

Author's note

Due to the extent limitations expected from this work, it was impossible to keep the topic submission exactly as planned. There are many subjects regarding patriotism, but dividing the topic according to different politically-oriented views or groups of people would be too complex. Similarly, it was impossible to cover the analysis of other literary works, apart from *The Lion and the Unicorn*, not mentioning that the modern literary novels connected to patriotism can be considered merely as popular literature. Therefore, one of the speeches of the current Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Gordon Brown, was found as far more appropriate and worth analysing example. This was discussed and agreed both by the Supervisor of this Bachelor Paper and the Head of Department of English and American Studies.

1 INTRODUCTION

It is vital to understand the concepts of nationhood and identity in order to understand the British history and in order to find out how relevant they are in the history of modern Britain. Similarly, studying the British experience and history is important from the perspective of contemporary Britain, which has evolved as a multi-national state. After examining the multinational and multi-cultural character of modern Britain, it is crucial to find out how the competing internal nationalism and multiple identities have affected the British society. The British state and Britishness have been under threat recently especially due to renewed calls for devolution and separation internally, and externally due to facing the dilemma connected to the European Union. Even though it may seem like symbols of British nation are being contempted and damned nowadays, the British might consider them absurd, foolish or obsolete, patriotism will always stay, more or less deeply, in their minds, as it always used to be there in the past. Its strength is influenced by many factors, sometimes it can even lead to nationalism or extreme right wing movements and that is the reason for analysing its basis in order to find out, what makes it important for certain groups of people. For the purpose of this paper, it is necessary to clarify the basic terms and definitions of patriotism from different points of view, while the understanding and perceiving the usage of the terms „English“ versus „British“ by various groups of people will be specified as well. As regards the foundations of patriotism, which are necessary to take

into account, the aspects will be analysed in the historical point of view as the current situation depends on historic events. The paper will also try to discover why some forms of patriotism will always stay in mind of an individual, even though he/she may feel careless about the nation, finally trying to prove that the British patriotism has not disappeared with high degree of immigration in recent decades. Typical English behaviour and some of the symbols will be described and analysed regarding George Orwell's essay *The Lion and the Unicorn*, leading to characterization of British society between the two World Wars. Finally, it is crucial to find out what the current form of patriotism and Britishness is based on and why is it still called for, remembering the points made in the analysis of history and the situation between the World Wars as expressed by Orwell.

To start with the definitions, as defined in Macmillan Dictionary, a patriot in the most elementary sense is „someone who has strong feelings of love, respect, and duty towards their country.“ Basically, the term patriotism is derived from Latin word *patria* meaning fatherland, while further definition covers the „loyalty that all citizens owe to their country or nation,“ possibly placed ahead of personal interest and of various intensity. However, the term has a specific history, with political implications, as patriotism has generally tended to shift from a left-wing to a right-wing cause. Recently, it has shifted even further to the right, as some movements in various countries tend to equate the label patriot with white supremacy. (answers.com) On the other hand, as Rossi claims, the concept of patriotism has a varied history, which is traced since the 16th century in the Oxford English Dictionary, where the modern meaning of patriotism is characterized as „excessive love of one's country combined with hatred of other nations and people.“ (Rossi)

Patriotism can take different forms, which are described by Dobrée as „an intense attachment to... the countryside you inhabit,“ or „the triumph of you tribe,“ and further notes that „the emotion of patriotism can be nourished by a sense of the past, or again by a vision of the future.“ (Griffin:3) Nevertheless, patriotism does not necessarily have to be that innocent feeling of loving one's own country since the childhood. Emma Goldman is dubious about patriotism being defined as the love of one's birthplace, the place of childhood's recollections, hopes, dreams and aspirations, reformulating it as the love for the spot representing dear and precious recollections of a

happy, joyous, and playful childhood. That according to her means that: „Patriotism assumes that our globe is divided into little spots, each one surrounded by an iron gate. Those who have had the fortune of being born on some particular spot, consider themselves better, nobler, grander, more intelligent than the living beings inhabiting any other spot.“ Therefore, this can be interpreted as the reason for conceit, arrogance and egotism being the essentials of patriotism. (133)

Similarly, Rossi points out that Orwell was aware of the dangers of romanticizing patriotism. (Rossi) In his *Notes on Nationalism*, Orwell emphasizes that nationalism should not be confused with patriotism and states:

By „patriotism“ I mean devotion to a particular place and a particular way of life, which one believes to be the best in the world but has now wish to force upon other people. Patriotism is of its nature defensive, both militarily and culturally. Nationalism, on the other hand, is inseparable from the desire of power.“ (1945:1)

Nevertheless, Britain can never reach the racial-purity type of nationalism. Wingfield-Stratford confirms this by emphasizing that especially in the most easily accessible part of the islands the conditions are set for a thoroughly rich mixture of blood. (1939:5)

From the definitions mentioned above, it can be seen that patriotism is one of those things that one can never precisely define, even though everyone has some rough notion of its meaning, probably no-one has ever grasped its full meaning. Provisionally for the purpose of this paper, it can be described as the love that people bear for their country, obviously depending on the infinity and power of love. However, as for the love of a country, it is not always easy to tell the point at which treason ends and patriotism begins.

To speak of patriotism as the love of a person for his/her country, according to Wingfield-Stratford, it should be separated into its two main elements of an emotion, the purest of which our nature is capable, and its object, which next to God, is the utmost to which it can aspire. He says: „For patriotism is the highest form of love for a created person, and he that would be a patriot must thus think of his country.“ Nevertheless, it can be generally agreed that the nation to which we belong is not the sum of its living citizens, but includes the living and the dead and those who are yet to be. (1913:XVIII)

Every following generation creates a common heritage of the country. Everyone is an element of certain continuity and without realising it, we derive benefits from or pay for the mistakes of others, on the individual, as well as national level. Practically,

we are fellow-citizens of former kings ruling our country, as well as of current prime ministers. Thus, all these relations form the personality of a country and it must be taken into consideration that our lives consist of countless other lives influencing us, which is the basis of patriotism.

This is further supported by Wingfield-Stratford by saying: „We find that wherever men have been gathered together, some effort has been made to register the fact that a nation, or tribe, does not consist only of its living members.“ (1913:XIX) As regards the tribe, this fact can be explicitly proved by worshipping the ancestors. A tribesman, who believes in the power of his ancestors, the heroes of the tribe, thinks that his luck is directed by their will and therefore has somebody to worship, to pray to and to sacrifice for, which is wiser than a rationalist claiming that we should only care about the present and the future, not the dead who have nothing more to tell us. After all, the loyalty to a worshipped person is usually transferred to the whole community and does not concern only the dead, it may happen that even the living leaders are worshipped as gods.

Thus, it might be considered vacant to break the whole into pieces, and conquering a land to alter, reform and reorganize everything original with its own tradition and distinctiveness would be senseless. Wingfield-Stratford sees this as the absurdity of stealing a bronze statue and melting it afterwards. He also speculates about the sense of conquering, which should be recovering, reviving the country and culture without breaking the traditions as well as preserving and developing the distinctive features of every area, province, village or hamlet. (1913:XXXIX - XL)

Formerly, there was a tendency to unite the separated and individual loyalties of English people into a national patriotism in its original meaning. Since that time, England grew into Great Britain and, moreover, into the British Empire and nowadays there are uncompromising and narrow patriots, who think that by extending the bounds, England must necessarily lose its personality. Such as human life is influenced by many generations, also the personality of a country takes many generations to create. There might be some indications leading to patriotism but the nation does not have to be quite prepared and ripe for that. Human mind is constituted in such a way that any major real alteration in the attitude or opinions is never sudden.

Wingfield-Stratford illustrates this on the example of a soldier, who, on the theoretical basis of long-term training, is subconsciously obedient and co-operative in stress and physical exhaustion due to extreme conditions of war and that is the essence of victory. Even in the field of arts, theoretical knowledge is essential for the talented, gifted beginner as well as it would be naïve to think that our sins could be redeemed after *one-hour hysteria*. Therefore, the whole Middle Ages must be considered to be a period of preparation, when all the obstructions had to be diminished but the seeds of patriotism were sowed, and it took more than Magna Carta and Cressy to plant patriotism in the British nation definitely. (1913:3)

After some basic explanations of the term *patriotism* and mentioning that the different points of view on it may include its negative, arrogant, or even nationalist meaning, it was explained that, sometimes, the terms *patriotism and nationalism* are wrongly used interchangeably. Consequently, it was agreed that the meaning of the term *patriotism* used in this paper is the elementary sense of love that people bear for their country, while noting that some form of such love is rooted in every citizen born in particular country of some culture and history, which he deliberately starts to belong to. It was also remarked that conquering a land does not usually mean altering everything, as it is impossible to change the national history, which is shared by its members. Therefore, this history is necessary to maintain as well as to point out its features that make the basis for patriotism, which is present in the modern times, and that will be the task of the following chapter.

