

2. How would you describe the tone of this speech?
3. When Lincoln delivered the Gettysburg Address, the audience was quite surprised by how short it was: a mere 272 words. Do you think it should have been longer? Why or why not? Notice what he does not mention; for instance, there is no mention of the enemy. Discuss the rhetorical effect of such brevity.
4. Indicate examples of repeated diction. What is the purpose and effect of these repetitions?
5. Identify examples of diction that relate to life and to death. What is the effect of such language?
6. Indicate as many examples of parallel structures, juxtapositions, and antitheses that you can find. Explain their effect.
7. Note the rhetorical shift indicated by “But . . .” in sentence 6. What is its purpose and effect?
8. What is the “great task remaining before us” that Lincoln mentions in sentence 10?
9. In such a short speech, the final sentence is notable for its length (eighty-two words, roughly 30 percent of the total) and complexity. How do the style and rhetoric of the final sentence contribute to the speech as a whole?
10. Considering the importance of the speech, note how ironic it is that Lincoln said, “The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here” (sentence 8). Why do you think this speech has endured?
11. The historian Gary Wills titled his historical and rhetorical analysis of the Gettysburg Address *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America* (1992). That title, and the book as a whole, makes a mighty strong claim about the speech. Do you think that it is a reasonable claim? Drawing on your knowledge of U.S. history, discuss the extent to which Wills’s title accurately characterizes the importance of the speech.
12. Read “The Gettysburg PowerPoint Presentation” by Peter Norvig. It can be found online. What is the object of Norvig’s satire? Do you find it effective? Refer to Lincoln’s speech as well as your own experience with PowerPoint demonstrations to support your answer.

Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid

VIRGINIA WOOLF

A prolific novelist, critic, and essayist, Virginia Woolf (1882–1941) was born in London. Her novels, particularly *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925) and *To the Lighthouse* (1927), are renowned for their penetrating psychological insight. Woolf’s works are noted for the interior monologue, or stream of consciousness. She is also known for her nonfiction, especially for such major works as *The Common Reader* (1925), *A Room of One’s Own* (1929), and *Three Guineas* (1938). Severely

depressed over the war in Europe and anxious about her own sanity, she drowned herself in 1941. Woolf wrote the following essay in 1940 and published it in her *Collected Essays*, Volume Four. It also appears in *The Death of a Moth and Other Essays* (1942).

The Germans were over this house last night and the night before that. Here they are again. It is a queer experience, lying in the dark and listening to the zoom of a hornet, which may at any moment sting you to death. It is a sound that interrupts cool and consecutive thinking about peace. Yet it is a sound—far more than prayers and anthems—that should compel one to think about peace. Unless we can think peace into existence we—not this one body in this one bed but millions of bodies yet to be born—will lie in the same darkness and hear the same death rattle overhead. Let us think what we can do to create the only efficient air-raid shelter while the guns on the hill go pop pop pop and the searchlights finger the clouds and now and then, sometimes close at hand, sometimes far away, a bomb drops.

Up there in the sky young Englishmen and young German men are fighting each other. The defenders are men, the attackers men. Arms are not given to Englishwomen either to fight the enemy or to defend herself. She must lie weaponless tonight. Yet if she believes that the fight going on up in the sky is a fight by the English to protect freedom, by the Germans to destroy freedom, she must fight, so far as she can, on the side of the English. How far can she fight for freedom without firearms? By making arms, or clothes or food. But there is another way of fighting for freedom without arms: we can fight with the mind. We can make ideas that will help the young Englishman who is fighting up in the sky to defeat the enemy.

But to make ideas effective, we must be able to fire them off. We must put them into action. And the hornet in the sky rouses another hornet in the mind. There was one zooming in *The Times* this morning—a woman’s voice saying, “Women have not a word to say in politics.” There is no woman in the Cabinet, nor in any responsible post. All the idea-makers who are in a position to make ideas effective are men. That is a thought that damps thinking, and encourages irresponsibility. Why not bury the head in the pillow, plug the ears, and cease this futile activity of idea-making? Because there are other tables besides officer tables and conference tables. Are we not leaving the young Englishman without a weapon that might be of value to him if we give up private thinking, tea-table thinking, because it seems useless? Are we not stressing our disability because our ability exposes us perhaps to abuse, perhaps to contempt? “I will not cease from mental fight,” Blake wrote. Mental fight means thinking against the current, not with it.

