship as a discursive construct and by combining diplomatic history with corpus assisted discourse studies map discourse features of the Sinews of Peace speech against media discourse on Anglo-American relations in the early 1950s.

Key Words: Churchill, Anglo-American, special relationship, Sinews of Peace, discourse, Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies

In 1946 an elderly private British citizen travelled to the United States and visited a then obscure College in Fulton Missouri where he delivered what became one of the most significant speeches on international affairs in modern history. That individual was Winston Churchill, celebrated wartime leader of Great Britain but recently cast out of office by an electorate keen to address wartime deprivations and overdue domestic reforms. Churchill himself once called his Sinews of Peace – or Iron Curtain as it was often referred to – speech the most important of his career. Its immediate impact was certainly considerable, albeit the response within and beyond America was far from uniformly positive. Particularly riled were those who thought a less confrontational approach to the Soviets advisable, or feared that Churchill was angling for an Anglo-American military alliance, or were suspicious of British imperialism, or felt excluded by the 'othering' language of Churchill's English speaking peoples.

In hindsight it is often argued that the speech achieved 'much of the effect Churchill desired, once the initial fuss had died down.'[1] This is reasonable in terms of its aiding the Truman administration in persuading the American people of the Soviet Union's transition from wartime friend to peacetime foe and of reconfiguring

Congressional debate about the pending Anglo-American loan from as an investment in American national security rather than underwriting the British Empire. However, less immediately obvious is that Churchill succeeded in pressing what he termed 'the crux of what I have travelled here to say.' This was that the prevention of war and 'continuous rise of world organization' depended upon establishing 'a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States of America.'[2]

Hostetler argues that the speech failed in its main contention and the metaphors that undergirded it. Its subsequent fame owed only to a 'particularly memorable metaphor (iron curtain) mentioned only once and that two thirds of the way through the address'.[3] It is true that the nomenclature 'special relationship' both sparked American resistance and failed to gain either political or popular traction in the years immediately following the Fulton speech.[4] However, combining corpus assisted discourse analysis and diplomatic history, we ask in this article whether there is evidence to suggest that the Fulton speech was nevertheless significant, in less immediately obvious ways, in setting contours and expectations of 'special' Anglo-American discussion and interaction?

A note on method

Our approach here is to treat the special relationship as a discursive construct and to map discourse features of the Sinews of Peace speech against media discourse on Anglo-American relations in the early 1950s. We treat discourse as a form of action. This is in accordance with foundational work in Pragmatics, specifically within Speech Act Theory,[5] which conceives of language as performative.

This study combines diplomatic history with Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies (CADS[6]), the latter being defined as the practice of investigating particular discourse types by combining the quantitative rigour of Corpus Linguistics techniques with the social perspective of more traditional approaches to Discourse Analysis, in order to uncover '*non-obvious meaning*, that is, meaning which might not be readily available to naked-eye [perusal]'.[7] The analytic process normally 'funnels'[8] from general to specific: from distributional information (general quantifications and word frequency lists) down progressively closer to the individual texts and consideration of the extra-linguistic context. All corpus analysis relies on the employment of concordancing software[9] that computes statistical information, as well as being the interface between the researcher and the texts. The concordancer assumes its nomenclature from the *concordance*, which is the collection of all the examples containing a target word in the corpus. By juxtaposing vertically a series of fragments of text displaced from their original sequence, one after the other, it renders repetition visible and countable such that the repeated co-occurrence of items emerges. Corpus-based researchers zoom into the text using the concordancer, beginning with individual words, reading vertically through the concordance, and identifying other terms their target word repeatedly co-occurs with. These repeated co-occurrences of word pairs are termed *collocates*. The principle of collocation, fundamental to the understanding of corpus work, revolves around the notion that the meaning of a word is defined by the relationships it establishes

with other words 'which tend to occur in its environment'.[10] For instance, a word may absorb positive or negative evaluative meaning depending upon the words it is repeatedly found in association with, a process known as semantic – or evaluative – prosody.

The last concept (and tool) requiring introduction is keywords. These are the place where the search for patterns of meaning often begins because all Discourse Analysis is intrinsically comparative. A principal means by which to conduct corpus comparisons is keywords analysis: the comparison of the frequent and salient words in two corpora or in two portions of a dataset. A keyword is a word 'whose frequency is unusually high in comparison with some norm'.[11] We identify keywords by comparing two wordlists, the output from which is a new list of words that are characteristic (or rather characteristically different) in the corpus/text we are examining, with reference to another text or corpus.

