

# The Rhetoric of War - Former Yugoslavia Example

Gabrijela Kisicek, PhD<sup>1</sup>

---

## ARTICLE INFO

Available Online September 2013

Key words:

Rhetoric;  
argumentation;  
fallacies;  
political discourse;  
war.

## ABSTRACT

Disintegration of Yugoslavia resulted with war involving Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia. Although war ended in 1995 there are still unsolved issues concerning the cause, responsibility and guilt for more than 2 million refugees (both in Croatia and Bosnia) and more than 200 000 dead. This paper aims to determine characteristics of rhetoric in political discourse preceding the war. Speeches analyzed were delivered in the period of 1989 until 1992. We analyzed 20 speeches of dominant political figures from Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia (Franjo Tuđman, Slobodan Milošević, Radovan Karadžić, Vojislav Šešelj and Alija Izetbegović) aiming to find argumentation strategies in their speeches (especially usage of *topoi* considering national questions), system of value, and other rhetorical characteristics and dimensions of persuasion which could show certain similarities and differences between the leaders of three nations. Analysis of argumentation was based on several argumentation handbooks (Weston 1992, Rieke and Sillars 2001, Walton 2004, Tindale 2007). We believed that political leaders will have different argumentation strategies and different system of value since they represented different nations (with different historical background and cultural heritage) and different religions. Results of analysis show however that there are many similarities in argumentation strategies and frequent usage of fallacies (*argumentum ad populum*, red herring, *argumentum ad baculum*, hasty generalizations etc.) between analyzed speakers. The main goal of this paper and contribution to the rhetoric of citizenship is determining means of persuasion using analytical tools from rhetoric in order to describe what might be called The Rhetoric of War.

---

## 1. Historical background - dissolution of Yugoslavia

The Yugoslav state first formed as the Yugoslav Kingdom became the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia after World War II. What were the causes of the breakup of this multiethnic state and when did the dissolution start is a question on which different authors have different answers.

A conference gathering scholars from different republics of former Yugoslavia which took place in Belgrade in 2004 resulted in the book *The violent dissolution of Yugoslavia – causes, dynamics and effects* offering possible explanations for the dissolution. Vejvoda writes (2004, p. 61): “Yugoslavia was a country that had been imagined in the nineteenth century by Croat, Serb and Slovene cultural elites alike - a dream (the unification of the South Slavs) that their respective politicians espoused and endeavored to turn into reality.” Constituted from six republics (Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Macedonia) and two autonomist provinces (Kosovo and Vojvodina), it contained people belonging to three religions (Catholic, Orthodox and Muslim) and nations with different languages and different historical narratives. One might say that it was an artificial unit with a little chance of surviving for very long. However, “its seventy-two-year-long, often stormy, existence created a territorial reality which, especially after the Yalta settlement, cried out for political legitimization. That legitimization was provided in the postwar period by a communist ideology that thrust Yugoslavia on to centre stage, as a buffer country between the two Cold War blocs - but without changing its essentially peripheral position.” (Vejvoda, 2004, p.67). So, what led to violent dissolution of Yugoslav state? Richard Holbrooke, American diplomat whose efforts during the war resulted in the *Dayton Peace Accord* signed in 1995 by the leaders of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia, wrote a book trying to explain the reasons for the war. Holbrooke (1999, p.16) listed five reasons for

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Phonetics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

the war: "First, misreading of Balkan history, second, the end of Cold War, third, behavior of Yugoslav leaders, fourth, inadequate American response to the crisis and the last reason, European mistake in believing that they can handle their first challenge after the end of Cold War."

Ethnic tension grew in Yugoslavia after the death of Yugoslav President Tito in 1980, who was country's main unifying force. In the late 1980's political conflict began between Serbs on one side and Croats and Slovenians on the other regarding Serbian repression in Kosovo. Slovenia and Croatia wanted to move towards decentralization and democracy and Serbia led by Slobodan Milošević adhered to centralism and single-party rule, and by March 1989 effectively ended the autonomy of the autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina taking command of their votes in the Yugoslav Federal Presidency. In January 1990, the extraordinary 14<sup>th</sup> Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was convened. The Croatian and Slovenian delegations left the Congress on 23 January 1990, effectively dissolving the all-Yugoslav party. Wars in the former Yugoslavia were fought in the 1990s between the republics that sought sovereignty on one side and the government in Belgrade on the other side that wanted to either prevent their independence or keep large parts of that territory under its control. According to the 1994 United Nations report, the Serb side did not aim to restore Yugoslavia, but to create a "Greater Serbia" from parts of Croatia and Bosnia. According to the International Center for Transitional Justice the Yugoslav Wars resulted in the deaths of 140,000 people. The notorious characteristic of Yugoslav War was the "ethnic cleansing" which could be defined as a process or policy of eliminating unwanted ethnic or religious groups by deportation, forcible displacement, mass murder, rapes or by threats of such acts, with the intent of creating a territory inhabited by people of a homogeneous or pure ethnicity, religion, culture, and history. Vukovar and Škabrnja are going to be one of the places which history will remember as places of mass murders in Croatia and Srebrenica as a place of genocide in Bosnia.