2 THE FOUNDATIONS OF PATRIOTISM IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

This historical summary aims to find some of the features and present some of the events that led to calling for patriotism and, to some extent, lead to patriotism in modern times as well. For the purpose of this paper, the object is not to name and introduce all the people who loved their native land, not even the most important ones, as in the majority of cases, they did not influence the country as much as they were influenced and inspired by it. The historical events may help to find and understand the features that change the country and influence the people to feel patriotic. Many writers showed this inspiration in literature but only few were able to influence the whole country, and for many generations. Therefore, as far as the aim of this paper is

concerned, it is not particularly important how patriotism is expressed in literature but how it is expressed overall in order to achieve some national success. The magic of changing the historical events is usually the device of politically interested people, although the spirit of the nation is reflected in literature as well, more importantly, it penetrates the world of politics and action, which Wingfield-Stratford proves by saying that „it is the spirit that makes nations great.“ (1913:613)

2.1 Patriotism in the Anglo-Saxon Period

To track patriotism to the Anglo-Saxon period before the Conquest is quite difficult but it is possible to identify some hints. It is obvious that people were capable of high degree of loyalty, as one of its deeply patriotic kings found England in Alfred, the warrior, scholar and Christian, undoubtedly loved his country with all his heart, mind and soul. Alternatively, William of Malmesbury, a renowned chronicler, describes how Asser used to urge and reproach bishops, earls and eminent people for their lack of attention directed towards the public and, concerning those who died on Senlac Hill, he claims: „They were few in number but very brave, and throwing aside all regard for their own safety, laid down their lives for their country.“ He further notes that Normans, who were polite and enthusiastic about religion as well as battle, naturally felt contempt for comparatively low-minded and vulgar Saxons with disgusting habits. The situation did not change much at the time of Conquest, all the education was neglected, and the chronicler comments this as follows: „a person who understood grammar was a source of wonder and amusement“. (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:4)

However, Saxon patriotism was unstable as the country was not united. The peace in little kingdoms of Heptarchy was often intruded by civic disorder and turmoils, which even led to regicide in Northumbria. Imposing personalities and excellent leaders such as Alfred or Edgar could make an illusion of unity but, at the same time, they were frustrated by the passivity and indifference of their people. Therefore, this period cannot be called patriotic to all intents and purposes.

2.2 The State of Patriotism in Consequence of the Conquest

The Danish invasions did not make the country to unite, nor did it happen when invaded by Normans. Although there was some determination, unity, foresight and a

brave leader on one hand, he fought with disloyalty and lukewarmness of public on the other. If the English fleet had been able to defend on sea, William would have never landed, if the army had been waiting on the coast, guarding and ready to fight, he would never have got across Senlac Hill. Even though Alfred was conceited of the fleet, it was defeated as well as the army because two earls from the North refused to follow Harold. So his tactical and strategic skills came to naught and the only thing people could do for their country was to die in its name. Shortly, England of Harold did not merit to be called a nation, though the germs of nationality were noticeable. This was explicitly remarked by Bishop Stubbs: „Self-reliance in great and small alike without self-restraint, without the power of combination, with a national pride and yet no national spirit, laid England an easy, though unwilling, prey at the feet of the Conqueror.“ (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:7)

The Norman invasion, therefore, might seem to dispel all the possible glimmering of patriotism. The Conquest tended to kill patriotism both in the invaders and the conquered. By seizing the land and impounding castles, William oppressed the debased, nevertheless, Normans never intended to become English such as their ancestors became French due to their long-lasting scornfulness against the English. Still, as the Conqueror established tenure by knight service, the Conquest was responsible for the introduction of feudalism, which affects patriotism adversely.

2.3 Patriotism at the End of the Middle Ages

Patriotism is never something what a nation has or has not, as the emotions about patriotism are never the same. Though, it can be taken for granted that patriotism never increases with the same, smooth and uninterrupted pace. Formerly, the patriotism used to be in its early days yet, but with the reign of the first three Edwards, England started to bear fruits such as Cressy and parliamentary government. King Edward I can be seen as the first patriot king since the times of Conquest, especially due to his efforts to unite the whole island and to remove the unwanted alliance between France and Scotland. In the case of Cressy, final success of England was owed to the mix of races due to the contribution of Norman, Saxon and Celtic skills and to the well-organized tactics, which the French were not able to adopt. England was prepared for further military success, especially thanks to Edward III, who discovered the advantage of

employing a national army, which led to remarkable fighting versatility of its men and, consequently, affected the spirit of the nation. Although the degree of personal loyalty was not that high during this time, it was actually the first blossoming period of patriotism, which is proved by the patriotic literature of the time. The fact that the nation was welded together from the social point of view can be seen, for instance, in the works of Chaucer.

After the battle of Agincourt, when Henry V due to his decisive victory passed into the English legend as a type of an ideal patriot, „the flame of patriotism raised to fever-heat,“ as Wingfield-Stratford further declares. Nevertheless, after his death a period of dissension and treason came. His 9months-old son succeeded, so the governance passed into the hands of magnates, who hated one another worse than the enemy. The army had no support and declined and later it became just a gang of cruel pirates and robbers. The conquered towns and districts were sick of the English cruelty and gathered their forces and declared against England. The English sea power decayed and the navy of Henry V was sold, so that his debts could be paid. The horror of civil war was coming and patriotism of this period was weak and faint. It was a season of desolation, the dark night of the nation´s soul. The spirit of the nation was not killed, it was only necessary for it to go through the discipline of blood and shame in order to gain victories more renowned than those under the greatest of medieval kings.

2.4 The Tudor Dynasty, its Triumph and Fall

The Lancastrian regime left England thoroughly undisciplined; it actually turned to the stage as it was before the Conquest in a way. Literature was in a parlous state, as its brightness glows or is quenched with the spirit of nations. The spirit of anarchy was abroad, therefore a strong government was needed. As Wingfield-Stratford notes: „To the eye of a patriot, no prospect could have been much more disheartening than that of his country after the civil war.“ Consequently, the wars of roses, their treachery, cruelty, and absolute lack of patriotism or any other ideal had marked the conduct of the principles but Wingfield-Stratford further mentions: „It is a peculiarity of England that she has, in more than one field, contrived to combine liberty and order in a away that might justly be the envy of other nations.“ Nevertheless, England was at that time able to satisfy her need for strong government without detracting from the liberties.

After the useful, although not very refreshing reign of Henry VII, the country was ripe for a patriotic revival. As he was very good at business and paid much attention to commerce, the country was prosperous from a material point of view, despite the epidemic of sweating sickness, a mysterious and highly virulent disease. Similarly, England was very ripe for revival during the early Tudor period concerning the literary point of view. But even though the early triumphs of Henry VIII did not last long, the nation was pleased with anything to disturb its emptiness. (1913:123)

2.4.1 The Rise of Nationalism in Consequence of the English Reformation

It can be considered as the best for the national spirit when a country make something, which is unique worldwide, like its own Church. There were favourable circumstances for patriotism at the time of English Reformation, which is best expressed by Wingfield-Stratford as follows:

The more prominent of the Anglican Reformers had transferred their allegiance wholeheartedly from a Roman Bishop to an English King, and the national impetus of the revolt could not fail to make them identify the cause of their country with that of the supreme head of the English Church and nation. (1913:144)

According to Wingfield-Stratford, the first document where the theory of patriotism was laid down and discussed was Thomas Becon's *The Policy of War*, opened by saying: „The love of our country must needs be great, seeing the grave, prudent, sage, and wise governors of the public weal heretofore in all their acts sought nothing much as the prosperity and wealth thereof.“ Further he cries: „It doeth me good, yea, it maketh me seriously to rejoice even at my very heart to see how glad my countrymen are to serve the commodities of this my country—England.“ (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:145)

Becon, one of the Fathers of the English Church, further describes the miserable state of the world, without conditioning his love for his own portion of it. His conception of patriotism represents the highest standpoint to which any Englishman had attained up to his time. His passionate love of England is purified by his sense that England must not be only loved, but lovable. He celebrates King Henry for the way in which he has fulfilled his duty as a patriot king by saying: „What kingdom in the world is to be compared unto this our English Empire? How hath our most puissant and redoubted King fortified this his most flourishing monarchy, empire, and kingdom

with all things any man can invent for the prosperous conservation of a commonweal!“
(Wingfield-Stratford,1913:146)

His *Policy of War* does not confine itself to military matters; Bacon tried to explain that the ability of a country to win is determined not only by its military but also by its social fitness. In his words it can be seen that the second quarter of the sixteenth century saw the rise of nationalism, as his celebration of England goes even further:

O England, England, my own native country, for whose wealth and prosperity I do not only shed my prayers, but also salt tears, continually to the Lord our God, and am ready, at every hour willingly to sustain any burden that can be laid on my shoulders for thy safeguard! (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:148)

Nevertheless, after the death of Henry VIII, England had troubled and bitter periods, when the Reformation had a little chance of getting any grasp of the nation. Then came the reign of his second daughter, Catholic Queen Mary and the five years of her reign taught Englishmen, what papal supremacy meant, which was utterly distasteful to the nation. After the experience of Tudor discipline, it did not seem probable that the succeeding Queen Elizabeth would have a united nation at her back and England needed time to recover from its depression to gather strength again and to develop and foster patriotism.

At the last stage of Queen Elizabeth's reign there was an outburst of patriotism as intense and glorious as nothing recorded in history. There was the ideal of Drake for his countrymen, the dark days were at the end and the time of glory came as the bravery of the English men and the heroism of their leaders were displayed. According to Wingfield-Stratford, the achievements of Elizabeth's last years were splendid, almost miraculous. The nation underwent a spiritual development, which reflects in the literature of that time with the works of Shakespeare as a typical example of the Elizabethan patriotism. Shakespeare's patriotism is catholic and unique, inconceivable a decade before his time and almost forgotten twenty years after his death. His ripest experience on the subject of patriotism is embodied in his Roman trilogy, as Wingfield-Stratford believes:

In the English series he had declared, once and for all, his allegiance to the national ideal, and in the character of Henry V he had shown how the crown of heroism sits fairest on those who serve the motherland. In the Roman plays this is taken for granted, and we learn how hard it is even for a hero to serve his country truly. (1913:264)

However, it characterizes the British history that each period of spiritual energy and national activity has been followed by a corresponding reaction. It happened after

the patriotic revival of the fourteenth century, after the Seven Years' War, and after Waterloo as well. The cause of this rhythm of energy and decline lies in the lives of people being a creative activity. Taking Elizabethan England into account, one must consider that it took the Counter-Reformation circumstances and the fearful experience of Queen Mary's reign until Elizabeth's triumph over the Spanish Armada and the great energy of her last years finally came. Elizabeth inherited the system of her father and was not only the Queen, but the spiritual mother of her people. As proved by Courtauld, she said to her troops at Tilbury: „I know I have the body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a King, and a King of England too!“ (22) However, the careers of the greatest Elizabethans were marked by indiscipline and so were actually all the classes, which was partly connected to the state of the Church. The majority of pastors were illiterate and apathetic, therefore the sermons could not be inspiring, which led to little control over the people together with the fact that the Roman system had been rooted out, which resulted in the state of moral anarchy. The system of Tudors had done glorious work but its very success had diminished the need for it. Its task was accomplished, hence the touch with the spirit of nation began to gradually decrease.