At the core of CADS research is the corpus, design and compilation of which are an integral part of the research process. The corpus used in this study consists of two elements. First is the text of the Sinews of Peace speech. Second is approximately half a million words of archival and print media records relating to the first three post-war bilateral summit meetings (1950-54) between British Prime Ministers and American Presidents (see Table 1). The corpus architecture was informed by historical knowledge and designed prior to data collection in anticipation of potentially interesting uses. In the case of the summits, this allows for multiple comparisons: origin (UK sub-set vs. US sub-set), sources (newspapers vs. governmental records), individual summits (1950 vs. 1952 vs. 1954), and the timeline of each summit (four weeks before the summit vs. summit period vs. four weeks after the summit). [12]

We previously used the archival and press corpus to reveal how through communicative and coordinative discourses Anglo-American relations were raised from an 'ordinary' to an 'extraordinary' status in response to perceived threats (e.g. security threats) and postwar opportunities (e.g. Cold War international relations). In terms of establishing a common language and ideational framework upon which to base an agreed policy paradigm (the communicative discourse stage), we focussed on the political figure of Winston Churchill given that he articulated the special relationship in his Sinews of Peace speech and is widely held as a key advocate of it thereafter. Regarding the coordinative discourse stage, we focussed on print media coverage of the successive Prime Minister-President summit meetings in 1950, 1952 and 1954. We used summits as work in Diplomacy Studies' scholarship identifies them as the most important emergent diplomatic fora of the Cold War[13] and hence the principal political and media discourse context through which the policy paradigm of a special relationship could be articulated for the public during that period. As for the focus on media, and specifically print media, this was justified by the mediatisation of political communication in general and the onset of that

mediatisation process during the 1950s whereby media moved from mere channels of communication to active players in the political arena.[14]

We began that analysis with two keywords comparisons.[15] First, we compared the wordlists of the newspaper (UK and US press) against the government (UK and US government) sub-corpora. This produced a total of 415 keywords for the press data and 682 for the government data, which were then disambiguated, and examined in detail. Keywords offer a starting point to identify the ways in which the relationship between the UK and the US is referred to. Here we found that the term *special relationship* only occurred five times in the entire corpus and was picked up just once[16] in the press. Keywords were then grouped into semantic domains, meaning that individual key words were classified into lexically coherent areas of meaning, or disambiguated in context and assigned to the relevant semantic area. When comparing British and American data in both the media and government subcorpora, the same semantic domains emerged: Geographical/political entities; Participants; Military; Money and resources; and Interaction (i.e. verbal and mental processes). This revealed the themes central to each country's government and media (press) account of the summits. Throughout the US data they evidenced an obsession with Communism and a preoccupation with money and resources in the US news which was absent in the UK press, but which conversely dominated the UK governmental documents. The semantic categories also helped us identify alternative lexicon of the special relationship, such as *old friendship*. The UK press evinced a strong focus on what we termed a discourse of 'harmony' that foregrounded shared aims and agreement between UK and US. There was also repeated invocation of the common language shared by the two countries. From the US government data emerged a strong focus on *cooperation* and numerous references to collaborative Anglo-American activities. The US press especially focused on summit participants and the communication between them. Herein, key above all was Winston Churchill.[17]

The task at hand now is to map the contents of Churchill's Sinews of Peace speech against the findings outlined above that emerged from the corpus analysis of media records relating to the first three post-war bilateral summit meetings between British Prime Ministers and American Presidents. That previous investigation revealed that although there were no explicit references to the 'special relationship' between the UK and the US by the press, the specialness of the relationship was nevertheless being discursively constructed and reproduced in other ways. The Sinews of Peace speech, where Churchill coined the phrase 'special relationship', also finds relatively little mention in the press corpus. Yet, as we develop below, the themes that dominate Churchill's Fulton address are also pervasive in the news reporting of the 1950, 1952 and 1954 summits. This suggests that Churchill enjoyed a greater degree of success in setting the agenda of discussion than often allowed.

THE SINEWS OF PEACE SPEECH IN THE PRESS

We find 12 explicit mentions of the Fulton speech in press coverage of the summits (mainly in the American press: 10 out of 12 mentions), half of which appear in 1952 and half in 1954. The majority of occurrences (9 mentions) come in the *New York Times*, a newspaper characterised by overt enthusiasm for Winston Churchill. In fact, the references to Fulton are usually accompanied by some expression of praise. The speech is, for example, referred to as *famous* or *notable*. In the *New York Times* we also find the single citation of the official title of the speech, in a very pro-Churchill article:

we may all rejoice that such a high degree of understanding and such a close identity of views were established. Where there is such a basis the details can always be worked out and the future can be faced with confidence. **Mr. Churchill gave a pregnant title to that famous speech of his at Fulton: "The sinews of peace.** "He saw this tough union then in "the fraternal Association of the English-speaking peoples." He - and all of us - seed better today in an extension of that association to the Atlantic community.[18]

There is just one mention of Fulton in the *Washington Post*, a newspaper seemingly less fond of the British Prime Minister. It brings up Fulton only to state that Churchill visited Westminster College in an unofficial capacity and does not discuss the speech at all.

The most salient aspect of the Fulton speech as reminisced by the press is the reference to the *fraternal association* of the *English-speaking* peoples (4 references out of the 12 mentions of the Fulton speech). Perhaps surprisingly, the press refers to a lesser extent to the warning against Communism in Churchill's speech, in particular reporting the fact that after the speech he was criticised for being too anti-Communist (3 references).

Interestingly it is Churchill himself who puts Fulton in the news, both in 1952 and in 1954. During both summits he mentions his 1946 visit to Fulton and his speech. In 1952, for instance, the *New York Times* reports Churchill's toast to the leaders' friendship, which the Prime Minister says was '"born at Potsdam and grew at Fulton"'[19]. Similarly in 1954 Churchill brings up Fulton in an address to Congress on June 29h 1954:

if I had been properly supported in 1919, I think we might have strangled bolshevism in its cradle, but everybody turned up their hands and said "how shocking," and I even remember making a speech at Fulton (Mo.) six years ago it which I didn't get a very warm welcome in the United States because it was a so anti-Russian and anti-Communist, but I am not.[1]

---

[1] Text of Churchill's remarks at the press luncheon in his honor. *New York Times*, 29th June 1954.

