Katarina Petrovićová
Masaryk University, Brno
ORCID 0000-0003-3621-7474

US AND THEM.
THE ROLE OF PERSUASIVE AND MANIPULATIVE STRATEGIES IN CREATION OF PUBLIC ENEMIES

Cicero owed his formidable career success in politics especially to his outstanding rhetorical skills, which won him, as a *homo novus*, the much needed attention and appreciation. In particular, Cicero's ability to create an impenetrable barrier between the persons concerned in his speeches and the rest of the auditorium does not diminish in its importance and power despite the time that has passed since; and thus provides the basis for the following study concerning the rhetorical skills in politics. In this study I would like to find out how effective this particular skill can be in the current political context, and if, and how, it is related to the of rhetoric appropriateness principle. Due to the limitations posed by the scope of one study, it was necessary to limit our discussion to the concrete personages; for the purposes of comparison I have therefore found an appropriate counterpart to Cicero in a successful, even iconic politician of the modern history of the Czech Republic, our current president Miloš Zeman, whose discourse has been considered to be dominated by the same rhetorical quality. I intend first to describe the rhetorical qualities of both and, consequently, to show their differences between them and their use of persuasive, or manipulative strategies. Finally, I would like to discuss the topic of public enemies, that is closely linked to the persuasive and manipulative practices.

One of the main criteria of rhetoric, both ancient and modern, is the appropriateness of speeches (cf. e.g. Aristotle's definition of rhetoric[1]). This refers to the capability of balancing the ratio between (from the structuralist point of view) the informative, formative, and aesthetic function[2] and to the three goals formulated by Cicero in his dialogue *Brutus* (185): *Tria sunt enim, ut quidem ego sentio, quae sint efficienda dicendo: ut doceatur is apud quem dicetur, ut delectetur, ut moveatur vehementius.* The persuasive category is further specified in Cicero's perhaps most significant rhetorical treatise *De oratore* (2.115)[3] by another triad, structurally corresponding with the previous

---

[1] Arist. *Rhet.* 1,2 (1355b14): "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion".

[2] Mukařovský 1948: 38-40; cf. Petrů 2000: 13f.

[3] Cic. *De orat.* 2.115: *Ita omnis ratio dicendi tribus ad persuadendum rebus est nixa: ut probemus vera esse ea quae defendimus, ut conciliemus eos nobis qui audiunt, ut animos eorum ad quemcumque causa postulabit motum vocemus.*

triad and concerning the virtues of speech: 1) the ability to prove the truthfulness of the speech; 2) the ability to win the favour of the audience; 3) the ability to induce a desired reaction, to activate the audience (in Aristotelian tradition, these are called logos, ethos, and pathos). In classical tradition, as Cicero also witnesses (*De orat.* 1.34[4]), the quality of appropriateness also touches orator's internal attitude, another aspect which transgresses the borders of verbal expression and which is supposed to fulfil the criteria of wisdom and moderateness.

Current theory of political rhetoric operates with several linguistic currents, some of which examine rhetorical address as a social phenomenon (e.g. critical discourse analysis by Norman Fairclough[5]) or pragmatic feature (Austin and Searle's speech acts, Paul Grice's cooperative principle and, finally, Jeoffrey Leech's politeness principle) while others perceive it as a mental, cognitive, or generative process (influenced and inspired by Noam Chomsky); the unified theoretical approach to the language and politics is, however, missing from the debate[6].

The aforementioned ancient category of rhetorical appropriateness forms the basis for my analysis, and, in my opinion, corresponds with the maxims defined in the Cooperative Principle of Paul Grice (maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner[7]) as well as with Leech's addition to this theory called the maxims of Politeness principle (the tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy maxims[8]). In terms of these, one can distinguish the intentional violation of rules for the purposes of manipulation.

At this moment it is necessary to differentiate between persuasion and manipulation. Persuasion has been an intricate part of argumentation ever since Aristotle's times[9], be it a positive (containing truth/good at least as a desired goal[10]), or an ethically neutral category (in which the evaluation depends on speaker's intentions[11]). Manipulation, on the contrary, is regarded as a dispensable and negative category, to put it briefly, as a "perversion of persuasion"[12]. This consists in observing the inten-

---

[4] Cic. *De orat.* 1.34: *Ac ne plura quae sunt paene innumerabilia consecter, comprehendam brevi: sic enim statuo, perfecti oratoris moderatione et sapientia non solum ipsius dignitatem sed et privatorum plurimorum et universae rei publicae salutem maxime contineri.*

[5] See Fairclough 1989.