With the reign of James I of England, the patriotic spirit of the Elizabethans grows cold and the literary decay comes again as well. At this time, the main stream of national thought and art had its foundation in the Puritan gentry and the middle class, the class which was to produce a Milton and a Cromwell. (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:296)

After the Tudor system the nation was learning to look for leadership elsewhere than to the throne. While Henry VIII and Elizabeth had been in touch with their people, Charles and James were just the opposite. A fatal opposition was set up between the Court on the one hand and the nation on the other, similarly, the relations between the King and Parliament were changed fatally upon Charles's accession as well. His system was spiritually bankrupt, and in war it is spirit and not strategy that wins after all. He was unable to provide leaders and, finally, it was his faint patriotism that made it impossible for him to recover the loyalty of his people.

2.5 The Consequence of the Commonwealth on Patriotism

To explain the situation in the times of the English Commonwealth, it is necessary to point out that the King was executed in consequence of the rebellion, chiefly a middle-class movement, and the first task of the army was to subdue the whole of the United Kingdom. Both the Scots and the Irish were regarded as inferior races at the time and when the first real English conquest of Scotland was completed, the English Puritanism was able to stand by itself. Although the Commonwealth did not last long, the important change in the character of the nation had been accomplished. The nation gained temperament and the old indiscipline was the problem of the past and, together with its patience of subordination and the ability for command, the necessary power was built and ready to defeat Louis XIV and Napoleon.

Wingfield-Stratford emphasizes the influence of the two most noticeable patriotic characters of this period, that of John Milton and Oliver Cromwell. Milton's patriotism is at its best in his Pamphlet of Reformation (1641), where it shows to be part of his religion with warning to everyone standing in its way. Although as intense, it was fundamentally different from Shakespeare's patriotism, who loved the land because of its beauty, strength, majesty, invincibility and souls. Similarly, Cromwell could see no difference between patriotism and religion. His traditional boast: „I will make the name of Englishman as dreaded as that of Roman,“ usually ran through his speeches but one of his last shows his sincerity the most:

„I am persuaded that you are all, I apprehend that you are all, honest and worthy good men; and that there is not a man of you would not desire to be found a good patriot. I know you would! But we are apt to boast sometimes that we are Englishmen; and truly it is no shame for us that we are Englishmen, but it is a motive for us to do like Englishmen, and to seek the real good of this nation and the interest of it.“ (1649:368)

Though Milton and Cromwell were aiming at substantially the same objects, the first idea before the poet's mind was figured as liberty, that before the Protector's was to forward the work of Reformation. Milton's point of view has much in common with that of another patriot, the republican, Algernon Sidney, whose book on Government is a plea for liberty bound up with patriotism and the prosperity of nations.

The Puritan discipline was necessary, indeed, but it was not quite welcomed by the public. At the beginning of the Restoration, King Charles II could enjoy his reign with the loyalty of the whole nation finding that people became devoted to monarchy

again. The prime object of their passionate devotion was surprisingly King Charles I, who had been so cold and unsympathetic during his life but after his death became an icon and a potent stimulus to loyalty. Nevertheless, the new King and his brother were Frenchmen, with foreign sympathies and a foreign religion, hence his lack of patriotism was obvious. This is supported by Wingfield-Stratford, who emphasizes that the word patriotism had no meaning for Charles, because he was not, and did not feel, as an Englishman. (1913:387-405)

Nevertheless, during his reign the nation became so irritated that it led them to a wild and insane outburst of wrath and panic. The whole nation, from the highest to the lowest, became obsessed by the idea of a diabolical plot with the object of murdering King Charles and replacing him with his brother James. This episode of the Popish Plot was, in fact, the wildest and most grotesque outburst of patriotism ever known, which is described by Wingfield-Stratford as: „For there had been brewing a Popish plot of the most sinister description, and the King himself had been among the chief conspirators.“ However, in a short period of time, patriotism seemed to disappear for a while again, as there was another feature of materialism; an obstruction, which tends to prefer the brain or rational faculty to the emotions and the soul. (1913:409-410)

Following the Peace of Utrecht and the accession of a German King George I, a long period of peace came but with little inspiration shown in politics, literature or society. According to Wingfield-Stratford, the early eighteenth century was a depressing chapter in the British history and the darkest period of the British Prose Age, however the idea of patriotism becomes almost without a rival in England. (1913:473) Consequently, the turn of the century starts to offer more authors or politicians rather than monarchs, who are of higher importance in relation to patriotism. For instance, Joseph Addison states his conception of patriotism in a prose essay published in the *Freeholder*, by showing that patriotism has too often been „cynically depreciated for selfish or party reasons and that it is a virtue instinctive in the most barbarous as well as the most civilized peoples.“ (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:461)

While Drake and Cromwell can be taken as heroes of the poetic times, Sir Robert Walpole, the first „Prime“ Minister, can be considered the hero of the prose age. Although his principles were not admirable, his good sense, stability of purpose and hatred of fraud and hypocrisy were the basis of his character, which made him fit to

dominate his age. He was a man of compromise, a man that England was demanding. Furthermore, it can be suggested that there has never been a man more intensely and narrowly patriotic than Dr. Samuel Johnson. Wingfield-Stratford highlights the personality of a man who once half seriously said that all foreigners were fools and that „patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.“ (Wisdomquotes) In one of his works Dr. Johnson defines a patriot as one „whose public conduct is regulated by one single motive – the love of his country,“ and further adds: „He that wishes to see his country robbed of its rights cannot be a patriot.“ (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:504)

To name some important characters from the eighteenth century among the important politicians, Viscount Bolingbroke maintained the spirit of patriotism, for instance, by saying: „Patriotism must be founded on great principles and supported by great virtue,“ while William Pitt the Elder showed how intimately patriotism and religion were connected in his mind by declaring: „If all soils are alike to the brave and virtuous, so may all churches and modes of worship: that is all will be equally neglected and violated. Instead of every soil being his country, he will have no one for his country; he will be the forlorn outcast of mankind.“ (Wingfield-Stratford,1913:547) Pitt’s love for England purified and deepened as his character developed, and his religion matured, and also Wingfield-Stratford further notices that Pitt’s patriotism was blended with a passionate love of liberty in the abstract, in which he approached near to Bolingbroke. According to Bolingbroke, the word patriotism denoted less to a person who sustains the glory of his country abroad than to one who preserves her liberties at home. Such influences, working in favour of a patriotism founded upon freedom, actually characterized the eighteenth century and resulted in the fact that blending of conceptions of liberty and patriotism was sometimes tending to produce a less offensively insular attitude than had been common among English patriots. (1913:573)

Finally, it would be wrong to forget an influential and inspiring personality of William Blake, whose love for his native land was so intense that every part of it was sacred to him, and he even goes much further than Shakespeare. However, Blake’s passionate love of freedom was not in conflict with his love of England and he thinks and writes in terms of patriotism, while his mind, like that of the Elizabethans, is constantly engaged with the real and legendary history of England.

2.6 Understanding the Interconnection of Patriotism and Liberty in Modern Times

Although patriotism and liberty showed to be interconnected already in the seventeenth century, it is necessary to point out that in modern times this can be understood quite differently. There are not only the high costs for militarism and „defending“ armies that go along with the modern patriotism, people are also urged to be patriotic and their children are sacrificed to that as well. In the case that patriotism requires allegiance to the flag, for instance, it means obedience, which is obviously in contrast with liberty.

According to Goldman, children are often infected with a thought that other nations are wicked and, when they reach the adulthood, they can be thoroughly convinced that the Lord chose them to defend their country against the attack or invasion of foreigners. (133) This can be the result of their parents' influence as well as that of government, nevertheless, it leads to the feeling that it is a duty of everyone living in a particular country to fight, kill and die in order to manifest his/her superiority upon the others, and that is why it may be thought that a greater army and navy is needed. Therefore, the military expenditures increased at the end of the 19th century, high expenditures for army and naval purposes meant progressive exhaustion of men and resources and nations are threatened by this increased demand of militarism. The usual explanation is that a standing army is needed to protect the country from foreign invasions, however, these expenditures are deliberately covered by taxes, which means that people support their „defenders“ and also sacrifice their children. Along with this goes the fact that it is not the rich who contribute to patriotism, they are cosmopolitans who feel at home anywhere, patriotism is not for those who represent wealth and power, it is „good enough“ for the ordinary people.

Frederick the Great, the King of Prussia and patron of writers and philosophers such as Voltaire and Kant, uttered pertinently: „Religion is a fraud, but it must be maintained for the masses.“ (Goldman:134) In relation to this quote, patriotism can also be taken as a superstition maintained through the lies and falsehood and artificially created by government to mobilize people and to prepare them to fight for their country. Goldman further suggests that patriotism in war does not come spontaneously, it is raised by newspaper agitation, which can last for months. She also insists that patriotism

turns a human being into a „loyal machine“, such as in case of soldiers, who are exposed to unquestioned obedience and loyalty to the government, which demands all or nothing. She finds it ridiculous that it is considered to be high treason for a soldier to visit a radical meeting or to read a radical pamphlet, as it should be his free will. According to her, peaceful countries do not waste life and energy in war preparation, with the result that peace is maintained anyway. (145-150) Hence, this opinion is one of those that consider patriotism unnecessary to maintain, as it is incompatible with liberty.

2.7 Summary of the Features of Patriotism throughout the British History

Starting to trace the history of patriotism in the Anglo-Saxon period, it was found out that there were some hints of rising national spirit noticeable. Headed by King Alfred, people were capable of high degree of national loyalty already in this early period of the English history, although patriotism was unstable due to the fact that the country was not united. Nevertheless, with the rise of civic disorder between the kingdoms of Heptarchy leading to regicide, it was obvious that the beginning of national consciousness were at its negative stage again. Norman invasion had a similar effect but fortunately the French were not very interested in altering the English traditions. Hence, after the first glimmer of patriotism, negative features came leading to the fundamental summary that civil wars or the stage of not being sure, where people belong, are the crucial rivals of patriotism.