Since ethnic animosity still exists in several places on former Yugoslavia (especially in Kosovo but also in Bosnia) the intention of this paper is to discover particular rhetorical strategies which political leaders used in the pre-war period during the 90's. The hope is that this will enable us to recognize similar strategies in the future and to anticipate and avoid possible conflicts.

## **2. War rhetoric – analysis of rhetorical argumentation**

*In social movements, persuasion is pervasive while violence is incidental and often employed for symbolic purposes. In civil wars and revolutions, violence is pervasive while persuasion is incidental.*  
Stewart, Smith, and Denton, Jr. (2001), *Persuasion in Social Movements*

In the context of war rhetoric which Booth (2005, p. 222) sees as "obviously a major subcategory of political rhetoric in general, which is in turn a sub branch of the vast domain of rhetoric and rhetorical studies in every area of life" this paper is interested in analyzing the rhetorical argumentation in the speeches of political leaders in pre-war period in former Yugoslavia. Booth further on explains (2005, p. 223): "As a branch of what Aristotle labeled "deliberative rhetoric," war rhetoric transforms our futures. Changing the present in order to change the future is everyone's political goal. Everybody knows that political argument changes our world day by day, often causing disasters and only sometimes preventing them. And war rhetoric is by far the most influential form of it." War rhetoric is often described as less rational and more emotional because it evokes passionate patriotic emotions and it is characterized with the rhetoric of confrontation and as Herbert W. Simons explains that the very *threat* of mass action is a key feature of rhetoric of confrontation: participants "threaten, harass, cajole, disrupt, provoke, intimidate, coerce. But they do so rhetorically. . . . It is not a strategy of aggression; it is a strategy of persuasion from a position of power in the form of a threat of mass action." (In Lucas, 2006, p. 11)

Understanding the techniques of persuasion in pre-war speeches—recognizing and analyzing those techniques—might help in understanding the political discourse of conflict and even perhaps help in avoiding them in the future.

Analysis of rhetorical argumentation which, according to Tindale (2004, p. 20) "draws features from the rhetorical tradition and mixes them with newer innovations" thought to be the best approach to discover specific rhetorical activities and dominant means of persuasion which influenced political happenings during the 90's. Writing on this tradition, Tindale (1999, p. 13) refers to Aristotelian distinctions between *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* as different means of persuasion.

“Since audiences are *affected* by the argument, they need to be appropriately disposed toward its ideas and strategies. This is a link to *pathos*. They also need to be so disposed toward the arguer. This is the link to *ethos*. In these terms, we can see that rhetorical argumentation is about context and that the context it is about includes essentially *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*.”

The research in this paper is interested in discovering persuasive force of speaker’s character and finding out rhetorical strategies on which *ethos* was build. Further on, the role of *pathos* is very important since rhetoric of war is always connected with emotional appeal or as Brinton (1988) calls it “pathic arguments”. Emotional appeals have important role in the rhetoric of war, they induce anger, pity, pride and all of the emotions are strongly connected with the willingness to act, to change behavior, to show solidarity and in the end even go to war. Should the appeal to emotions be considered as fallacious or should they be considered as legitimate part of argumentation? Aristotle (1999, p. 80) wrote about angry emotions in *Nicomachean Ethics* stating: “The man who is angry at the right things and with the right people, and further, as he ought, when he ought, and as long as he ought, is praised” and “those who are not angry at the things they should be angry at are thought to be fools”. Although, being emotional about certain issues and expressing passion are thought to be the qualities of a good speaker, Fahenstock and Secor (1990, p. 358) point out that:

“The good person who argues well may also be a sensitive person who has emotional conviction, who feels anger, pity, fear, or warmth over an issue. Such emotion can be conveyed to the reader as an aid to, though never a substitute for, rational conviction. As servant of the premises, emotion is conveyed in carefully chose words and examples.”