[6] Chilton 2004: Xf.

[7] Grice 1975: 41-58

[8] Leech 1983: 79-151.

[9] See above mentioned Arist. *Rhet.* 1355.b14 (Note 1).

[10] See Gass and Siter 2015: 3f. Cf. also e.g. McGinnis 1985: 20f., and esp. Ross 1994: 2: "Democracies use thoughtful ethical persuasion whenever they elect leaders, establish laws, or try to protect their citizens."

[11] Cf. Gass and Siter 2015: 358f.

[12] Hoffeld 2018.

tions of an individual or a group, but not of the target group of the listeners, or, in other words, in coercion and distortion or concealment of truth.

To be able to distinguish between persuasive and manipulative speech, I have taken into account the following: firstly the appropriate application of rhetorical means; secondly the significant representation of particular vocabulary; and finally, the implementation of the so-called manipulative techniques and framing, as defined by scholars analyzing media.

Rhetorical skills are based on the appropriate application of rhetorical means. In political discourse, orators most frequently incorporate alliteration, anaphor or repetition (including lists, especially in triads), parallelism or contrasting pairs, rhetorical questions or suggestive answers, simile, metaphor, allusion (i.e. an indirect or casual reference to historical or literary figures, events, or objects), and quotation[13]. Pronouns specific for certain purposes, such as clarification or concealment of elements, and remarks favourable to us and, at the same time, unfavourable to them are often used, too.

For the purposes of differentiation between persuasion and manipulation, the vocabulary is studied at the elementary level as well, particularly its ability to construct a "presented world", or "our part of the world" in political propaganda texts[14]. "Seven fundamental properties" of importance, proximity, universality, legitimacy, necessity, coherence, progress/permanence are being recognised. Additionaly, implication and contact words are being studied in this context as well. Manipulation is being considered in case the individual categories are being overused[15]. In terms of the vocabulary, expressive terms are crucial to the analysis of the phenomenon of the public enemy as well; I will classify those at a later point.

Finally, manipulative techniques are examined nowadays, especially when it comes to the media. The fundamental criteria observed are as follows: putting the blame on somebody else, fabrication, labelling, appealing to one's fear, author's opinion in the news, relativization, demonization, manipulative video, manipulative picture, unfounded statements, selective choice, and lies[16]. I will exclude the criteria irrelevant for the antiquity, i.e. author's opinion in news, manipulative video, and manipulative picture.

---

[13] Atkinson 1984: passim. In his analysis of political speeches, Atkinson focuses on inclusive / exclusive and approving / disapproving pronouns, lists of three, contrasts, rhetorical questions which he considers to be the most frequent rhetorical means. David 2014: 164–170, adds more of them.

[14] Introduced by Jerzy Bralczyk (Bralczyk 1987: 116).

[15] See the whole chapter "Językowy kształt świata propagandy", Bralczyk 1987: 116-216; and its summary at pp. 232-235.

[16] The categories studied here are taken from Gregor and Vejvodová 2017: 4f. Cf. also instructive analysis of manipulative techniques in general: Beck 2005.

The so-called framing must be added to the aforementioned criteria. In Entman's definition: "To frame is to *select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation* for the item described."[17] For the needs of this analysis, it will be understood as a negative framing of certain people or groups of people.

The individual speech of an orator, to some extent, contains manipulation, as it represents a personal view of an individual on a certain topic. Thus, it cannot be judged on the basis of the same criteria as a reporting speech. However, it can be assessed according to the evaluating criteria of manipulation.

Now let us move on to Cicero in particular. I presume that his rhetorical skills do not have to be presented here; I would only like to remind you (based on the exordium to his famous speech *Against Catiline*) of his masterful evocation of grave atmosphere as well as the exemplary picture of a public enemy.