On the other hand, the Middle Ages saw some victories at important battles, rising stability of government and tendencies to unite the country, which worked adversely, and England was at its blossoming period of national success. At this time, it could be seen that growing patriotism reflected in the literature as well, which serves as a prove that the country was at its favourable period. During the historical analysis, it was found out that these periods take turns regularly, which is confirmed by the fact that afterwards came the period of decline due to accession of incapable ruler, as he was too young, which caused the decay of government and army. This period, finished by the terrible stage of the national spirit as well as literature after the wars of roses, called up the need for strong government and new discipline, and was replaced by the new wave in the form of Tudor dynasty.

Creating its own Church showed to be something unique and specific, which separated England from the rest of the world and, therefore, patriotism at the times of the English Reformation was so strong that it can be even considered as the rise of nationalism, as reflected in the work of Thomas Becon. However, with the queens succeeding Henry VIII, England lost its spirit for a while due to losing the religion, which they did not feel oppressed by and which was only theirs. During the period of Elizabethan England, there was a literary revival expressed especially by Shakespeare and the national success on the world-wide level was achieved by Drake, hence the people had something to be proud of nation-wise again.

As regards the examples of successful reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, it stays obvious that patriotism grows with the capability of monarchs, or leaders such as Cromwell, as seen later. Contrastingly, with the reign of two French kings, who succeeded, their lack of patriotism proved to be obvious due to England not being their fatherland. After that, there came the obstruction of materialism, which has no space left for emotions such as love for one's country. Nevertheless, it was proved that patriotism has always been something that existed to a higher or lesser degree. Similarly, it was observed that the features that help to increase patriotism are, more or less, of the same kind depending mostly on national success and capability of rulers, and the periods of the rise and fall of patriotism have been proved to be quite regular.

As summarized by Colley, a common British patriotism is based on resistance to a foreign enemy, namely on prolonged conflict with the French. There was also an underlying unifying factor of Protestant religion, especially when at war with Catholic Continental powers. Nevertheless, patriotism reached new heights in the years of the French wars with the spontaneous popular enthusiasm for „Church and King“ in addition to the long-lasting anti-French tendencies. Growing self-confidence of the British nation was maintained due to victories from Trafalgar and Waterloo and stimulation of government propaganda, activities of patriotic societies, as well as artists and writers. (Powell:1)

Finally, it was noted that patriotism in the modern viewpoint can stand in contrast with liberty and can be misused for the purposes of militarism. However, following analysis of George Orwell's essay will show that during the World War II, calling for patriotism in consequence of war was absolutely legitimate.

3 ORWELL ON PATRIOTISM

Considering that George Orwell is one of the most admired English-language essayists of the twentieth century and a well-noted critic and commentator on politics, his work is supposedly of great importance. For the purposes of this paper, his essay *The Lion and the Unicorn* was chosen as an outstanding example of work showing the state of British patriotism at the beginning of the World War II. His “powerful and fresh way of looking at patriotism,” according to Rossi, emerged as the approach of a war made Orwell to re-consider where his real loyalties lay. (Rossi) Although Orwell starts his essay with seemingly unrelated topics, the linking is found very soon and his loyalty to his country can be discovered. To understand the following referencing to his work, concerning the layout, the essay is divided into three parts, all of which are further divided into chapters. As regards the language, it is refreshed by similes often ridiculing the state of things and people whom he describes. However, in Rossi’s view, the purpose behind it was not just to shock the readers but to seize readers’ imagination, and this approach can be considered as one of the dimension’s of Orwell’s craft. (Rossi)

Firstly, part I is opened with illustrating that war is not so much about individuals as most men in the war are just doing their duty for their country and what is evil about war is somehow disconnected from their personalities. In war people are forced to national loyalty in a way and at the same time nothing has such a positive force as patriotism. If it had not been for patriotism, Hitler or Mussolini would have never gained such power. On the other hand, Christianity or international Socialism can never reach such stage as they do not consider patriotism to be as important.

Secondly, of course there are real differences in behaviour among nations, although one would say that all human beings are very much alike. Despite this fact, nearly all foreigners feel dislike for British national way of life. Coming to a foreign country, the differences and characteristic features of the scene can be seen immediately. However, it is questionable whether one can make a pattern out of that or whether there are millions of individuals without anything in common. Undoubtedly, the obvious symbols bound up with the national culture come into souls of its people no matter how much they hate it or laugh at it. No-one can probably deny belonging to the country of birth as he/she *nolens volens* became a part of its civilization.

Orwell finally gets back to the point by explaining that all countries are changing into directions which can be partly foreseen but it is necessary to determine what a country like England *is* before guessing „what part it can play in the huge events that are happening“. (1941:1-2)

3.1 National Characteristics

It is not always easy to identify national characteristics even though they are often very simple. They usually seem to have no connection with one another but nothing is causeless and every single characteristic can tell something about the way of life in a certain country. To emphasize the good ones, Orwell gives some of the main generalizations about England. Besides the fact that English people are not gifted artistically, neither for music, nor painting, nor sculpture, he also finds them not very intellectual, ridicules them for having a horror of abstract thought and argues that they are not as practical as they think. And although they do not have any aesthetic feelings, Orwell finds one of the minor English characteristics to be the love of flowers, which is linked to their addiction to hobbies, spare-time occupations and privacy of the English life. The English want to have a home of their own, to do what they like in their spare time, to choose their own amusements instead of having them chosen from above. Such as in the 19th century, they still believe in the liberty of the individual. In all societies common people must live against the existing order to some extent and not accept the hypocritical laws, which are in fact designed to interfere with everybody but practically allow everything to happen. (1941:2-3)

Similarly, Orwell states that English people do not want to feel any interference of the Church and, to prove this fact, one must admit that they *have been* without definite religious belief for centuries. They are known for their gentleness and hatred of war, which is rooted deep in the history. No wars or battles are celebrated, neither the won, nor the lost; even the great battles are not known to the public. There is actually no military tradition, therefore, any patriotism of this kind is definitely not vocal or conscious. Orwell argues that the English ignore the existence of the British Empire, they are even ashamed of it but this kind of anti-militarism seems quite hypocritical, not mentioning that in the working class this takes the form of not knowing that the Empire

exists. Social atmosphere is ritually expressed by military parades, however, this is possible only in the countries where common people dare not laugh at army. (1941:3-4)

Furthermore, Orwell points out that the criminal law is out-of-date, nevertheless, people accept it and assume the law to be unalterable. This suggests the respect for constitutionalism and legality, the belief in the law as something above the State and individual, as something cruel and stupid but incorruptible. People do not imagine the law to be just, because there is one for the poor and another for the rich; yet the totalitarian idea that „there is no such thing as law, there is only power“, has never taken root. Orwell further adds that the electoral system is an open fraud, in the interest of the moneyed class but people are not told which way to vote, the votes are not miscounted, nor is there any direct bribery. Finally, he ridicules judges by saying that „nothing can teach them what century they are living in“, still finds it symbolic in a way. (1941:5-6)

3.2 Defining Nation by Region or Class

In the third chapter, Orwell gets to defining nation from two different points of view. One suggests that the English, the Welsh and the Scottish feel that they have big differences between each other, although a foreigner usually cannot distinguish between them, as they have a strong family resemblance. On the other hand, the nation can also be defined, according to the big differences, as the nation of the rich and the poor. Nevertheless, patriotism has always been stronger than class-hatred. Even the poor one feels to be a single nation with the rich one and is conscious that they resemble one another more than they resemble foreigners. Patriotism is stronger in the middle class than in the upper and due to far stronger insularity and xenophobia, in the working class it is profound, but unconscious. The common people hate foreign habits, do not take foreigners seriously and this actually repels tourists and keeps out invaders. To summarize this point, Orwell says: „In England patriotism takes different forms in different classes, but it runs like a connecting thread through nearly all of them.“ (1941:6) However, Rossi adds the positive point that it was the insularity of the English that saved their patriotism from hatreds of others, as it can be seen in other parts of Europe. (Rossi)

To the previous characteristics Orwell adds that the English lack of artistic ability does not include literature but, unfortunately, that is the only art that cannot cross

frontiers as it usually has little or no value outside its own language group. As for the typically English lack of philosophical faculty and the absence of any need for ordered system of thought or the use of logic, he suggests that there can be moments when the whole nation suddenly swings together and does the same thing while it does not necessarily have to be the right thing to do. And although „a foreigner can see the huge inequality of wealth, the unfair electoral system, the governing class control over radio, press and education considering it a dictatorship, there is a considerable agreement that exists between the leaders and the led.“ Such was the case of Chamberlain, who had the support of public even in policies that were completely incompatible with one another, only when the results of his policy became apparent did it turn against him and the people picked Churchill, who was „nearer to their mood“. He was the one who was able to grasp that wars are not won without fighting and later they may pick another leader who „can grasp that only Socialist nations can fight effectively“. (1941:8)

At the end of this chapter, Orwell finally tries to describe England in a sententious phrase. He argues that the English public life has never been openly scandalous, using the example of the English press, which he finds dishonest but not because of direct bribery. He suggests that the corruption that happens in England is usually unconscious, more in the nature of the right hand not knowing what the left hand does. And even though the country is ruled by the old and the silly, it is a land of emotional unity, where the nation is bound together by an invisible chain. Finally, he defines England as „a rather stuffy Victorian family with not many black sheep in it but with all its cupboards bursting with skeletons - a family with the wrong members in control.“ This is further commented by Rossi, who suggests that the middle classes and the masses were in the struggle, but it was patriotism that showed they are connected into a family-like nation. (Rossi)

3.3 Ruling Class Critique

As a dominant fact in English life during the last few decades before the World War II, Orwell sees the decay of ability in the ruling class. After 1832, the old land-owning aristocracy steadily lost power but interwove with merchants, manufacturers and financiers, who started to copy them. But this was just one of the things which went wrong in Britain and Orwell tries to give some reasons for the mistakes made.