Emotions should not replace reason. Therefore, this analysis is trying to discover how did the speakers influence their audience and what rhetorical devices were dominantly used. In the evaluation of arguments it is important to take the argumentative situation into consideration because it represents the “dynamic ‘space’ in which arguer and audience interact, but interact in a way that makes them coauthors.” (Tindale, 2004, p. 23)

Based on the theoretical assumptions of the rhetoric of war and the historical situation it is expected that political leaders in the pre-war period in Yugoslavia would use appeals to emotions, especially appeal to angry emotions, appeal to fear and appeal to pity.

My research includes analysis of *logos* or the “argument” itself in the sense of discovering the dominant forms of argumentation and evidence which are used in support of argumentation.

### 3. Corpora for the analysis

This analysis was based on the speeches delivered by the prominent political leaders of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina and included two speeches of Slobodan Milošević, Vojislav Šešelj and Radovan Karadžić and also three speeches from Franjo Tuđman and Alija Izetbegović.

*Slobodan Milošević* was Serbian politician, President of Serbia (1989 – 1997) and President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1997 – 2000). He was charged by the International Criminal Tribunal for war crimes including accusations of genocide and crimes against humanity during the wars in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. Milošević died in 2006 in the UN war crimes tribunal's detention center in Hague.

*Vojislav Šešelj* is a Serbian politician, founder of the Serbian Radical Party and was a representative in Serbian Parliament. He was accused for crimes against humanity by International Criminal Tribunal. His trial is still ongoing and he has been in custody since 2003.

*Radovan Karadžić* was a leader of Bosnian Serbs during the war in Bosnia and was also a President of Republika Srpska (part of Bosnia inhabited mainly by Serbs). He sought the direct unification of that entity with Serbia. He was also accused for war crimes against Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats and for ordering Srebrenica massacre. He was arrested in 2008 and extradited to the International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia. He is still in custody in Hague.

*Franjo Tuđman* was the first President of Republic of Croatia and a founder of Croatian Democratic Party. He was a supreme commander of Croatian Army during the war in Croatia and Bosnia. After the war he was re-elected as a president and remained in power until his death in 1999.

*Alija Izetbegović* was Bosnian politician and the first President of Bosnia and Herzegovina until 1996 when he became the member of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He resigned from his duties in 2000 in the age of 74 due to illness. He died in 2003.

#### 4. Results and discussion

##### 4.1. Persuasion by ethos

*Ethos* as a mean of persuasion which is based on the credibility and character of the speaker could be considered as very important means of persuasion in political discourse because as Aristotle (1991, p.38) explains in *Rhetoric*. "There is persuasion through the character whenever the speech is spoken in such a way as to make the speaker worthy of credence; for we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly [than we do others] on all subjects in general and completely so in cases where there is not exact knowledge but room for doubt." As a sub branch of political rhetoric, persuasion based on *ethos* is emphasized in war rhetoric because the audience is expected to act on what they are persuaded to do. Having that in mind it is important to analyze the qualities that Aristotle considers to be contributing to ethos: practical wisdom (*phronesis*), virtue (*areté*) and goodwill (*eunomia*) as well as those that Leff (2003) writes about: embodiment, enactment, and evocation. Tindale (2004, p.21) explains Leff's dimensions of ethos:

What Leff demonstrates is that an arguer is not a simple predetermined author of argumentative texts in which he or she is uninvolved. The arguer is implicated in, and in ways constructed by, the text. Thus attention to ethos is important for appreciating the full nature of argumentative situations and for recognizing the importance of rhetorical argumentation over and against its logical and dialectical cousins.

Although there is a discrepancy in understanding ethos in the sense of preexisting image of the speaker and an image constructed through speech or as Amossy (2006:79) distinguishes it as discursive and prediscursive *ethos*, we will base our conception of *ethos* on the one that is constructed through speech using different rhetorical strategies but taking into account the preexisting reputation.

Slobodan Milošević as President of the Republic of Serbia had a strong preexisting image and a reputation as a protagonist of Serbian supremacy as well as a defender of the Serbian minority in other republics of the former Yugoslavia. One of the analyzed speeches was delivered at Kosovo in 1989 advocating more rights for Serbian minority among the majority Albanian ethnic group in Kosovo.