In the introduction to his speech, Cicero uses rhetorical means, as regards both lexical and syntactic levels which invoke certain mental images and which he verbalizes the very next moment. The speech is delivered to the Senate, while Catilina is addressed in the very first sentence in an apostrophe (as I will show later, the potential objection that he was one of the senators is not plausible). The series of rhetorical questions (an open-ended triad[18] is followed by a double closed-ended triad[19]) create a picture of a clear border between "you", a lunatic furious conspirator similar to a runaway horse, and "we", the patient, temperate, and seemingly passive senators, supposed defenders of state. Simultaneously, Cicero implicitly tightens the noose around Catilina's neck by disclosing the conspiracy (the tightening is conveyed both in terms of time, towards the previous preparations and plans of the conspirators, and in terms of space, moving from the Senate throughout the whole city back to the present session, including the persons concerned). The disclosure is verbally referred to, or rather blown up, only in the next pair of mutually parallel rhetorical questions[20]. As for the language means used, it is truly a verbal storm accompanied by anaphors, acoustically distinctive sounds, asyndetic connection of syntactic constituents, and increasing lengthening of the particular parts of sentences which culminates in a suggestive exclamation full

---

[17] ENTMAN 1993: 52. (*Italics* are kept according to original.)

[18] CIC. *Cat.* 1,1: *Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? Quam diu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet? Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia?*

[19] CIC. *Cat.* 1,1: *Nihilne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium, nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora voltusque moverunt?*

[20] CIC. *Cat.* 1,1: *Patere tua consilia non sentis, constrictam iam horum omnium scientia teneri coniurationem tuam non vides? Quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris, ubi fueris, quos convocaveris, quid consilii ceperis, quem nostrum ignorare arbitraris?*

of indignation. Cicero's grievance is then made objective by the transgression to the neutral third person[21]. His final statement reminds us again of the imminent danger by the metonymy of throw javelins. The negatively perceived patience, i.e. passivity, of the Senate, is put into contrast with conspirator's activity that is compared to plague and demands a single possible answer, death penalty[22].

From the further parts of the speech, I would like to note the emphasis on the existence of a relevant authoritative decision (*senatus consultum ultimum*) and the ironical rebuke of the impotence or unwillingness to apply it (*Cat.* 2,4). Moreover, one can observe very expressive metaphoric phrases and comparisons powered by epithets like *pestis* (*taetra, horribilis, infesta, Cat.* 5,11; see also 1,2 and 12,30/33), *intestina pernicies* (2,5), *consultum tamquam in vagina reconditum* (2,4), *Etruriae fauces* (2,5), *luce sunt clariora… consilia* (3,6), *orbis terrarum exitio* (3,9); Cicero's thundering stroke in the introduction to the argumentation part of the speech appealing to Catilina's leaving (*Cat.* 5,10) and, finally, his emotional dialogue with the personified Republic (11,27ff.). The use of rhetorical questions and the lists of three, as well as the contrasting technique (the use of contrasts) is a common feature in Cicero's speeches in general; however, these are even more prominent in his speech against Catilina.

Miloš Zeman has a reputation of an outstanding, excellent orator[23], who is capable to convey his ideas clearly and extempore. As a sample speech, I chose (for the sake of better comparability) his two speeches delivered, within a year's distance, at the 70th and 71st sessions of the United Nations' (further UN) General Assembly. I have found the speeches given at the UN's General Assembly as comparable to Cicero's speech against Catilina, given the high standing of the audience as well as the language criteria (the speeches were delivered in English). In the fall of 2017, the third speech was delivered at the United Nations, however, this I include for the sake of completeness, as in my analysis it will be dealt with only briefly[24].

The first speech starts with a general statement (a popular bon mot) saying that he, as a good speaker, is going to cling to one topic and be brief[25] (this is typical: most of Zeman's speeches are introduced by a reference to brevity as a sign of an in-

---

[21] Cɪᴄ. *Cat.* 1,2: *O tempora, o mores! Senatus haec intellegit. Consul videt; hic tamen vivit. Vivit? immo vero etiam in senatum venit, fit publici consilii particeps, notat et designat oculis ad caedem unum quemque nostrum.*

[22] Cɪᴄ. *Cat.* 1,2: *Nos autem fortes viri satis facere rei publicae videmur, si istius furorem ac tela vitemus. Ad mortem te, Catilina, duci iussu consulis iam pridem oportebat, in te conferri pestem, quam tu in nos omnes iam diu machinaris.*

[23] Cf. e.g. STEM/MARK 2015: 5 and 44; Fᴇɴᴅʀʏᴄʜ 2013; or ČTK ᴀɴᴅ Kᴜʙɪšᴛᴏᴠᴀ́ 2016.