The ruling class, headed by manufacture owners, were doing nothing else than just drawing interests and profits and spending them. They turned into parasites of the society, a functionless class living from their investments. They attended public schools, where the duty of dying for their country was laid down as the first and greatest of the Commandments. Therefore, they had to feel themselves true patriots and could only escape into stupidity as „they could keep society in its existing shape only by being unable to grasp that any improvement was possible.“ They fixed onto the past without admitting to themselves that the world was changing. Along with this goes the fact that higher commanders in wars were the members of aristocracy, hence they had obsolete methods and weapons. Nevertheless, the navy and the air force were more efficient as they were untouched by the ruling class. The final point found negative by Orwell is the fact that the ruling class primarily ignored Fascism because they did not understand it. On the other hand, in time of war they are ready to get themselves killed, which would not be true „if they were the cynical scoundrels that they are sometimes declared to be. It is important not to misunderstand their motives, or one cannot predict their actions... they are merely unteachable. Only when their money and power are gone will the younger among them begin to grasp what century they are living in,“ Orwell finishes the chapter by this explanation of the reason for their instinct for doing the wrong thing. (1941:9-11)

3.4 Weakening of Imperialism

Another important point is made by Orwell to explain the importance of patriotism, especially during the war. General weakening of imperialism due to the stagnation of the Empire had a direct effect upon two substantial sub-sections of the middle class, the left-wing intelligentsia and the military-imperialist middle class. It was partly the work of the left-wing intelligentsia that it gradually became almost impossible to induce young men to take any part in imperial administration, although middle-class imperial sentiment remained quite strong. As intellectuals live in a state of chronic discontent with the existing order because the society has no room for them, they can find a function for themselves only in the literary reviews and the left-wing political parties. They lack constructive suggestions and, living in the world of ideas, also lack the contact with physical reality. English intellectuals are ashamed of their own

nationality, they find it disgraceful to be an Englishmen and these anti-British opinions and a special position of theirs is a by-product of ruling class stupidity. However, both these groups of middle class sign incompatibility between patriotism and intelligence, which Orwell finds unfavourable for modern nation and suggests: „Patriotism and intelligence will have to come together again. It is the fact that we are fighting a war, and a very peculiar kind of war, that may make this possible.“ (1941:12-13)

Nevertheless, the tendency of advanced capitalism was to enlarge the middle class and their ideas and habits spread among the working class as well. Technical advances are bound to benefit the whole community, as the rich and the poor read the same books, watch the same films or listen to the same radio programmes, for instance. Production of cheap clothes or improvements in housing meant that clothes and houses of both groups started to look similar, hence the real differences were not so sharp and the older class distinctions began to break down. Finally, Orwell reckons that the war will wipe out the existing class privileges and, after all, there is a decreasing number of people who wish them to continue. He does not fear that national culture could be destroyed, expecting that „the gentleness, the hypocrisy, the thoughtlessness, the reverence for law and the hatred of uniforms will remain.“ (1941:14-15)

3.5 Changing the System

Orwell opens his part II with calling for a change and reminds that unless the ways of dealing are changed, the war will make a big harm. So far the war showed that private capitalism does not work, as it cannot deliver the goods. And before suggesting any practical steps he finds it important to define what Socialism and Fascism actually are.

Socialism can be defined as „common ownership of the means of production“ and according to Orwell, it can, unlike capitalism, solve the problems of production and consumption. To support this fact, he mentions: „In time of war, a capitalist economy has difficulty in producing all that it needs, because nothing is produced unless someone sees his way to making a profit out of it (...) whereas in a socialist economy, the State calculates what goods will be needed and does its best to produce them.“ To finish the definition of Socialism, he adds the features of approximate equality of incomes,

political democracy, abolition of all hereditary privilege, especially in education. (1941:16)

On the other hand, Fascism has some features of Socialism, which could be seen in Germany at the time as well. Although ownership has never been abolished, the State in the form of Nazi Party was in control of everything and, in effect, everyone was a State employee, which led to building up „the most powerful war machine the world has ever seen.“ However, the idea underlying Fascism is completely different; Nazism assumes that human beings are not equal and free, while Socialism takes the equality of human rights for granted. The horrible system, as Orwell says, worked because it was a planned system geared to a definite purpose, unlike British capitalism, where the main objective was private profit, not preparing for war and cutting down on consumption goods. (1941:16-17)

Nevertheless, Orwell argues that it is impossible to change the system and not the people, and calls for a shift of power. As said before, the country was governed by old people incapable of leading England to victory, as they did not realize what enemy they were supposed to fight. After realizing what the war means and understanding its nature, one must admit that the necessary moves can be made only if the social structure changes. Therefore, Orwell calls for a calm revolution in the form of power shift, for „a conscious open revolt by ordinary people against inefficiency, class privilege and the rule of the old.“ He does not primarily mean to change the government, as it represents the will of people, but claims that the structure needs to be altered from below in order to get the appropriate government.

Finally, Orwell suggests that the equality of sacrifice is more important than radical economic changes, while nationalization of the industry is urgent and necessary. He emphasizes further: „Given equality of sacrifice, the morale of a country like England would probably be unbreakable. But at present we have nothing to appeal to except traditional patriotism, which is deeper here than elsewhere, but is not necessarily bottomless.“ As Orwell expects, the war will last three years and people will suffer terrible things, so they need some kind of proof that they will have a better life when it ends. (1941:20-21)

Due to German propaganda and its willingness to offer everything to everybody, there are certain groups of pro-Fascists who like the idea of Hitler winning, definitely

including the very rich, the Communists, the pacifists and even some sections of Catholics. Orwell, though, warns that Hitler is a real danger even for the English people since the moneyed class have always been on his side, as he had never persecuted the rich, apart from those who were Jews, and although they lost most of their power, they stayed in their position of the rich versus the poor and masters versus men. Therefore, a reasonable degree of social justice needs to be introduced. (1941:21-22)

While political parties seem to have no progress and reactions, Orwell suggests that it is impossible to defeat Hitler while remaining economically and socially in the 19th century. As he mentioned earlier, the government should be altered from below and something that has never existed in England should arise. According to him, it should be a Socialist movement with the mass of people supporting it but, firstly, it is necessary to realize why English Socialism has failed so far.

First to mention is the Labour Party, which, though Socialist, has never had an independent policy though. It is a party of trade unions devoted to raising wages and improving working conditions, which actually means an interest in the prosperity of British capitalism but no aim at fundamental changes. And this fault of not being complex gives them the role only in permanent opposition, never in the lead. Orwell further mentions the influence of the Communists, which is currently very low as they are gradually losing their followers. He explains it by assuming that they have no chance in western Europe, as the appeal for Fascism is greater, and suggests that it appeals only to a rare type of person, especially to the middle-class intelligentsia, a person „who has ceased to love his own country but still feels the need of patriotism, and therefore develops patriotic sentiments towards Russia.“ There was not any strong Fascist movement either, as the good and skillful leaders appear only when the psychological need for them exists, and Sir Oswald Mosley and his British Union of Fascists were not even able to realize the basic fact that Fascism must not offend national sentiment. (1941:23-24)

At the time of writing his essay, Orwell argues that no reasonable version of Socialism has been produced and found acceptable for the mass of people. As Rossi notes, Orwell believed the intellectuals would never be able to motivate the masses and bring about a real revolution. (Rossi) Moreover, as expressed by Orwell „the stupid left-wing propaganda had frightened away whole classes of necessary people, who had been

taught to think of Socialism as something which menaced their livelihood.“ Orwell again emphasizes that, with the present social structure, England cannot survive and that working class needs to see that they have something to fight for and, as a result, he suggests that a Socialist movement which can bring patriotism and intelligence into partnership should be introduced, since the war has changed this to a realizable policy. To support that, he says: „War is the greatest of all agents of change. It speeds up all processes, wipes out minor distinctions, brings realities to the surface.“ (1941:24-25) In this point, Rossi also observes that Orwell finds patriotism as a way of energizing the war effort, but even more importantly, this patriotism in context of war should raise and support the revolution. (Rossi)

3.6 Orwell’s Programme of Action

At the end of his essay, Orwell finds out that the only possible approach to war is through patriotism, which is also the basis for the Socialist movement. He suggests a programme of six steps necessary to put into practice, some of which were already mentioned earlier; they are, however, unrelated to the present, therefore there is no need to emphasize them again as far as the aim of this paper is concerned. Nevertheless, Orwell himself declares that his programme is a policy and a possible direction, which does not have to be carried out immediately, if ever, but the main prerequisite is the shift of power from the old ruling class.

He encourages people to get interested in his programme by characterizing the movement that is, according to him, about to rise. He assures that it would be „a specifically English Socialist movement“, completely different from what has ever existed before. Furthermore, Orwell hopes that the movement would touch the heart of the English people, abolish the House of Lords and expects it would, quite probably, not abolish the Monarchy, while it would „leave the judge in his ridiculous horsehair wig and the lion and the unicorn on the soldier’s cap-buttons.“ He also emphasizes that the movement would not persecute religion but it would have nationalized industry, sealed down incomes and set up a classless educational system. (1941:25 – 31)

Finally, Orwell claims that patriotism is actually the opposite of Conservatism and that being patriotic means being revolutionary. As a result of this, the war should be either turned into a revolutionary war or it could be lost. „The choice before us is not so

much between victory and defeat as between revolution and apathy," he encourages again and adds a catchy example: „Hitler said once that to accept defeat destroys the soul of a nation.“ Although the revolutionary efforts seem quite strong at the end of the essay, Rossi believes that Orwell called for a responsible patriotism that could be used as a positive force for change. Patriotism, which in its highest sense could be a source of inspiration and guidance for the people. (Rossi)

After all, Rossi comes to an important conclusion connected to the modern times. According to him, Orwell finds out that patriotism could serve as a bridge between the middle class and the masses in a way that any other „-ism“ could not. (Rossi) Therefore, patriotism can be considered as the emotion of a great power, which Orwell find necessary to achieve success. Such theory is covered in the final words of his essay: „We must add to our heritage or lose it, we must grow greater or grow less, we must go forward or backward. I believe in England, and I believe that we shall go forward.“ (Orwell,1941:35)

3.7 The Summary of Orwell's Perspective

Orwell tries to achieve that patriotism should be perceived as a positive force, especially during the war. After discussing whether there really is such thing as nations or whether it is only about individualities, he makes a connection between patriotism, nation and war. First, it is argued that the national characteristics are necessary to realize when being involved in a war, then, basic national characteristics are given in order to realize the features that are shared throughout the nation, while stating that national consciousness does not depend on class or region so much, whereas the insularity, for instance, is shared, which cannot be disputed. Hence, it is necessary to realize what the country is and what the people are like to determine what can be done at the time of war. This is the connecting thread to the following chapter, as Gordon Brown is very enthusiastic about the same topic 65 years later.