Starting his speech with the words *I am motivated by the pain that I see here but also inspired with hope* he is presenting himself as a speaker of goodwill, willing to help his people. Further on he states *We are facing disunion because leading Serbian politicians are favoring compromises which damage their own people. Our country has suffered enough* he thereby identifies himself with the "people in pain" and distances himself from other Serbian politicians. Using the pronouns *we* and *them* he is building what Leff (2003) calls embodiment because he embodies the values and interests of his audience and separates himself from the politicians which were advocating "compromises". The values which he shares with his audience are frequently repeated: glorification of Serbian people (*The Serbian people were always there to help the others and the fact that we are a great nation was never used to harm anyone else. The Serbian people were courageous, brave, ready to die for their country...*), the injustices that were done to Serbs during throughout history (*traitor politicians humiliated Serbian people, Europe forgot that Serbs were the ones protecting it from the Turkish conquests*) and by excluding himself from all the other Serbian politicians (*who are nothing more than servants of Western countries*). The main Milošević strategy was to distinguish himself from ordinary politicians, by claiming that he was the one who was not afraid to oppose Western European political leaders. By turning to history Milošević is building his ethos using the dimension of what Leff calls evocation. Remembering the courageous deeds of Serbs who fought a much larger Turkish army (*Six centuries ago Serbia was here, on this Kosovo field, and heroically fought and defended itself. But it also defended Europe. Serbia was on the edges of Europe protecting its culture, religion and heritage. That is why it is not only unjust but from historic point of view completely absurd to talk about Serbia belonging to Europe. Serbia has always been a part of Europe.*)

Through the speech Milošević is trying to present himself as a person of virtue and wisdom. He talks about "need for ethnic tolerance" and the "tragedy of ethnic conflicts" but at the same time emphasizes Serbian

supremacy (*We need tolerance, cooperation and even equality (...)*) but Serbs have to be leaders *because if they cannot be at the head, we will forever be in the back*).

A similar strategy was used by Radovan Karadžić, the leader of the Bosnian Serbs, glorifying Serbian conquests, their brave history and emphasizing the injustice that was done to them in the past while at the same time identifying himself with his audience. He talked about the killing of Serbs during the WWII and the suffering under the dictatorship of fascism, concluding *We had no peace from the time of rebellion against fascism in WWII because this job was never finished. I hope that with God's mercy this generation is going to finish it*. This is an example of evoking the past and constructing the relationship between speaker, audience and the society which calls for yet another rebellion, yet another war.

He presents his virtue by identifying himself with the Serbian audience which he presents with words *Everyone knows that Serbs are good people, simple farmers, people of Orthodox religion and Orthodox souls. But as God is our witness we have suffered enough, we are forced to fight; we have to save our houses*. Like Milošević he presents himself as a peaceful person who opposes conflict but is now forced into it. He advocates war but only because it is the sole remaining solution.

Glorifying its nation, culture, history, emphasizing the greatness of its people and identifying itself with the audience and nation is the strategy of building ethos used by the Bosnian president (Alija Izetbegović) and also by the Croatian president (Franjo Tuđman).

Franjo Tuđman talked about Croatian people who he described as a proud, brave people with dignity, but also peaceful people who want to solve the problems peacefully. But, he continued, *we are aware that we have to be strong, we have to create a force to defend our independence*. The main difference between Serbian on one side and Croatian and Bosnian political leaders on the other is emphasizing the need and desire for independence. The argumentative situation is of course connected with the historical situation in which Serbs were interested in the preservation of Yugoslavia (in the beginning) and then (later) in the creation of Greater Serbia (which included parts of Croatian and Bosnian territory). Croats and Bosnians opposed that political strategy and advocated dissolution of the existing political arrangements and a move to independence.

Alija Izetbegović stated *Bosnia is not going to stay on the remains of Yugoslavia and by saying Yugoslavia I mean Greater Serbia. We want unity of Bosnia*.

By supporting national independence he is presenting himself as a brave person who has only wellbeing of his people in mind.

#### **4.2. Persuasion by pathos**

*Pathos* is defined by Aristotle as "creating a certain disposition in the audience" and he states that "[There is persuasion] through the hearers when they are led to feel emotion [pathos] by the speech; for we do not give the same judgment when grieved and rejoicing or when being friendly and hostile. (Aristotle, 1991, p. 38)

Persuasion by appealing to emotion has an important role in rhetoric of war especially appealing to anger and fear and as Tindale (2004, p.21) emphasizes *pathos* "brings the audience into the picture and leads us to ask about the nature of audience and their role in the argumentative situation."