That current flows fast and furious. It issues in a spate of words from the loudspeakers and the politicians. Every day they tell us that we are a free people,

fighting to defend freedom. That is the current that has whirled the young airman up into the sky and keeps him circling there among the clouds. Down here, with a roof to cover us and a gas-mask handy, it is our business to puncture gas-bags and discover seeds of truth. It is not true that we are free. We are both prisoners tonight—he boxed up in his machine with a gun handy; we lying in the dark with a gas-mask handy. If we were free we should be out in the open, dancing, at the play, or sitting at the window talking together. What is it that prevents us? “Hitler!” the loudspeakers cry with one voice. Who is Hitler? What is he? Aggressiveness, tyranny, the insane love of power made manifest, they reply. Destroy that, and you will be free.

The drone of the planes is now like the sawing of a branch overhead. Round and round it goes, sawing and sawing at a branch directly above the house. Another sound begins sawing its way in the brain. “Women of ability”—it was Lady Astor¹ speaking in *The Times* this morning—“are held down because of a subconscious Hitlerism in the hearts of men.” Certainly we are held down. We are equally prisoners tonight—the Englishmen in their planes, the Englishwomen in their beds. But if he stops to think he may be killed; and we too. So let us think for him. Let us try to drag up into consciousness the subconscious Hitlerism that holds us down. It is the desire for aggression; the desire to dominate and enslave. Even in the darkness we can see that made visible. We can see shop windows blazing; and women gazing; painted women; dressed-up women; women with crimson lips and crimson fingernails. They are slaves who are trying to enslave. If we could free ourselves from slavery we should free men from tyranny. Hitlers are bred by slaves.

A bomb drops. All the windows rattle. The anti-aircraft guns are getting active. Up there on the hill under a net tagged with strips of green and brown stuff to imitate the hues of autumn leaves guns are concealed. Now they all fire at once. On the nine o'clock radio we shall be told “Forty-four enemy planes were shot down during the night, ten of them by anti-aircraft fire.” And one of the terms of peace, the loudspeakers say, is to be disarmament. There are to be no more guns, no army, no navy, no air force in the future. No more young men will be trained to fight with arms. That rouses another mind-hornet in the chambers of the brain—another quotation. “To fight against a real enemy, to earn undying honour and glory by shooting total strangers, and to come home with my breast covered with medals and decorations, that was the summit of my hope. . . . It was for this that my whole life so far had been dedicated, my education, training, everything. . . .”

Those were the words of a young Englishman who fought in the last war. In the face of them, do the current thinkers honestly believe that by writing “Disarmament” on a sheet of paper at a conference table they will have done all that

¹Nancy Witcher Astor (1879–1964), Viscountess Astor, first woman to serve in the British House of Commons.—Eds.

is needful? Othello's occupation will be gone; but he will remain Othello.² The young airman up in the sky is driven not only by the voices of loudspeakers; he is driven by voices in-himself—ancient instincts, instincts fostered and cherished by education and tradition. Is he to be blamed for those instincts? Could we switch off the maternal instinct at the command of a table full of politicians? Suppose that imperative among the peace terms was: “Child-bearing is to be restricted to a very small class of specially selected women,” would we submit? Should we not say, “The maternal instinct is a woman's glory. It was for this that my whole life has been dedicated, my education, training, everything. . . .” But if it were necessary, for the sake of humanity, for the peace of the world, that child-bearing should be restricted, the maternal instinct subdued; women would attempt it. Men would help them. They would honour them for their refusal to bear children. They would give them other openings for their creative power. That too must make part of our fight for freedom. We must help the young Englishmen to root out from themselves the love of medals and decorations. We must create more honourable activities for those who try to conquer in themselves their fighting instinct, their subconscious Hitlerism. We must compensate the man for the loss of his gun.

The sound of sawing overhead has increased. All the searchlights are erect. They point at a spot exactly above this roof. At any moment a bomb may fall on this very room. One, two, three, four, five, six . . . the seconds pass. The bomb did not fall. But during those seconds of suspense all thinking stopped. All feeling, save one dull dread, ceased. A nail fixed the whole being to one hard board. The emotion of fear and of hate is therefore sterile, infertile. Directly that fear passes, the mind reaches out and instinctively revives itself by trying to create. Since the room is dark it can create only from memory. It reaches out to the memory of other Augusts—in Bayreuth, listening to Wagner; in Rome, walking over the Campagna; in London. Friends' voices come back. Scraps of poetry return. Each of those thoughts, even in memory, was far more positive, reviving, healing, and creative than the dull dread made of fear and hate. Therefore if we are to compensate the young man for the loss of his glory and of his gun, we must give him access to the creative feelings. We must make happiness. We must free him from the machine. We must bring him out of his prison into the open air. But what is the use of freeing the young Englishman if the young German and the young Italian remain slaves?