In his analysis of the Sinews of Peace speech Hostetler cites 'The instant popularity of the iron curtain metaphor' as the key to its memorable status.[20] Churchill certainly did his best to keep the metaphor current in Cold War discourse. During his 1954 visit to Washington, for instance, he re-invoked it, saying: 'And if we can work together, we may get along or write ourselves, and do a lot to help our neighbors in the world, some of whom, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, seem to face even greater problems than we do ourselves.'[21] Yet here we come to an interesting finding. Our data actually shows that the expression *Iron Curtain* failed to catch in the press reporting of the Anglo-American summit meetings, this despite Britain and the US being at that time the two key western allies in the fight against communism. In the entire dataset we find just 10 mentions of it. In the press corpus we find just 7 references, which is the same as explicit reference to a *fraternal association*. This suggests that the Iron Curtain was perhaps not as instantly pervasive in Cold War international relations discourse as in hindsight it is sometimes perceived to be. Rather, similar to the special relationship, it was a slow-burning concept instead of an overnight sensation or failure. Moreover, for all the relative media neglect of the specific terms coined in the Fulton speech, the core themes of the speech did arise as key semantic categories in the American press' reporting of the Anglo-American summit meetings. The themes of friendship and of Communism, in fact, are the dominant narrative in the US press corpus. The *New York Times*, in particular, fully embraced in its accounts Churchill's appeal to collaboration and his invocation of Anglo-American friendship and kinship.

A CORPUS-ASSISTED MAPPING OF THE SINEWS OF PEACE SPEECH

We set out to read the Fulton speech through the lens of the corpus findings, mapping connections between the vision set out by Churchill at Fulton in 1946 and the ways in which Churchill's later visits to the US and their outcomes were represented by the media in 1952 and 1954. From a corpus linguistics perspective the Fulton speech is too short (approximately 5000 words) to justify or even enable any kind of quantitative analysis. It is nonetheless still possible to make some observations on pervasive patterns. Specifically, rather than dwell upon the rhetorical devices used by Churchill, we seek here to observe recurrent themes, phrases and lexicon in the speech, or as they are termed in corpus linguistics: key semantic areas, key clusters and key words.

Looking at the Sinews of Peace speech through the lens of a concordancer[22] means reading it in an entirely different way from the orthodox horizontal sequential reading. The software produces word frequency lists. In simple terms, it counts all the occurrences of each individual word in the text and then enables us to concordance every word displaying all the instances of a word in the text, displacing them from the original sequence and juxtaposing them vertically. Such a display makes repeated patterns visible and countable.

The wordlist of the Fulton speech (Figure 1) is a typical frequency list: grammar words at the very top, lexical words deeper down the list. It is typical in particular of spoken discourse at large: high frequency of personal pronouns and of modal verbs. In fact if we compare this address with other Churchill addresses the use of grammatical elements that are typical of political speeches is very much the same.

fulton.lst

File	Edit	View	Compute	Settings	Window

N	Word	Freq.	%
1	THE	334	6.86
2	AND	193	3.96
3	OF	191	3.92
4	TO	139	2.85
5	IN	117	2.40
6	IS	72	1.48
7	A	70	1.44
8	I	67	1.38
9	THAT	65	1.33
10	WE	54	1.11
11	ALL	50	1.03
12	IT	49	1.01
13	HAVE	48	0.99
14	WHICH	48	0.99
15	BE	47	0.97
16	ARE	38	0.78
17	NOT	36	0.74
18	FOR	35	0.72
19	OR	34	0.70
20	WITH	34	0.70
21	BY	33	0.68
22	OUR	32	0.66
23	WORLD	31	0.64
24	THIS	30	0.62
25	BUT	29	0.60
26	AT	26	0.53
27	WAR	26	0.53

Figure 1: portion of the wordlist of the Fulton speech as produced by Wordsmith. The second column shows absolute frequencies and the third relative frequencies per hundred words.

The conformity with equivalent texts was tested by comparing the Fulton speech with a further corpus that we compiled, containing a selection (28,000 words) of speeches Churchill gave before and during WW2 and all the words that came up as key (that is words whose frequency in a text is characteristically different from their frequency in another text or corpus) were lexical words, i.e. words that depend on the topic of a text. Key lexical/content words are, as a matter of fact, supposed to tell us the 'aboutness'[23] of a text.

The most frequent content word in the Fulton speech is the word *world*, with 31 occurrences, a third of which appear in the cluster *world organisation*, by which Churchill refers to the *United Nations* (7 occurrences in the text) and which is the most mentioned participant/actor in the text. In terms of 'participants' follow the *United States* (13 occurrences and 12 occurrences of *American*), the British Empire and Commonwealth (16 occurrences of *British*), the USSR (10 references to *Communist*, 7 to *Russian*, 7 to *Soviet* and 6 to *Russia*) and *Europe* (10 occurrences).