Nevertheless, there is a smooth interconnection of the impact of the ruling class on the society in the mid-nineteenth century with the previous historical chapter. The continuity is also ensured with the theme of imperialism. After explaining the terms *Socialism and Fascism*, which are being discussed along, Orwell suggests that being apathetic may harm England to a high degree and therefore, calls for patriotism in the

form of revolution, which would replace the unwanted apathy. Finally, he notes that his programme of action would change the system, which has to be changed from below, but would leave the traditions and symbols like The Lion and the Unicorn on the uniforms, for instance.

4 PATRIOTISM IN THE MODERN BRITISH SOCIETY

In modern context, it is more urgent to clarify the ambiguity of the terms used throughout the previous chapters. Recently, the use of *British* as a synonym for *English* has been called into question from many different sources, instead of using the old imperial equation of the terms due to the attention centred on other more pressing issues such as gender or class. As Graham Dawson warns, the common interchangeability of the terms English and British must be realized in order to explore the shared Britishness that has resulted from belonging to the „imperial race“. He further emphasizes that it happens that „English“ often refers also to Scottish, Welsh and Irish people. (Bassnett:XXI) Nevertheless, „Great Britain“ entered general use as the imperial title for the union of England and Scotland, from the accession of James I to the throne in 1603. Samuel declares that „*Britishness* began to serve as a synonym for, or promise of, all-embracing coverage,“ from 1768 with the publication of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. (48)

Nowadays, most of the opinions are similar to that of Susan Bassnett, who suggests that using phrases such as „the British people“ is a political rhetoric and that any globalizing idea of Britishness is being rejected by regions which is, for instance, proved by the huge emergence of Irish-, Scots-, Welsh-speaking music groups or the spread of Welsh language television. However, the transition of society to multiculturalism and multi-ethnicity, which has happened most visibly in England, contributed to the debates about national identity. (XXI-XXVII) These opinions suggest that Britishness is based on imperialism as the only thing shared by the constituent parts of Great Britain, while following arguments confirm that using the term *British* is considered to be politically correct and, therefore, has recently been used instead of *English*.

In 1995, Neal Ascherson suggested that the problem of Britishness is basically a problem of Englishness. He also remarked that people feel to be Scottish or Welsh in

national identity, but British only in the form of citizenship. (Bassnett:XXIV-V) Similarly, he argued in 2005 that fewer people feel primarily British and that British political values and virtues are actually English. (Ascherson) Katie Gramich also suggests that the majority of Welsh people would identify themselves as Welsh rather than British and cites Welsh poet and nationalist R. S. Thomas to prove it: „Britishness is a mask. Beneath it there is only one nation, England.“ Furthermore, she translates the words of Gwynfor Evans, the former leader of Plaid Cymru, the Welsh nationalist party, as:

What is Britishness? The first thing to realize is that it is another word for Englishness; it is a political word which arose from the existence of the British state and which extends Englishness over the lives of the Welsh, the Scots and the Irish. If one asks what the difference is between English culture and British culture one realizes that there is no difference. They are the same. The British language is the English language. British education is English education. British television is English television. The British press is the English press. The British Crown is the English Crown, and the Queen of Britain is the Queen of England. (...) Britishness is Englishness.(Bassnett:99)

On the other hand, Michael Portillo, the right-wing Conservative minister, proposed that national self-confidence and self-belief should be rebuilt and that the value and quality of the British way of life and British institutions should be asserted. He argues: „We are proud of our history, proud of our language, proud of our culture, proud of our military skills, proud of our democratic institutions, proud of commerce and business, our exporters and investors.“ (Bassnett:XXIII) These features are something that can be considered as shared throughout the whole of Great Britain, at least, as seen by the foreign observer from the outside. Similarly, Gordon Brown tries to find these shared features and values to underlie the fact that it is necessary not to talk about England, but about the Great Britain, which is going to be discussed in the following chapter.

The theme of national identity is an important feature in the history of modern Britain. It is necessary to point out that the constituent parts of Great Britain always had to ask themselves what Britain is. While people had to ask what is to be British, their answers actually shaped the histories of their regions. To support this fact, Powell says that the loyalty to a British state had to compete and co-exist with the other national identities of the constituent parts. Between the different parts of Great Britain, remaining strong differences of language, religion and culture as well as those of a legal and institutional nature has reflected in the rise of political nationalism since the mid-

nineteenth century. (8-9) The following analysis tries to answer the aboved mentioned questions and arguments as well as it tries to explain the importance of patriotism, which is covered in the topic of Britishness, in the modern context.

4.1 Brown on Britishness

It is the nature of human beings that every person has a different view on every topic. All human beings perceive the surrounding things differently, even those within one national identity, which would have quite a lot of things and values in common. Therefore, concerning patriotism and Britishness topics and without any background knowledge, one can assume that, for example, half of the nation would feel patriotic and the other half not, as well as one half can think that preserving Britishness is important and the rest would disagree. Similarly, there are obviously different views on how to preserve Britishness. Some can think that knowing different cultures can be reached by travelling and that it is important to establish strict immigrant policy to preserve nationhood. The others may have a more liberal view and argue that patriotism is a part of history nowadays and may consider it merely right-wing or radical. They would prefer multiculturalism which enhances their everyday lives and they would probably think that if they are citizens of a rich state, they must offer opportunities for the poorer. There are certainly some, who do not feel concerned with this at all, however, as David Goodhart claims, these questions recently moved up the political agenda as the result of world-wide terrorism or devolution tendencies in Scotland and Wales. (Ascherson) Nevertheless, if Britishness is called for by Gordon Brown, the Chancellor at the time, it means that there is some growing importance of the topic and some historical context behind it as the reason for Britishness preservation.

Gordon Brown held the speech on The Future of Britishness at the Fabian Britishness conference on 14 January, 2006. At first, he stated that Britain has been facing some major challenges, concerning relationships with Europe, the United States and the rest of the world. Therefore, equipping for globalisation, future of constitutional change, a modern view of citizenship, local government, ideas of localism, community relations and multiculturalism, balancing diversity and integration and the shape of

public services are the topics which should be discussed in order to find out what being British means, what are the values and the purpose as a nation. (1)

To confirm that discussing the topic of Britishness has a new urgency today, Freedland claims that the current model of integration failed, as he summarizes the cause of London bombings. He warns that London bombers were born in Britain, they had British accents, still, did not show any loyalty to Britain. (Freedland) This is why the problems of multiculturalism and integration and their impact on the British society have to be discussed and not marginalized as Brown also mentions, in spite of the fact that Great Britain undoubtedly is a multicultural state. One of the related problems, which can arise, is that being too multicultural as a state can prevent somebody from caring about his/her nation, feeling that characteristic features seem to disappear or, on the other hand, one would feel even more patriotic, which can be counter-productive, as the individual would be patriotic but the country would be divided anyway.

Brown further suggests that after World War I, Britain lost confidence in itself, too many people retreated into the idea of unchanged Britain and its institutions and for the fear of losing the British identity, for example the questions of constitution were not faced. On the contrary, it is necessary to remember that losing national identity is more probable within a country with fewer identities.

Therefore, as Britain is and has “always been a country of different nations and thus of plural identities,” (see Table 1) it should gain great strength because the British identity is superior to the identities of its parts. This is further explained by Brown by the example of 19th century and its conception of blood, race and territory, which caused that there were more insecure people who needed to be rooted and therefore chose more exclusive identities, such as the Welsh or Cornish. In modern times, when the confidence has been gained again, Britain can derive benefits from shared values and the way these values are expressed through British history and institutions. (p1)

To be more specific about the ethnic composition of the United Kingdom, according to the 2001 Census, it was as follows:

Ethnic group	Population	% of total*
White British	50,366,497	85.7%
White Irish	691,232	1.2%
White (other)	3,096,169	5.3%
Mixed race	677,117	1.2%
Indian	1,053,411	1.8%
Pakistani	747,285	1.3%
Bangladeshi	283,063	0.5%
Other Asian (non-Chinese)	247,644	0.4%
Black Caribbean	565,876	1.0%
Black African	485,277	0.8%
Black (others)	97,585	0.2%
Chinese	247,403	0.4%
Other	230,615	0.4%
Table 1 (Wikipedia)		* Percentage of total UK population

For instance, the national identity of the Czech Republic can be taken as an opposite example for comparison. In the country, where 94 % are Czechs (out of which almost 4 % claimed Moravian ethnicity), 2 % are Slovaks and the rest are minorities such as Poles, Vietnamese, Germans and Romanies (all of them under 1 %), vast majority has Czech values and would probably less likely accept values of the others. (Czech Statistical Office) And if the Czechs do not have to evaluate the values of theirs and the others, they can be bound in their own nation, not gaining much experience in in-state communication with other ethnic groups, not moving them forward. Hence it can be claimed that shared values of more identities are more valuable than shared values of one ethnic group.