[24] All speeches cited here are available at the Prague Castle website, which is the official webpage of the President of the Czech Republic (www.hrad.cz/cs and www.hrad.cz/en). For the elected speeches, see Zᴇᴍᴀɴ 2015, Zᴇᴍᴀɴ 2016A and Zᴇᴍᴀɴ 2017.

[25] Zᴇᴍᴀɴ 2015: "If you have *many* topics in your *short* speech, you have none; and if you have *many* priorities in your speech, you have also none. So let me concentrate on *one* topic and *one* prior-

telligent and entertaining speaker); the use of an anaphor and the altogether parallel statement in the very first sentence is also typical. The second sentence is contrasted with the first one and proceeds right away to the main topic of the speech, terrorism. The choice of the topic is explained by a rhetorical question put into the mouth of the auditorium[26]; it defines terrorism as a humiliation and a threat to humanity and puts it into a direct link with migration wave as the result of terrorism. The following passage is ironical-amusing[27]; however, the perceived lightening only dramatizes the speech. At the same time, the first actual fact, the name of the contemporary Al-Qaeda leader (i.e. Al-Baghdadi) is stated, which is something president Zeman likes doing. The triadic list reveals illusions connected to terrorism and opposes these. This is done firstly by comparing terrorism to cancer and a list of growing dangers (reference to collapsed states and violence), the latter being objectivized as undeniable; and secondly, by associating Islamic State with all other Muslim terrorist organizations led by the Muslim Brotherhood, while this information, too, is objectivized by pointing out two confidential sources from the highest ranks of Arab politics ("two outstanding politicians from the Arab world"). Finally, Zeman calls for a coordinated attack of a new kind against terrorism led by the UN using the latest technology. To further strengthen his point, he gives a list of the series of terrorist attacks all around the world and creates a contrast between the terrorists and the pirates (low danger led to UN's involvement, whereas the big one does not). He refers to the dormant articles of the UN Charter ("the sleeping structures") and asks for their awakening as well as for a clear resolution by the UN (together with the practical establishment of the "ranger" units of Blue Helmets). Zeman concludes his speech by self-ironizing himself as a historical optimist and generalizes his proposal as a buffoonery which, however, might become reality in a couple of years. In this part, we frequently find comparisons ("commandos", "rangers", or comparison of his statement to the "the Earth moving around the Sun"), metaphors and metonymies ("the small Blue Helmets", "nerve centres"), while rhetorical figures are used less often.

His second speech draws on the first one; therefore, it starts with a reference to it and a selective choice of events that happened between the two speeches (terrorist attacks). The general assumption of the growing terrorism communicated in the

---

ity only – the fight against the international terrorism." (Anaphor and parallels are underlined; brevity is marked by *Italics*.)

[26] ZEMAN 2015: "You may ask why just the president of a small Central European country speaks about terrorism."

[27] ZEMAN 2015: "It is wonderful to criticize terrorism, it is wonderful to organize demonstrations and manifestations against terrorism, and it is nice to prepare the declaration protesting against terrorism. Al-Baghdadi reading those declarations will be careful, I am sure."

first speech is objectivized and reinforced by the actual numbers[28], while the same principle is applied for the metaphor of cancer which is further developed through the differentiation between tumors and metastases[29]. The introductory paragraph culminates in the three 'Catilinarian' questions: 'How long...'[30]. Furthermore, he brings forward three terrorist perils not yet mentioned: the threat of a new Islamic State in Afghanistan, the radicalization of population (compared to the pre-Hitler Germany situation[31]), and especially the reluctance of the UN to adopt any measures. To exploit the last peril even more, he reminds the audience of the long-term inability to legally define the international platform of the UN for the fight against terrorism and ironizes the situation as well as the legal experts involved.[32] He himself regards the legal definition as trivial which he declares through a movie allusion to Holmes': "Elementary". Other theses of the previous speech are repeated, specified with data, and emphasized, too, which leads to the exhortatory exclamation: "let us wake up", further strengthened by rhetorical questions aimed at possible consequences of the passive approach and a Latin quotation "Ceterum autem censeo Carthaginem esse delendam". In the conclusion, the quotation is turned into a joke[33] to soften the dramatic and, to a certain extent, also reproachful nature of the speech.