There is hardly anything surprising in the fact that these terms are frequent in the speech. However there are a few other lexical items that are key, whose relevance is perhaps less obvious. At this stage we will limit ourselves to roughly grouping them semantically (horizontal lines in table 1), though they will re-emerge in the analysis shortly.

war (26)	*peace* (7)	*freedom* (7)	
power (12)	*strength* (7)	*force* (6)	*strong* (5)
work (7)	*duty* (7)	*action* (6)	*purpose* (5)
dangers (6)	*difficulties* (5)		
together (5)	*temple* (5)	*the English-speaking* (5)	*fraternal association* (4)
future (9)			

Table 1: selection of top lexical/content words in the Fulton speech wordlist

Technically *English-speaking* and *fraternal association* are not words but clusters and together with the expression *strategic concept* (4 occurrences) they are the most repeated clusters in the speech. The expression *the English-speaking world / nations / family or brotherhood / peoples* is also one of the most frequently borrowed of Churchill's soundbites in the reports of the later Anglo-American summit meetings in both the (London) *Times* (16 occurrences) and in the *New York Times* (12).

While the frequencies of these keywords are low in absolute quantitative terms, they are statistically significant relative to the limited size of the dataset. When addressing a small corpus (in this case a relatively short text) from a corpus linguistics perspective, it tends to be most interesting and effective to examine functional words because they are more frequent and they may unveil surprising patterns. As aforementioned, the fact the Fulton speech is not linguistically atypical in terms of grammatical features does not make the usage of frequent elements, such as pronouns and modal verbs, less relevant or interesting.

2.1 CHURCHILL AS *I*

The pronoun *I*, with 67 occurrences is the most frequently used in the speech. This is not surprising since Churchill explicitly and from the onset characterises himself as *private visitor*. He says he has *no official mission or status* and states clearly *I speak only for myself*. What is interesting here is how Churchill uses this 'ordinarisation' to establish an equally personal bond with his audience, both that co-present at Westminster College and beyond.

Churchill opens his address with a joke about Westminster: *The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard it before...* and by means of humour he creates the first 'we' in his speech: *we have both been educated at the same, or similar, or, at any rate **kindred** establishments*. The pronoun *we* (at its first appearance) and the word *kindred* are key, because just a few lines later the 'we' as 'me and you' evoked by Churchill in addressing the College audience is extended to a much wider public: *gives me the opportunity of addressing this **kindred** nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean*. The aim of the entire opening of Churchill's speech thus appears to be the establishment of a firm kinship between himself and the United States of America. Britain is set as a peripheral participant[24]: another addressee of his speech, but, for now, not a part of the 'me and you' group. The word *kindred* comes up yet another time halfway through the speech, once the kinship between Churchill and the US has been extended to Britain and the US and the idea of the *fraternal association* (and of *special relationship*) has been pitched: *Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but **kindred** Systems of society...*

It becomes clear, soon after Churchill's declaration that he speaks only for himself and that *there is nothing here but what you see*, that the benevolence he has captured towards himself as a friend creates a new 'we', and that in reality Churchill as friend, really means Britain as friend. The second time the pronoun 'we' is used in the speech is, in fact, in association with the first mention of the *English-speaking peoples*:

*Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for <u>both our countries</u>. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the <u>English-speaking peoples</u> in peace as they did in war. **We** must, and I believe **we** shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.*

This mechanism of extension of benevolence by contact - friend of Churchill, thus friend of Britain - finds a perfect match in the press reporting of Churchill's later summit meetings with Presidents Truman (1952) and Eisenhower (1954). Interestingly, however, it also applies to the summit between Prime Minister Attlee and Truman in December 1950. For example, Churchill was invoked by the US press as the mastermind behind

this summit and Attlee was signalled as a *friend* of Churchill. On December 7th 1950, the *Washington Post* wrote:

> Attlee not only was careful to get Churchill's support before he left London, but Churchill even advised him on how to force Truman's hand regarding the trip […] Though political opponents, the two men served in the same coalition war cabinet together and are **personal friends**. At one time Attlee was Churchill's deputy Prime Minister and handled British domestic affairs while Churchill was busy with the war. With this background of **friendship**, it is not hard to understand why Attlee should have consulted Churchill or why Churchill advised him that he should take the trip to Washington.[25]

This exemplifies again the personal influence of Winston Churchill and his personal relationship with the American public: a friend of my friend is my friend.

In the reporting of all three meetings Churchill was presented in the American press as a close friend that Americans are fond of and Churchill's words were reported to the effect of establishing and reinforcing that discourse of friendship. This discourse, which will be discussed in further detail in section 2.3, is one of three narratives that dominated press reporting of the summits and the most salient and encompassing one. The others are Churchill as negotiator (i.e. mediator between the USA and the USSR) and Churchill as Britain.[26] These three roles are tightly intertwined. The US press, for example, uses the motif of friendship to steer the focus towards the practical implications of being friends: acting together against foes, namely Communism. Churchill is presented, too, as the embodiment of the best qualities of Britain: the 'British bulldog spirit'. In imposing a metonymic relationship between Churchill and Britain the newspapers once again reinforce the association that being a friend of Churchill equates to being a friend of Britain. The special relationship between the US and Britain is thus being constructed in terms of the kinship between Churchill and America. The connection is a metaphorical journey, as the Prime Minister himself puts it speaking of his physical journey to Washington in June 1954: 'from my fatherland to my mother's land' - a strategic reference to his American-born mother.[27]

2.2 THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IN-GROUP

Churchill models the in-group participants throughout his Sinews of Peace speech: starting from a 'you and I' association when referring to himself and his Fulton audience, then transforming into 'you and I/we' in terms of Churchill and Americans and finally into a collective 'we' in the form of the British Commonwealth and the United States. The progressive construction of this 'we' is discernible by plotting[28] the use of pronouns in the text.