In addition to this, Brown further asks whether national identity is defined by shared values or just by race and ethnicity and suggests that test of loyalty would be wrong. (2) Definitely, different race or ethnic group would fail the test of loyalty in comparison with British people but it is more important to share the values. If the members of different ethnic groups and races are integrated and assimilated and all their values, including religion, are accepted, the satisfaction of larger amount of people is more valuable for the whole community than couple of loyal patriots.

Concerning the integration mentioned above, there are obviously some requirements necessary to be met in the society together with balancing the need for

diversity. Brown suggests that the responsibility of citizenship should be defined while being clear about what underlies Britishness and being clear that shared values define what it means to be British in the modern world. After that, a new, contemporary settlement of relationship between state, community and individual should be forged, though remarked: „It is also easier to address difficult issues that sometimes come under the heading „multiculturalism“ – essentially how diverse cultures, which inevitably contain differences, can find the essential common purpose without which no society can flourish.“ (2)

In addition to this, Brown emphasizes that for the success as a country in global economy, in international, demographic, constitutional, social and security challenges, Great Britain needs to rediscover and build from history to apply „the shared values that bind us together and give us common purpose.“ Furthermore, there is a necessity to take the right long-term decisions on stability, science, trade and education and to come together and, sharing a common view of challenges, decide what is important according to unified and shared sense of purpose. In Brown’s view, „British patriotism is founded not on ethnicity nor race, not just on institutions we share and respect, but on enduring ideals which shape our view of ourselves and our communities – values which in turn influence the way our institutions evolve.“ (2)

According to Jonathan Freedland, „unlike America and many other countries, Britain is almost unique in the fact that it has no constitutional statement or declaration enshrining the country objectives, no mission statement defining purpose, nor explicitly stated vision of future.“ (Brown:3) As Queen Elizabeth II once said: „The British Constitution has always been puzzling and always will be.“ (MacDonald:159) Nevertheless, Brown feels that there is no need to state the country objective in constitution, as there is something to build upon together with realizing what else needs to be done and reconsider. To make a suggestion for a change, Brown introduces five main points that need to be taken into account:

- a new constitutional settlement,
- an explicit definition of citizenship,
- a renewal of civic society,
- a rebuilding of our local government
- a better balance between diversity and integration. (3)

As for the new constitutional settlement, Easthope also suggests that: „There is one important area in contemporary English life which certainly will have to be reinvented in the immediate future because of the force of current events, that of constitutional reform.“ (204) However, all the above mentioned points are not possible to carry out without being more explicit about the objectives and priorities of the British people, which is to be done by finding shared purpose as a country and realizing what Britishness means. To summarise this, Brown emphasizes that apart from the qualities of creativity, inventiveness, enterprise and internationalism, the central belief should be a commitment to liberty for all, responsibility by all and fairness to all. (3) This implies that even though every country has its national symbols and traditions that unite it, in modern times it is more important to be concerned about citizens, government, services etc., as these are the features that form a new tradition, which will influence the way of being united as a country in the future.

Even though Brown feels that the country needs to be more united, recent surveys show that the British people feel more patriotic about their country than almost any other European country. To support the fact that the importance of Britishness grows, Brown mentions that nowadays, two thirds of British people find Britishness important while being aware it carries responsibilities as well as rights. He considers a strong sense of duty and responsibility as one sentiment ordinary British men and women have in common, as they prefer solidarity to selfishness and thus creating the Britain of civic responsibility, civic society and the public realm. These arguments are supported by George Orwell, as Brown further mentions: „Orwell focused on justice, liberty and decency defining Britain.“ (3-4)

Supporting Brown's argument, Opinion Leader Research company conducted a demographically representative poll and a qualitative research with an extended focus group of members of the public in November 2005. The results of the poll were introduced by the Fabian Society expressing the following:

- 75 % think that Britain is about Justice and pride themselves on their tolerance, fairness and fair play,
- 71 % think that Britain has a reputation for being clever and innovative, stating that the British creativity in the arts and sciences is world renowned,

- 50 % believe that they run the real risk of a divided society if they do not promote what Britishness means, 27% disagree,
- 41% say being British has become more important to them after the July 7th bombings, 33% disagree,
- 43% think race relations are better in the UK than in our European neighbours, while 22% disagree,
- 29% say they often feel ashamed to be British, while 55% disagree.
(fabians.org.uk)

The opinions above are supported by the YouGov survey carried out in July 2005, where the British citizens answered that people's politeness and consideration towards one another is important by 86 % (47 % of which said it is „very important“). As even more defining feature of Britishness the sense of fairness and fair play was considered – 54 % find this very important, while 36 % consider it fairly important. These opinions were closely followed by their tolerance of other people and other people's ideas, which is considered important by 81 % altogether. (YouGov)

To summarize his idea, Brown suggests that the current situation stands „a long way from the old left's embarrassed avoidance of an explicit patriotism.“ Paraphrasing Orwell, he argues that the old left view for thinking that patriotism could be defined only as defence of unchanging institutions, deference and hierarchy and as dislike of foreigners and self-interested individualism. He agrees that this reactionary right-wing view was correctly ridiculed and sees that „when the old left recoiled from patriotism they failed to understand that the values on which Britishness is based – liberty for all, responsibility by all, fairness to all – owe more to progressive ideas than to right wing ones.“ (5)

After all, in his speech Brown sets up practical instructions that should be applied to achieve the desired aims concerning community services, civic society including charities, mentoring and non-governmental organizations, local government and what should be done to strengthen local institutions and claims taking citizenship seriously. Similarly, as Orwell did in his *The Lion and the Unicorn*, after suggesting the particular moves for the process to be undergone, he also argues that the debates about Britishness have a new urgency because of war, with terrorism in this case. (5-9)

To sum up, before defining patriotism in modern context, it was necessary to explain different viewpoints on Britishness. It has been a common mistake that the term *English* sometimes refers to the whole of Britain. The British themselves prefer using regional terms because they see a lot of differences between the constituent parts of Britain, as mentioned by Orwell in the previous chapter as well. Not only is this fact very closely connected to the problems of multiculturalism, it is also connected to the threat of terrorism, hence the debates about Britishness have become more urgent. Also, there have recently been some voices that there obviously are some points that are shared by all the British citizens and that is what Brown is calling for to realize. He further discusses the challenges that Britain is facing and explaining why it is important to be more explicit about the shared ideals and values, which are based on history and which are the basis for the modern form of patriotism.

5 CONCLUSION

This paper studied the British history and patriotic experience as the basis for further analysis of contemporary situation regarding British patriotism. It was found out that it is necessary to realize the history in order to state the values.

As contemporary Britain is multicultural, which may affect the spirit of nation unfavourably, it is necessary to be more explicit about the objectives, priorities and to find a common purpose to be able to achieve national success or to fight terrorism. Nevertheless, the fact that Great Britain is a country of plural identities splits the patriotism, so it is crucial to build from history and, while realizing the shared values, make the new sense for Britishness.

Nowadays, it has been the Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, who has been calling for realizing Britishness to be able to face the current challenges, however, similar opinion was that of Orwell, who called for a revolution as a form of expressing patriotism in order to succeed in what is happening in the world.

This suggests that if the world-wide situation involves a particular state such in the case of wars, the leaders find it necessary to have the public support behind their back. As the history part proved, the challenges faced are won and solved in favour of the country if the leader is capable. Likewise, if the country is united, national success is achieved in war as well as in peacetime, which is, for example, reflected in economy.

To sum up, the features that cause the fall of patriotism as proved in history are those of civic disorder, civil wars, invasion and conquest, while knowing that people belong to a united country cause the opposite. Other positive features that can help to increase patriotism are victories at important battles, resistance to a foreign enemy, stability of government, capable rulers or leaders or patriotic literature, as it gets to the wide range of readers. If there is something unique or specific for the country, such as own religion, it also helps building self-confidence.

Furthermore, it was found out that patriotism can be misused for militarism but during war it serves as positive force as expressed by Orwell. Similarly, Brown calls for patriotism in order to fight terrorism. As Orwell and Brown both suggest, patriotism is a positive force for achieving success. Firstly, it must be realized what underlies it and what underlies nation and its characteristics. Then, it must be found out what is shared, what the common purpose of the nation is and what the shared values are. They also both agree that it is history what unites people and that the objectives of country should be stated and executed effectively, as the apathy is wrong. Finally, it has been confirmed that to maintain patriotism, it is also necessary to maintain traditions and symbols.

Therefore, the aim of the paper to understand the history and features that formed patriotism was accomplished. The topics of national identity and multiculturalism were also clarified. It was found out that patriotism has always been rooted in the minds of the British people and that there are some foundations which can Orwell, Brown or others always refer to. The factors that influence patriotism were also stated and it was explained why they are so important. Lastly, it was also proved that multiculturalism is not a serious obstruction of patriotism in Great Britain.

RESUMÉ

Abychom porozuměli britské historii, která souvisí se současnou Británií, je důležité pochopit problematiku národní identity. Británie je dnes multikulturní zemí, jejíž charakter je ovlivněn vnitřním nacionalismem stejně tak, jako různými identitami. Kvůli tomuto střetu hodnot musí Británie neustále čelit problémům, které jsou spojeny s přístupem k Evropské unii a požadováním decentralizace moci. Přestože jsou názory na tuto problematiku různé a někteří Britové mohou považovat symboly „britství“ za absurdní či zastaralé, je zřejmé, že patriotismus v Británii vždy byl a bude do určité míry zakořeněn. Jeho sílu ovlivňuje více faktorů, a právě to, co je činí důležitými a co ovlivňuje veřejnost, bude tato práce zkoumat.

Pro takovou analýzu je nezbytné upřesnit základní pojmy, které se tématu týkají, stejně jako základní definice patriotismu z různých úhlů pohledu. Jelikož aktuální stav souvisí s historickými aspekty, bylo nezbytné začít s analýzou historie, aby bylo možné vyvodit důsledky pro současnou Británii. Dále se práce zaměřuje na prvky, které Brity spojují tak, jak je popisuje George Orwell ve svém díle *The Lion and the Unicorn*. Nakonec se práce pokusí potvrdit, že patriotismus v Británii nebyl oslaben vysokou mírou imigrace.