The political leaders whose speeches I will analyze delivered their speeches in different situation and for different audience and therefore they will be discussed separately.

Slobodan Milošević delivered his speech in 1989 at Gazimestan in Kosovo on the 600<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo Field. Members of his audience were mostly people from Kosovo but of Serbian ethnic background which were considered to be a minority in Kosovo. Both the speaker and his audience shared the same values and the same set of beliefs and commitments. They share the belief that Serbian people were the victims of injustice in Yugoslavia and especially in Kosovo: *There is probably no better place in our country to talk about harmony, solidarity and cooperation than is here, on Kosovo Field, which is a symbol of betrayal*. The battle of Kosovo field is an important part of Serbian history; some even say a basis of Serbian national identity. For centuries that historic event inspired many painters, writers and poets and it

became a national myth and even a synonym for the destruction of the Serbian state. Glorification of Serbian courage in that battle was the central topic of many folkloristic works. Yet, despite the Serbian courage in that battle, they were defeated. In his speech Milošević states: *The Battle of Kosovo is a symbol. A symbol of heroism. Many poems, literature are dedicated to that moment.* Returning to glorified history, the speaker is appealing to the emotion of pride. But he is doing so just to intensify emotion of anger that he expect will be aroused by the memory of the injustice and humiliation that the heroic nation of Serbians had to go through for six centuries. Milošević speaks about *traitor politicians who humiliated the Serbian people and who are servants of Western countries.* He states: *Our beautiful country has suffered enough (...) This is where you belong, your heart beats here, here are your houses, your gardens, your memories. You are not going to leave this country simply because it is a hard life here. It is not and never has been in the spirit of Serbian people to give up. You are not going to stand back when you have to fight.*

Brinton (1988, p. 81) talks about appeal to angry emotions or *Argumentum ad Indignationem*.

There are certain rhetorical phenomena which we may refer to as the "appeal to indignation," "appeal to anger," "appeal to envy," "appeal to enmity," "appeal to jealousy," and so on, at least one each for each identifiably distinguishable harsh emotion. These, we might say, when used on a crowd, are subspecies of the sort of rhetorical phenomenon for which the label "*ad populum*" seems appropriate.

Furher on, Brinton (1988, p.82) continues and explains the logical correctness of *Argumentum ad Indignationem*.

The logical correctness of an *argumentum ad indignationem* will be a matter of at least two things: (1) whether the reasons given for the emotion are good ones, whether the truth of certain propositions, namely those which are appealed to, would in fact justify the feelings which they are supposed to arouse; and (2) whether the degree or intensity of the emotional response (or intended emotional response) is appropriate to the reasons given, in the context of the rhetorical situation considered as a whole.

Having this explanation in mind we can conclude that *argumentum ad indignationem* frequently used by Slobodan Milošević was logically incorrect because the reasons allegedly supporting certain emotions were not good ones i.e. emphasizing Serbian superiority based on historical combats (which they in fact lost) and therefore the need for Serbians to be leaders of the multiethnic community. Because they do not feel they are now leaders he claims that they are *humiliated* and *without dignity*. Further on, he suggests that the intensity of the intended emotional response is also inadequate. Even though he does not explicitly call for war, "fighting" (an intentionally ambiguous term) is something he announces: *Today, six centuries after we are again in battles, before battles. This time battles are not fought with guns although they are not excluded. But no matter how we fight we are not going to win if we do not have courage, boldness and sacrifice.*

We can conclude that the dominant means of persuasion in speeches of Slobodan Milošević was appealing to pathos, *invoking* an emotion which according to Brinton (1988) means appealing to an emotion as a basis for action.