Figure 2 shows how the density of the first person pronoun *I* peaks at the beginning of the text, drops off in the body of the speech and becomes dense once more towards the end. The pattern is even clearer with the referents *my* and *me*. These have a strong presence at the beginning and then fade or disappear. The use of the pronoun *you* follows a similar pattern, with a strong presence at the beginning and then disappearing in the middle before staging a marginal comeback at the end of the speech). In the central part of the address, right after the decline of *I* and *you* we see an intensification of the use of *we* and *our*, which progresses steadily until the end of the text.


Figure 2: dispersion plot of personal pronouns through the Fulton speech.

With regard to how the pronouns are used to build an in-group, we find two strands: the narrative of a common past and the narrative of a common future.

Churchill speaks of the things Britons and Americans share, for example:

> **Our** *two vast but kindred Systems of society*
>
> **our** *traditions*
>
> **our** *way of life*

Referring to the American people and the British people he says: **our** *own people on both sides of the Atlantic*. Tellingly here he speaks of a singular *people* merely separated by an ocean, but nevertheless one and whole (elsewhere in the text he refers to *peoples*).

Then Churchill speaks of a common present that he projects as a common future:

> *Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for both* **our** *countries*

our difficulties

our dangers

our fortunes

our duty / *our* supreme task and duty

our joint care

our path

our common purpose

The phraseology gives a clear representation of shared roots and shared destiny and builds up towards the idea of *the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples* and *the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world*.

The use of the expression *joint inheritance* (a reference to the roots), resonates with another use of the word *joint* in the text: *our joint care*, marking again a correspondence between the past and the future. It is possible that repetition of the word *joint* in these two contexts is casual rather than strategically intended. Nevertheless it is yet another manifestation of the discursive interlocking of the shared history of the two countries (e.g. *our stupendous struggle*) and the call for shared future action (e.g. *the conduct of the English speaking peoples*). The word *future* itself appears 9 times in the Fulton speech, which is noteworthy given that in relative terms it is four and a half time more frequent than in the comparative corpus of speeches Churchill gave before and during WW2.

If we look at the use of *us* in the speech, we encounter further corroboration. The pronoun is mainly used in exhortative constructions:

let *us* make sure

let *us* preach what we practice – let *us* practice what we preach

Do not let *us* take the course of allowing events to drift along

Churchill's message is simple. Either act together, or pay together the consequences:

catastrophe may overwhelm *us* all

reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon *us* all the long reproaches of the after-time

Churchill's call for action is most manifest in the way that he utilises the pronoun *we*. The top collocates of *we* are the modal verbs *must* and *should,* and the collocational pattern works in both directions. In fact, half of the occurrences of *must* and over two thirds of the occurrences of *should* are in association with *we*.

Figure 3: concordance line for *we* co-occurring with deontic pronouns in the Fulton speech.

The deontic modality is aimed at inspiring collective action and legitimises the definition of the 'us-group'. Less certain, though, is whether there is truly an 'us and them' contraposition in Churchill's speech. If we stick to pronouns, just four out of 24 mentions of the pronoun *they* refers to Soviet Russia. Overall there are 13 references to *Russia* or *Russian* and 11 to *Communist* or *Communism*, but when Churchill talks in terms of enemy or threat, what he refers to is more general, vague and looming. The great dangers Churchill speaks of are war and tyranny. Quantitatively speaking, the Sinews of Peace speech is very marginally about the threat of Communism, while it is massively about the common duty of the United States and Britain to act together to prevent war and tyranny and guarantee *safety*, *security*, *freedom*, *democracy*, *welfare* and ultimately *peace*.

> *If there is to be a fraternal association of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilising the foundations of peace. There is the path of wisdom.*

The dominance of Churchill's call to fraternal association is absolute throughout the speech, which makes it somehow baffling that the address is remembered for the 'iron curtain' metaphor rather than for, for example, the much more prominent 'temple of peace' metaphor. This tends to be attributed to the aforementioned 'apparent failure of Churchill's fraternal association proposal'[29] as opposed to the overwhelming success of the iron curtain metaphor. And yet we have already noted that our press corpus data does not support the appeal of the expression *iron curtain* in the newspapers' reports at the time of the Anglo-American summit meetings. This is despite the facts that the American press in the 1950s is

characterised by a strong focus on the Communist threat and that there is a very visible 'Red Scare' obsession in the news headlines. In 1954 the *New York Times*, for example, chooses to stress that Churchill is *violently anti-red* rather than his conciliatory tones when speaking of the USSR during the Anglo-American summits and his urging of a 'parley at the summit' with the Soviets.[30]

American press reporting about the relationship between the US and Britain is intensely centred on the notion of friendship and foregrounds Churchill's anti-Communism to reinforce the idea of an 'unbreakable unity'. The reference to 'unbreakable unity' is in turn a soundbite that the newspapers pick up from another speech Churchill delivered in 1954 (see Figure 3), which is itself an obvious echo of the Sinews of Peace address:

> When great and buoyant communities enjoy free speech in the same language, it is not surprising that they often say different things about the confused and tangled age in which we dwell. But nothing must divide us as we march together along the path of destiny. If the world is to be split in twain we know which side we are on and we believe that our unbreakable unity is the core to the safety and survival and to the freedom and peaceful progress of mankind. As I have several times said, our policy is 'Peace through Strength'. There is nothing contradictory in that. In fact I believe the two are inseparable. [31].