Poté, co byla v práci uvedena charakteristika situace v britské společnosti mezi světovými válkami, budou ze vztahů k současné situaci vyvozeny prvky, na kterých je patriotismus založen. Zároveň bylo zodpovězeno, proč se političtí představitelé či politicky zainteresovaní snaží znovu a znovu patriotismus v lidech vyvolávat.

V úvodu práce bylo uvedeno základní pojetí patriotismu a zmíněno, že je tento pojem někdy chybně zaměňován s nacionalismem. Pro účely této práce je tedy patriotismus definován jako láska lidí k jejich zemi za základního předpokladu, že taková forma lásky vzniká narozením v dané zemi. Dále bylo nastíněno, že historie národa je něco, co bude občany dané země vždy spojovat a co nezmění ani její narušení dobyvateli. Proto je nezbytné se historií zabývat a uvědomovat si prvky, které patriotismus formují a podporují v moderní době.

Co se týče historie, bylo zjištěno, že prvky patriotismu byly zjevné již v anglosaském období. Jelikož však země nebyla sjednocena, nedá se hovořit o stabilitě, zvláště pak když občanské nepokoje vyústily v královraždu. Invaze Normanů měla na britský patriotismus podobně neblahý vliv, situace se však změnila s úspěchy

středověkých bitev, se stabilnější vládou a díky tendencím sjednotit zemi. Toto období se tak pozitivně promítlo i v literatuře, která víceméně dokazuje v jakém stavu se země nachází. S nástupem vládce v novorozeneckém věku nastal opět úpadek, a tím bylo v analýze definitivně potvrzeno, že periody rozkvětu a úpadku se cyklicky opakují.

Bylo zjištěno, že rozkvět nastává s nástupem osobností, které jsou schopné zemi a společnost pozvednout. Tak tomu bylo i v případě Jindřicha VIII., který zavedl vlastní církev, i v případě Olivera Cromwella, který byl zodpovědný za ustanovení republiky. Nárůst patriotismu je tedy přímo úměrný národnímu úspěchu a schopnostem panovníků a vůdců, přispívali k němu však i velkolepá vítězství v bitvách, zejména v těch, kde byli poraženi Francouzi, stejně jako prvky, které byly jedinečné a specifické pouze pro Británii, jako v případě náboženství.

V dnešní době se ovšem vyskytují názory, že patriotismus bývá zneužíván k militarismu. Orwell však ve svém díle dokazuje, že využití patriotismu ve válečném období je příznivým prvkem k dosažení úspěchu. V analýze Orwellova díla je vysvětlena souvislost mezi národem, patriotismem a válkou. Nejprve je uvedeno, že je nezbytné charakterizovat typické národní prvky, které národ spojují, zvláště v případě, že se má země ujmout nějaké role ve válce. Orwell dále uvádí, že národní vědomí nezáleží tolik na společenské třídě, ani na specifické oblasti země, jelikož je důležité si uvědomit, že existují hodnoty, které jsou všem společné jako je například fakt, že všechny občany Británie spojuje jejich oddělenost od kontinentální Evropy. Proto je důležité uvědomit si, čím země je a co spojuje její občany, aby bylo možné určit, jaká pozice může být zaujata ve válce, což je také problémem, kterým se zabývá i další analýza související se současnou Británií.

Tak jak se Orwell zmiňuje o problému národní identity, která se vztahuje k současnosti, jeho rozbor vládnoucí třídy a problematiky imperialismu navazuje na historickou část této práce. Poté, co jsou vysvětleny pojmy socialismus a fašismus, Orwell navrhuje kroky, které by měly být učiněny, a zdůrazňuje, že apatie Britů by mohla způsobit velké škody, a proto je nutné přistoupit k posílení patriotismu. Jeho program by měl vyvolat revoluci a především změnu systému, zatímco symboly a tradice je nutné udržet.

Pro analýzu současné situace bylo nejprve nutné objasnit nejednoznačnost týkající se pojmů *britský* a *anglický*. Někteří považují pojem *britský* za politicky

korektní výraz, který však u občanů Británie vyvolává rozpaky, jelikož inklinují spíše k regionální identitě a *Britství* tak pro ně představuje spíše příslušnost k impériu. Na druhou stranu někdy se pojem *anglický* zaměňuje s pojmem *britský* i v případě, že se jedná o záležitost vztahující se i na ostatní regiony. Existují ovšem i názory, že je třeba vyhledat prvky, které občany Británie spojují. Tyto společné hodnoty jsou pak předmětem analýzy projevu současného premiéra Velké Británie, Gordona Browna.

Nejprve je uvedeno, že jedním z důvodů, proč je třeba si tyto hodnoty uvědomit, je hrozba terorismu, která v Británii není pouze hrozbou abstraktní. Důkazem toho, že systém integrace selhal jsou bombové útoky na Londýn britskými občany, proto je tedy důležité řešit otázku multikulturalismu. Brown upozorňuje, že taková různorodost může být pro zemi i přínosem, protože může mnohem více vyniknout britská identita. Podle Browna je dále důležité v různorodosti najít společné hodnoty, a ty by měly být objeveny právě ve společné historii a v ideové shodě. Jedním z bodů, které by měly být změněny, je ústavní uspořádání, před tím je však nutné upřesnit a stanovit cíle a priority země a uvědomit si, co se skrývá pod pojmem *Britství* a jaký je společný záměr občanů Británie. Z toho je zřejmé, že se Brown zabývá stejnými myšlenkami jako Orwell a že se vlastně opět dovolává patriotismu, stejně cyklicky, jako tomu bylo v celé historii. Na druhou stranu, výzkumy ukazují, že Britové se cítí být patrioty více než jakékoli další evropské státy. To si Brown uvědomuje, a proto připomíná hodnoty, které podle výzkumů Britové mají zakořeněné, aby dokázal, že opravdu mají na čem stavět.

Cíl práce porozumět historii a prvkům, které v ní formovali patriotismus, byl splněn, stejně jako byla vysvětlena problematika národní identity a multikulturalismu v dnešní době. Bylo zjištěno, že patriotismus byl vždy v Británii zakořeněn a že se tedy při dovolávání se patriotismu je na co obracet, jak potvrzuje Orwell i Brown. Dále bylo zjištěno, jaké faktory patriotismus ovlivňují a proč jsou tyto prvky důležité. Nakonec bylo podloženo i to, že patriotismus není oslaben tím, že je Británie multikulturní zemí. Je tedy možné s pomocí patriotismu dosáhnout úspěchu jak na národní, tak světové úrovni, případně i v boji s terorismem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bassnett, Susan. *Studying British cultures*. London, New York: Routledge, 1997.
2. Courtauld, George. *The Pocket Book of Patriotism*. London: Halstead Books Ltd, 2004.
3. Easthope, Antony. *Englishness and National Culture*. London, New York: Routledge, 1999.
4. Goldman, Emma. *Anarchism and Other Essays. Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty*. Second revised edition. New York, London: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1911. pp 133- 150.
5. Griffin, Dustin H. *Patriotism and Poetry in Eighteenth-century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
6. MacDonald, Guy. *Gross Britain: The Antidote to Patriotism*. London: Michael O'Mara Books Ltd, 2005.
7. Mayor, Michael, Rundell, Michael, et al. *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers, 2002.
8. Powell, David. *Nationhood and Identity : the British State Since 1800*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2002.
9. Samuel, Raphael. *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain*. London, New York: Verso, 1998.
10. Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé Cecil. *The Foundations of British Patriotism*. London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1939.
11. Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé Cecil. *The History of English Patriotism*. New York: John Lane Co, 1913.
12. Ascherson, Neal. Britain Rediscovered. updated April 2005 [viewed 25 February 2008]:
http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=6832
13. Brown, Gordon. The future of Britishness. updated 14 January 2006 [viewed 21 January 2008]:
<http://fabians.org.uk/events/new-year-conference-06/brown-britishness/speech>
14. Freedland, Jonathan. The Identity vacuum. updated 3 August 2005 [viewed 13 May 2007]: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/aug/03/race.july7>

15. Lewis, Jone Johnson. Patriotism Quotes. updated 4 May 2007 [viewed 4 May 2007]: http://www.wisdomquotes.com/cat_patriotism.html
16. Orwell, George. The Lion and the Unicorn. updated 13 January 2007 [viewed 13 January 2007]:
<http://www.k-1.com/Orwell/index.cgi/work/essays/lionunicorn.html>
17. Orwell, George. Notes on Nationalism. updated 26 March 2008 [viewed 26 March 2008]: http://www.orwell.ru/library/essays/nationalism/english/e_nat
18. Rossi, John. Orwell and Patriotism. updated 26 May 2007 [viewed 26 May 2007]: <http://www.netcharles.com/orwell/ctc/docs/orwlpatr.htm>
19. Answers.com. Patriotism. updated 4 May 2007 [viewed 4 May 2007]:
<http://www.answers.com/patriotism>
20. Český statistický úřad. Zjišťování národnosti ve sčítání lidu, domů a bytů v období 1921 - 2001. updated 24 May 2007 [viewed 12 February 2008]:
[http://www.czso.cz/csu/2003edicniplan.nsf/t/C2002D382C/\\$File/Kapitola1.pdf](http://www.czso.cz/csu/2003edicniplan.nsf/t/C2002D382C/$File/Kapitola1.pdf)
21. Fabian Society. Integration agenda needed to strengthen Britishness. updated 14 February [viewed 14 February 2008]:
<http://fabians.org.uk/publications/review/winter-05-britishness/integration/>
22. Wikipedia. List of Ethnic Groups. updated 27 March 2008 [viewed 27 March 2008]: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethnic_groups_of_the_United_Kingdom
23. YouGov. YouGov/Daily Telegraph Survey Results. updated 14 February 2008 [viewed 14 February 2008]:
http://www.yougov.com/uk/archives/pdf/TEL050101032_1.pdf