An even more drastic example of invoking emotions and appealing to anger are speeches of Vojislav Šešelj. He was more explicit and some historians even say that he said things that Milošević thought but because of the political consequences he might face could not. His speeches could be regarded as hate speeches, his performance was passionate, and qualifications he used reviled unresolved issues from Yugoslav past, primarily, referring to Croats as Usthashas which is the name of the Croatian fascist group during the WWII. They were associated with Nazis and were fighting against partisans and communists in Croatia. In one of his speeches in June 1990 he stated: *Vukovar is the biggest Ustasha's fort. We have to kill them all and after that they will have no chance in saving Osijek and Vinkovci.* Further on he stated: *I have a message for all the Ustasha's, we know that Serbian heads had been rolling. But have in mind: we will revenge Serbian blood.*

Similarly to Milošević but more explicit, he refers to the past (usually WWII) in which Croats killed Serbs. He is appealing to anger claiming that the crimes were unpunished and the time has come for the revenge. His appeals to anger are also logically incorrect because given reasons are not good ones. Some historical facts are left out (for instance, killings of Croats and their families in Bleiburg in 1945) and the fact that 50 years passed from the ending of WWII imposing the question to whom they might revenge.

Suffering of Serbian people in Bosnia is the core of Radovan Karadžić speeches delivered in 1991 and 1992: *Serbian people have suffered enough. A killing of Serbs in WWII was unpunished. We have to revenge them.* Radovan Karadžić was the leader of Serbian entity in Bosnia and Herzegovina and therefore most of his hostility was aimed at the Muslim entity: *Muslims do not think that our political solution is good. Well, then we will have to crash them.*

The common feature of Serbian political leaders is appealing to angry emotions, evoking memories on the events in history when injustice was done on Serbian people. Those events were never corroborated with real historic facts, evidence or any logical support but were recognized as something the speaker and the audience share, some kind to collective memory spread by heroic poems, folklore etc. Speaker and the audience share the same value system which made analyzed speeches effective and persuasive for specific audience. As Bench-Capon (2002) writes arguments derive their force from the values they promote. There are no value free arguments. Of course, they do not appear alone in argumentation. They appear in value systems – values are linked together and reflect unified system. Based on shared value system, presented arguments were persuasive which confirms the importance of audience profiling, importance of knowing your audience, their beliefs and knowledge. As Perelman and Olbrecht-Tyteca (1969, p.30) write:

Thus the nature of the audience to which arguments can be successfully presented will determine to a great extent both the direction the arguments will take and the character, the significance that will be attributed to them.

Croatian political leader Franjo Tuđman in his speeches in 1990 and 1991 also used *pathos* as a mean of persuasion but he was not dominantly appealing to the emotions of anger or at least not explicitly. Primarily he was appealing to the emotions of pride: *We created unity, we created our long desired dream. We have aroused hope, pride, we achieved national independence. Finally we can solely decide on our destiny.*

Angry emotions are appealed to only when stating that someone wants to destroy what was accomplished but emotions are not intensive: *We are aware that we have to create a force and defend our independence.* More emotionally intensive is his referring to enemies (without nominalization): *Some who are not friends of Croatia say that we are to blame for this war. Well, yes if war means not giving up on our dream to create independent Croatia.* Independence of the country is a value that speaker shares with his audience and persuasiveness of his arguments derive from that value. As Perelman and Olbrecht-Tyteca (1969, p. 74) write:

Agreement with regard to a value means an admission that an object, a being, or an ideal must have a specific influence on action and on disposition toward action and that one can make use of this influence in an argument.

Politically more complicated is the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina because the country is integrated of three entities: Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Croats and Muslims.

Further more, argumentative situation is also complicated because Bosnian leader Alija Izetbegović delivered his speech in 1991 in Bosnian Parliament constituted from the representatives of all entities. Therefore, he did not have homogenous audience as all the other speakers. In his speech he is appealing to emotions, primarily compassion but aiming at the Serbian representatives reminding them how generous and proud nation they were: *We hope that Serbians are going to return to their democratic tradition by which they were known and recognized worldwide. This, what is happening today does not serve to the honor of Serbian people, threatening and intimidating. Muslim nation is not going to vanish, I promise that.* Recognizing the difficulty of speaking in front of heterogeneous audience with which he has a dispute, he chooses appeal to their compassion and prevents hostility toward Muslim people.

The second analyzed speech was delivered at the founding assembly of his political party. His audience was Bosnian Muslims gathered in the same political party. Alija Izetbegović stated: *I am certain that I speak for all Bosnian Muslims when I say we are not going to allow destruction of Bosnian state. Shameful agreement dating from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century which divided our county is now dead. The new strength is evolving in this room, right now.* Equality of Bosnian Muslims in multiethnic community was value that speaker and his audience shared.

Based on the results of analyzed speeches it can be concluded that the difference between political rhetoric and war rhetoric as its sub branch is in the dominance of emotional appeal and intensity of invoked emotions. Importance of *ethos* is not neglected but persuasion by *pathos* is more dominant and more effective in the speeches delivered in pre-war period in former Yugoslavia political discourse.