The searchlights, wavering across the flat, have picked up the plane now. From this window one can see a little silver insect turning and twisting in the light. The guns go pop pop pop. Then they cease. Probably the raider was brought down behind the hill. One of the pilots landed safe in a field near here the other day. He said to his captors, speaking fairly good English, “How glad I am that the

²Venetian general, title character in *Othello* by William Shakespeare.—Eds.

fight is over!" Then an Englishman gave him a cigarette, and an Englishwoman made him a cup of tea. That would seem to show that if you can free the man from the machine, the seed does not fall upon altogether stony ground. The seed may be fertile.

At last all the guns have stopped firing. All the searchlights have been extinguished. The natural darkness of a summer's night returns. The innocent sounds of the country are heard again. An apple thuds to the ground. An owl hoots, winging its way from tree to tree. And some half-forgotten words of an old English writer come to mind: "The huntsmen are up in America. . . ."³ Let us send these fragmentary notes to the huntsmen who are up in America, to the men and women whose sleep has not yet been broken by machine-gun fire, and in the belief that they will rethink them generously and charitably, perhaps shape them into something serviceable. And now, in the shadowed half of the world, to sleep.

Exploring the Text

1. What is the effect of beginning the essay in the first-person plural, present tense?
2. In paragraph 2, what kind of fighting does Virginia Woolf call on women to do?
3. How do the hornet metaphor (para. 3) and the sawing simile (para. 5) serve Woolf's purpose as she argues for women to fight against the war?
4. Woolf includes a quotation from the *Times* in paragraph 3 and offers examples to support its validity. How would the change in women's social and political status in England since 1940 affect Woolf's thesis today?
5. In paragraph 5, Woolf writes, "Hitlers are bred by slaves." How can such a paradoxical statement be accurate? What is the effect of following that short sentence with the abrupt three-word sentence in paragraph 6?
6. What are the purpose and effect of the rhetorical questions in paragraph 7? Woolf concludes paragraph 7 with the aphoristic statement "We must compensate the man for the loss of his gun." What does she mean?
7. In paragraph 8, Woolf refers to "this roof" and "this very room" and counts the seconds. What is the effect of such details?
8. What is Woolf's attitude toward war and peace as revealed in the last two paragraphs? How does Woolf try to appeal to Americans?
9. Woolf writes of the English fighters. Does her essay speak to the American fighters as well? And even to the German fighters?
10. Explain whether you believe that Woolf's suggestions about the relationship between gender and warfare, between gender and aggression, are still relevant.

³"The huntsmen are up in America, and they are already past their first sleep in Persia."—Sir Thomas Browne (1605–1682), from "The Garden of Cyrus."—Eds.

The Destruction of Culture

CHRIS HEDGES

Educated at Colgate University and at the Harvard Divinity School, Chris Hedges (b. 1956) has worked as a foreign correspondent for over two decades, witnessing wars in the Balkans, Central America, and the Middle East. In 2002, he shared the Pulitzer Prize for coverage of global terrorism. His most recent books include *The World as It Is* (2011) and *Death of the Liberal Class* (2011). The selection included here is taken from the chapter entitled "The Destruction of Culture" in his book *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning* (2002). Referring to the book, General Wesley K. Clark—former NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe—says, "War is a culture of its own, [Hedges] warns, and it can undercut and ultimately destroy the civil societies that engage in it."

The first casualty when war comes is truth.

—SENATOR HIRAM JOHNSON, 1917

In wartime the state seeks to destroy its own culture. It is only when this destruction has been completed that the state can begin to exterminate the culture of its opponents. In times of conflict authentic culture is subversive. As the cause championed by the state comes to define national identity, as the myth of war entices a nation to glory and sacrifice, those who question the value of the cause and the veracity of the myths are branded internal enemies.

Art takes on a whole new significance in wartime. War and the nationalist myth that fuels it are the purveyors of low culture—folklore, quasi-historical dramas, kitsch, sentimental doggerel, and theater and film that portray the glory of soldiers in past wars or current wars dying nobly for the homeland. This is why so little of what moves us during wartime has any currency once war is over. The songs, books, poems, and films that arouse us in war are awkward and embarrassing when the conflict ends, useful only to summon up the nostalgia of war's comradeship.

States at war silence their own authentic and humane culture. When this destruction is well advanced they find the lack of critical and moral restraint useful in the campaign to exterminate the culture of their opponents. By destroying authentic culture—that which allows us to question and examine ourselves and our society—the state erodes the moral fabric. It is replaced with a warped version of reality. The enemy is dehumanized; the universe starkly divided between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. The cause is celebrated, often in overt religious forms, as a manifestation of divine or historical will. All is dedicated to promoting and glorifying the myth, the nation, the cause.

The works of the writers in Serbia, such as Danilo Kis and Milovan Djilas, were mostly unavailable during the war. It remains hard even now to find their