The context of the unbreakable unity evoked in the US press is consistently the defeat of Communism and Churchill's staunch anti-Communism is a ubiquitous feature of the leader's celebration in the press. US newspapers actually overstate and over-simplify Churchill's anti-communist zeal. Nevertheless, that sentiment is used to reinforce the sense of close Anglo-American friendship and the final effect is one of a strengthened togetherness of values and aims, which is exactly what seems to be Churchill's desired effect with the Sinews of Peace speech.

Among the list of key words in Table 1 there was also the word *together* (5 occurrences). In the Fulton speech this appears in the constructions *work together*, *stand together*, *preserve together* and *use* together, and the subjects of the action are always the US and Britain. This pattern finds an overwhelming correspondence in the press reporting of the Anglo-American summit meetings where the vast majority of the 175 occurrences of *together* also appear in association with *work* (Figure 4) and *stand*, or in the construction *joined together* or *together more closely*, and where they also refer to the togetherness of US and Britain.

```
Concordance
      point of view and do all we can to work together for the common cause, trusting
         airport, Churchill said that "if we work together we may get along all right
   ten days. 5. Both countries would work together and with other countries to
          the whole field, so that we can work together easily and intimately at the
          the whole field, so that we can work together easily and intimately at the
  over the whole field so that we can work together easily and intimately at the
            old great Americans should work together for all the things that matter
       and Britain see eye to eye and work together there is still hope for world
             was: "If America and Britain work together there is still hope for world
     to carry out their determination to work together to strengthen the unity which
   Both governments will continue to work together to produce an idea right. The
          Treaty Organization and will work together to improve that machinery and
             5. Similarly, they agreed to work together more closely in the Middle
  to carry out their determination to work together to strengthen the unity which
             5. Similarly, they agreed to work together more closely in the Middle
    he and Franklyn D. Roosevelt worked together in times even more perilous
 two men are old friends, having worked together in World War I, when Mr.
 two men are old friends, having worked together in World War I, when Mr.
     he and Franklyn D. Roosevelt worked together in times even more perilous
       as their common interests in working together to stop the expansion of
     clear that the fact that we are working together and are known to be
       as their common interests in working together to stop the expansion of
                  are talking again and working together as friends and allies should: an
 Nations as new starting point in working together on general policy and on
```

Figure 4: concordance for the lemma WORK co-occurring with *together* in the US press corpus.

'Working together' is but one example of the many ways in which the discourse of unity, togetherness, cooperation and friendship is conveyed by the press. It is also one of the many elements that corroborate the impression that Churchill was in fact extremely successful in setting the agenda he initiated with the Fulton speech.

1.3 OLD FRIENDS

The most widespread pattern that emerged from the data-driven analysis of the 1950s press corpus is the representation of Churchill as a friend. It is on this dominant narrative of personal and intimate friendship that the American press constructs the entire relationship between the United States and Britain. The US newspapers like Churchill; they like him more than the press in the UK does and they like him better than they like Truman. The latter is dismissed by the *New York Times* as merely a *president-by-death*[32] who

constantly needs advice, while Churchill is routinely described as a figure of epic proportions, e.g.: *a prophet that history will not forget*.[33]

Churchill is celebrated in the press for his role in WW2 and for his friendship with President Roosevelt. As he arrives for the 1954 summit meeting in Washington the *New York Times* publishes a two-page spread of photographs of previous Churchill visits, opening with a wartime picture of the Prime Minister and Roosevelt in 1941 and including a picture of Churchill at Fulton in 1946. The article is titled 'THE OLD FRIEND VISITS AGAIN'[34] and it conveys the special relationship between Britain and the US by displaying the special/intimate relationship between Churchill and a sequence of American leaders. Churchill is the archetypal *old friend* (15 occurrences in the US press corpus) and the relationship between the two countries is similarly lexicalised as *old friendship*, *old Anglo-American collaboration*, *old acquaintance*.

> When after a long absence two **old friends** meet, having some difficult business to do, what matters most is not how they do the business but whether still they are friends.[35]

The word *old* is key in the US press and the adjective is a frequent collocate of *Churchill*. It often refers to the Prime Minister's age and, interestingly, in association with Churchill the adjective is imbued with a very positive semantic prosody: *the brave old Prime Minister*, *the old champion*, *the old master*, *the great old man*, *the grand old man*, *the grand old warrior*, *good old Winnie*, *the old strong Churchillian voice*. Beyond the literal old age, any time the word *old* co-occurs with *Churchill* it evokes the old friendship.