#### **4.3. Persuasion by logos**

Aristotle (1991, p. 39) writes: "Persuasion occurs through the arguments [*logoi*] when we show the truth or the apparent truth from whatever is persuasive in each case." Analysis of political speeches in the pre-war period in former Yugoslavia showed lack of rational argumentation. Argumentation which Rieke and Sillars (2001, p. 2) define as: "communicative process of advancing, supporting, criticizing and modifying claims so that appropriate decision makers, defined by relevant spheres, may grant or deny adherence." Relevant decision makers in political discourse is audience, they are expected to decide wheatear to trust the politicians (and vote for them), adopt the claim or to take a demanding action (which is the case of war rhetoric).

The claim of Croatian and Bosnian political leaders was that their countries have to leave Yugoslavia and become independent countries while Serbian politicians demanded remaining of Yugoslavia. One of the frequently used rhetorical techniques was redefining terms, using persuasive definitions which Macagano and Walton (2008) describe as the technique of changing the emotional meaning of a term, leaving unaltered its denotative meaning. Term which was redefined was Yugoslavia. Bosnian president Alija Izetbegović defied it as *Great Serbia, a community in which Serbs change borders and rule over the most of the territory treating other nations as minorities*. Croatian president Franjo Tuđman defined Yugoslavia as *a historic deception which promised equality to all nations but turn out to be a communist hell*.

Although analyzed speeches show serious lack of support for the claims i.e. usage of facts (true historic facts), documents, laws or any sort of valid reasoning, speeches are rich in figures of speech. Can we see figures of speech as arguments? Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969, p. 169) write:

We consider a figure to be *argumentative*, if it brings about a change of perspective, and its use seems normal in relation to this new situation. If, on the other hand, the speech does not bring about the adherence of the hearer to this argumentative form, the figure will be considered an embellishment, a figure of style. It can excite admiration, but this will be on aesthetic plane, or in recognition of the speaker's originality.

Croatian president Franjo Tuđman frequently used prolepsis which we consider to be an argument. When stating: *They are insinuating that we want the renewal of Croatian Independent State, that we are Ustashas but let me say one thing. Croats were fighting fascism, Croats were partisans*. In his speech he is reacting to the objections to Croatian independence and accusations that Croats are returning to fascist state from the period of WWII.

Frequently used argument in analyzed speeches of Bosnian president Alija Izetbegović was slippery slope. Groarke and Tindale (2013, p. 279) write:

Slippery-Slope argument is one that shows either (1) that an action should not be performed or allowed because it will begin a causal chain leading to an undesirable consequences or (2) that an action should be performed or allowed because it will begin a chain of causes leading to desirable end. A good slippery-slope argument must be founded on a plausible causal chain and an acceptable claim about what is or is not desirable.

When Alija Izetbegović in 1991 speaks about possibility of hundreds of dead, he is making a good slippery slope argument because he is relying on plausible consequences. *The only solution of this crisis is democracy. Alternative is hundreds and hundreds of dead people. (...) Bosnia knows what war is and what peace is. But the war in today's Bosnia would be total war resulting with three bleeding nations*. The consequences were plausible not just from today's perspective but because Alija Izetbegović was basing this arguments on the previous historic events and saying *we know what war is* and his presumption on the extent of the war in Bosnia was justifiable.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper was based on a descriptive approach to rhetorical argumentation of political speeches in pre-war period in former Yugoslavia. Referring to the three traditional means of persuasion: *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos* analysis aimed to determine which mean of persuasion was dominant. It can be concluded that *pathos* or appealing to emotions especially appealing to angry emotions was dominant in majority of speeches. *Ethos* was important and was based on preexisting credibility of the speakers. Strategies of building ethos during the speech was identification of the speaker with his audience, glorifying his nation, presenting himself as a person interested in wellbeing of his audience fighting against injustice in the past (Serbian politicians), fighting for independence and preserving the long wanted dream (Croatian and Bosnian politicians). Lack of rational reasoning in all speeches, lack of support for the claims is common characteristic for all speakers. Although, the paper is, as mentioned before, based on descriptive approach, a normative component must be emphasized. Countries of former Yugoslavia which were living in communism and do not have long democratic tradition need rhetorical as well as critical thinking education. Audience is the one which allows or does not allow hate speeches, emotional appeals which lead to war conflicts.

It is known from the ancient Greek orators that if you wish so change the speaker, first you have to change the audience. Demosten (in Perelman and Olbrecht-Tyteca, 1969, p. 24) struggling against demagogu directs his speech to audience:

Your orators never make you either bad man or good, but you make them whichever you choose; for it is not you that aim at what they wish for, but they to aim at whatever they think you desire. You therefore must start with a noble ambition and all will be well, for then no orator will give you base counsel, or else he will gain nothing by it, having no one to take him at his word.

Although emotional appeals are frequent in political speeches and are not illegitimate in argumentative discourse, rhetorical education and critical thinking will help to distinguish between manipulation and passion of the speaker. As Groarke (2011:679) writes:

In the course of making and judging arguments we are continually enmeshed in emotionally charged situations in which desires, fears, anxieties, prejudices, hopes, pleasures, etc. may interfere with our ability to judge what is true or false. In such circumstances, the crux of careful thinking may be an effort to distance ourselves from our emotional inclinations: to stand back and judge a situation "objectively." We might distinguish between proper and improper appeals to emotion, and proper and improper uses of argument in emotive contexts (..)

Final goal of this research is to show how much influence did rhetoric had on unfortunate happenings in the countries of former Yugoslavia during the 1990`s and how rhetoric can help prevent repeating the same mistake.

## References

- Amossy, R. La notion d'ethos de la rhétorique à l'analyse de discours. Amossy, R. (ed.). *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'ethos. Lausanne*. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, (1999): 9-30.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing co, 1999.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (translated George A. Kennedy). New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Bench-Capon, Trevor J. M. "Value-based argumentation frameworks", *Proceeding of: 9th International Workshop on Non-Monotonic Reasoning*, April 19-21, Toulouse, France (2002): 443-454.
- Booth, Wayne. "War Rhetoric, Defensible and Indefensible", *A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture and Politics* 25, 2 (2005): 221-244.
- Brinton, Alan. "Appeal to Angry Emotions", *Informal Logic*, X.2 (1988): 77-87

- Carey, Christopher. "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion". In *Esseys on Aristotle`s Rhetoric*, edited by Ameilie Oksenberg Rorty, 399-416, Berkley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Fahenstock, Jeanne and Marie Secor. *A Rhetoric of Argument* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1990.
- Groarke, Leo. Emotional Arguments: Ancient and Contemporary Views. In *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* edited by Frans H. van Eemeren, Bart Garssen, David Godden and Gordon Mitchell, 677-687, Amsterdam: Rozenberg / Sic Sat
- Groarke, Leo and Christopher Tindale. *Good Reasoning Matters! A Constructive Approach to Critical Thinking* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed) Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Holbrooke, Richard. *To End A War*. New York: Modern Library, 1999.
- Leff, Michael. "Rhetoric and dialectic in Martin Luther King`s *Letter from Birmingham Jail*" In *Anyone who has a view: Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation*, edited by Frans van Eemeren et al. 255-268. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Macagno, Fabrizio and Douglas Walton. (2008). Persuasive Definitions: Values, Meanings and Implicit Disagreements. *Informal Logic* 28,3 (2008): 203-228.
- Oksenberg Rorty, Amelie. "Structuring Rhetoric". In *Esseys on Aristotle`s Rhetoric*, edited by Ameilie Oksenberg Rorty, 34-56, Berkley: University of California Press
- Perelman, Chaim and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame-London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Rieke, D. Richard and Malcom O. Sillars. *Argumentation and Critical Decision Making*. (5<sup>th</sup> Ed). New York: Longman, 2001.
- Simons, W. Herbert. "Requirements, Problems and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements". In *Readings on Rhetoric of Social Protests* edited by Charles E. Morris III and Stephen Howard Browne, Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, Incorporated, 2001.
- Stewart, Charles and Craig Allan Smith and Robert E. Denton Jr. *Persuasion and Social Movements* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed). Illinois: Waveland Press, 2001.
- Tindale W. Christopher. *Acts of Arguing: A Rhetorical Model of Argument*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Tindale W. Christopher. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications, 2004.
- Vejvoda, Ivan. "Why did War happened?" In *The Violent Dissolution of Yugoslavia – causes, dynamics and effects*, edited by Miroslav Hadžić. Belgrade: Centre for Civil-Military Relations-Goragraf, 2004.