The theme of the 'old friends' comes, once again, from Churchill himself. The example below arises in the context of his speaking about the 'temple of peace' – a metaphor conjured no less than five times (as opposed to a mere two mentions of the 'iron curtain') in the Sinews of Peace speech:

> *Workmen from all countries must build that temple. If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old friends, if their families are inter-mingled, and if they have "faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity towards each other's shortcomings"-to quote some good words I read here the other day-why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners?*

Once again there is a parallelism between the way in which Churchill interlocks the shared past that is the old friendship and the shared future at Fulton (i.e. *work together at the common task*) and the way years later Churchill's mission to the US is represented by the press in terms precisely of *old friendship* and *inseparable destinies*. The impression that one gets is of significant correlation between 'the crux' of Churchill's Fulton speech and press reports of the Anglo-American summits. The call for cooperation, both in terms of practical joint action and of more ideal mutual understanding, concentrated in the Fulton speech distils through the

later press coverage that Churchill receives. Ultimately the press ends up circulating the currency if not nomenclature of the special relationship articulated in the Fulton speech and further underwrites it through its embrace of Churchill as the 'old friend'.

Conclusion

In and of itself the Sinews of Peace speech is an outstanding example of performative language, a masterpiece of phraseology, rhetorical scaffolding and memorable metaphor. Its immediate reception, though, was mixed and its impact contingent in part upon its being delivered in the critical interregnum between war and Cold War. As for the historical prominence of the speech, Churchill's authorship is significant. However, more important is that in the quest to make sense of global descent into Cold War, commentators and historians have so frequently in hindsight seized upon the Sinews of Peace and its evocative iron curtain metaphor as a symbol of / shorthand for international change that within and through their narratives the speech has acquired a prophetic and almost mystical status.

It may sound odd but the historical significance of the speech does not necessarily equate to its being a successful speech. This is Hosteler's key critique: its fame owes to one memorable metaphor and this fame has obscured the fact that Churchill's call at Fulton for fraternal association and a special Anglo-American relationship secured little obvious positive response. Neither the US government, nor the American media, nor the American people were at that point willing to cast aside lingering hopes for peace, isolationist traditions and anti-colonial sentiment.

All of this makes it important to look deeper into the historical record to ascertain whether the impression of failure in 'the crux' of the Sinews of Peace speech is justified. It is for this reason that we combined diplomatic history and CADS. And our research suggests that Churchill was indeed more successful through the Sinews of Peace speech in establishing contours and expectations of 'special' Anglo-American discussion and interaction than previously allowed.

It is clear that key themes of Anglo-American kinship, shared responsibility and collaboration developed by Churchill at Fulton were picked up and remediated by the press. There is a discourse continuity between 'the crux' of the Sinews of Peace speech and how the media reported the Anglo-American summit meetings in the early 1950s. At the most obvious level the speech becomes a referent point within that media coverage. Churchill consciously developed this but it also a case that passage of time and the deepening Cold War accorded his words at Fulton a perceived gravitas of wisdom and prescience. Moreover, for journalists writing in the 1950s of Anglo-American relations, Fulton, and Churchill himself, connected the wartime

apogee of the special relationship with the postwar re-gathering of that relationship in the face of communism. The product was to reinforce Churchill's selective narrative of longstanding Anglo-American kinship and collaboration; the estranged interwar years and pre-Great Rapprochement enmity were consigned to the margins, or beyond, of newspaper columns and media memory.

The dominance of the discourse of friendship, both in the 1946 speech and in the press reporting of later visits, suggests that Churchill was well aware of the weight of his personal popularity and masterfully played with it. Mining down into our corpus reveals some of how he did this and just how significant the symbiotic relationship between him and the press was in developing the Anglo-American special relationship. A good example is the 'friend of my friend' construction that enables Churchill to extend his personal standing as a friend of America both to individuals – notably Attlee – and to Britain itself.

Another significant aspect of the Fulton speech for Anglo-American relations, and reflected in later press coverage of the summit meetings, is how Churchill models the in-group participants within his establishment of a collective Anglo-American 'we' identity. Plotting the use of pronouns in the Sinews of Peace speech reveals that he begins with a 'you and I' association when referring to himself and his Fulton audience. He then transforms this into 'you and I/we' in terms of Churchill and Americans and finally moves into a collective 'we' in the form of the British Commonwealth and the United States. The extent of his success in this exercise is reflected in press reporting of the summit meetings, where Churchill is used interchangeably with Britain.

It also becomes apparent from our analysis that Churchill's method of constructing a 'we' fraternal association at Fulton was unusual. As is often the case in identity formation, Churchill wove through his speech a selective reading of history with the objective of making a special relationship appear not only necessary but also 'natural' as it flowed from long-established commonalities in law, language, values and so forth. However, a detailed analysis of the text reveals that Churchill steered clear of 'othering' the Soviets as a 'them' group in order to consolidate his Anglo-American 'we' group. Although he was criticised in some quarters for his allegedly strident anti-communist message at Fulton, in quantitative terms the speech is actually only marginally about the threat of Communism. Instead, the threats he invokes are general ones of war and tyranny. It is these, rather than communism, that are used to define the common duty of the United States and Britain to act together to guarantee *safety*, *security*, *freedom*, *democracy*, *welfare* and ultimately *peace*.

Finally we found an interesting example of the importance of re-mediatisation that arguably constituted a misrepresentation of Churchill's Sinews of Peace speech and subsequent diplomacy at Anglo-American summits but which nevertheless contributed to legitimising and popularising the sense of a special relationship. US media affection for Churchill combined with American anti-communism in the early 1950s to exaggerate the anti-Soviet message at Fulton and produce a selective reporting of his words at the Anglo-American summit meetings such that he appeared to be the archetypal all (American) action hero defending life, liberty and freedom against the communist menace. The reality, of course, was much different. Churchill was a pragmatist and far more willing to parley at the summit with the Soviets than either Truman or Eisenhower. Nevertheless, media construction of Churchill as a long-term stalwart against communism tied Britain to America by association and hence into an emergent special relationship.

---

[1] Richard Toye, *Churchill's Empire: The World That Made Him and the World He Made*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011), 267-68.

[2] Winston Churchill, Sinews of Peace, http://www.winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/235-1946-1963-elder-statesman/120-the-sinews-of-peace

[3] Michael J Hostetler, 'The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric: Churchill's Fulton Address as Great Art and Failed Persuasion', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 83, no.4, (1997), 416-28.

[4] Anna Marchi, Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Steve Marsh, 'Churchill's inter-subjective special relationship: a corpus-assisted discourse approach,' in Alan P.Dobson and Steve Marsh eds, *Churchill and the Special Relationship*, (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

[5] John L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, 1962, J.O. Urmson and Marina Sbisà (eds), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

[6] Alan Partington, 'Corpora and discourse, a most congruous beast', in Alan Partington, John Morley and Louann Haarman (eds), *Corpora and Discourse*, (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004), 11–20.

[7] Alan Partington (ed), *Corpora Special Issue. Modern Diachronic Corpus-Assisted Studies*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), at p. 88.

[8] See Anna Marchi, 'The moral in the story': a diachronic investigation of lexicalised morality in the UK press, *Corpora*, 5, no.2, (2010), 161–190.

[9] For this analysis we used two pieces of concordancing software: *Wordsmith 5.0* and *Sketchengine*. Further details about their application will be provided along with the analysis.

[10] Geoffrey Leech, *Semantics*, (London: Penguin, 1974), at p. 20.

[11] Mike Scott, *WordSmith Tools Manual*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), at p. 53.

[12] For reasons of space limitation, the analysis offered here draws primarily on the press sub-corpus, which includes 482 newspaper articles from one British source (*The Times*) and two American ones (*The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*). The preliminary phase of the research, however, is based on an exploration of the corpus in its entirety and it was the initial keywords analysis of the whole of the data that informed the subsequent research and led to identifying the path to pursue.

[13] David Reynolds, *Summits: Six Meetings that Shaped the Twentieth Century*, (New York: Allen Lane, 2007).

[14] Andrea Umbricht, 'Patterns of news making in Western journalism: A content analysis of newspapers across six Western democracies and five decades', *National Center of Competence in Research Working Papers*, 79, (Swiss National Research Foundation, 2014).

[15] For a description of the process see C. Gabrielatos and Anna Marchi 'Keyness: Appropriate metrics and practical issues'. Talk given at CADS International Conference, 13-14 September 2012. Slides available online at: http://repository.edgehill.ac.uk/4196/.

[16] In a letter to the editor in the *Washington Post*.

[17] Anna Marchi, Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Steve Marsh, 'Churchill's inter-subjective special relationship: a corpus-assisted discourse approach,' in Alan P.Dobson and Steve Marsh eds, *Churchill and the Special Relationship*, (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

[18] '*THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY*', *New York Times*, 11 January 1952.

[19] *New York Times*, 8 January 1952

[20] Hostetler, 'The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric**',** 417**.**

[21] W. H. Lawrence, 'Eisenhower and Churchill confer on European army and atomic data; prime minister appeals for unity,' *New York Times* 26 January 1954.

[22] We used the software Wordsmith Tools 5.

[23] M. Phillips, 'Lexical Structure of Text', *Discourse Analysis Monographs* 12, (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1989).

[24] There are no mentions of *Britain* (*British* or *Britons*) for the first 1/3 of the speech.

[25] Drew Pearson, 'Truman-Attlee likeness cited', *Washington Post*, 7 December 1950.

[26] For details see Anna Marchi et al, 'Churchill's inter-subjective special relationship'.

[27] Chalmers M. Roberts, *Washington Post*, 26 June 1954.

[28] The Plot tool is a feature in the concordancing software which makes it possible to track the dispersion of a term in the text/corpus.

[29] Hostetler, 'The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric', 417.

[30] Klaus Larres, *Churchill's Cold War: The Politics of Personal Diplomacy,* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002).

[31] Extract from Churchill's speech 'Anglo-American Friendship. A Speech at a Dinner of the English-Speaking Union in Honour of General Gruenther, 8 June 1954', from Winston S. Churchill, *The Unwritten Alliance. Speeches 1953-1959*, (Rosetta Books, LLC, 2014).

[32] 'Big Two Meet To Strengthen Ties', *New York Times*, 6 January 1952, p.E1.

[33] 'The old master', *New York Times*, 18 January 1952, p.26.

[34] *New York Times*, 20 June 1954.

[35] Walter Lippman, 'Today and tomorrow', *Washington Post*, 1952.