The third speech of Miloš Zeman is the shortest of the three. In its opening passage he refers to two publications, those of Francis Fukuyama and Samuel Huntington, which both had significant impact in the nineties; Zeman never fails to put them against one another[34], and to interpret the conclusions of the preferred Huntington's book in relation to Islamic terrorism. In doing so, he goes back to the topic of the two preceding speeches. He reiterates his previous statements on the general lack of action on the part of the UN, however, this time he also praises the UN for having established the UN Office of Counter-Terrorism (effective from June 15, 2017). He

---

[28] Zeman 2016a: "One year ago, I warned here against the spreading of international terrorism. What has happened after only 1 year? Paris, Brussels., Dhaka, Istanbul, Orlando, Munich, Nice, and New York again. A few years ago, the number of countries which were influenced by Islamic terrorism were only 6. Now it is 35".

[29] Zeman 2016a: "So, the Islamic state is something like a cancer, but it is not only the tumor. Many cancers have metastases which are more dangerous than the tumor itself".

[30] Zeman 2016a: "How long are we to wait? How long are we to convey the condolences only? How long are we only to express our declarations of solidarity?".

[31] Zeman 2016a: "Well, let me give you one unpleasant example. In the 30s of the last century in Germany, there was also quite and stable population, and very cultivated population, the nation of Goethe and Schiller. In a few years, this very decent nation became fanatic Nazis. In just a few years".

[32] Zeman 2016a: "And international lawyers have been discussing this problem for 16 years. Thanks god I am not an international lawyer".

[33] Zeman 2016a: "And deep in my heart, I do believe that we shall overcome the international terrorism, not Cartago some day".

[34] The contrast has been used in his speeches many times, e.g. June 27, 2011 during the conference of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, September 30, 2016 during the conference Dialogue of Civilizations at Rhodes, June 29, 2017 during the debate on TV Barrandov.

considers this step as crucial, however, once again, he does not fail to criticize the UN for housing "38 anti-terrorist organizations or institutions", reinforced by the triple repetition of the number mentioned, as well as by an exclamatory "Good heavens!" remark[35]. Following the thread on terrorism, he introduces the migration topic, which he sees both as a consequence of, and a part of, the wave of terrorism. He further sees migration as a threat not only to Europe, but also to the original homelands of the migrants. The speech, non-ironically, results in three optimistic quotations; namely the spontaneous reactions of the Barcelona citizens to the terrorist attacks, Roosevelt's proclamation, and the words incorrectly attributed to Martin Luther.

I will now return to Cicero and analyze his speech from the point of view of manipulative techniques. From these, the most relevant for Cicero's text are those which serve to accentuate the real threat. There is no doubt that Cicero demonizes Catiline and frames him exclusively negatively, which he does by using the strongest expressions invoking sense of fear and general imperilment (the metonymy of plague, blemish, disgrace, the corruption and conflagration of the whole world, murder of all citizens). From the aforementioned "fundamental properties" of the presented world, expressions of proximity (*nos*, i.e. senators, versus *tu*), importance (*tam*, *multi*), universality (*omnes*, *undique*, *orbis terrarum*) and necessity (*oportebat*) are widely used. To a lesser extent, but still quite often, the implication (*nam, etenim, igitur*) is employed. Moreover, the emotional personified dialogues of Catiline with his homeland (with a lovely oxymoron *tacita loquitur*) and of Cicero with the Republic are on the verge of manipulation. Nevertheless, in case of Catiline's conspiracy, the conspirators really attempted a violent coup and were disclosed, i.e. Cicero had plenty of real evidence and testimonies he could use in the speech. There are no explicit lies in the speech and the information given, as far as we can judge nowadays, is not selective (the selection is limited to several historical cases used as model situations by Cicero). In addition, Cicero speaks as a consul and a senator; thus, even in the real Plural, he presents his private opinion, in particular, while general statements are found only in exclamations.

Speeches of Miloš Zeman are, unlike Cicero's speech, based to a large degree on general assumptions and expertly sounding statements; the role of "I" is very strong in these ("I /do not/ recommend", "I am sure", "I warned"), whereas speaker's opinions are presented in an impersonal way compared to Cicero (e.g. "why just the president of a small Central European country speaks about terrorism", "there are three illusions concerning the terrorism"). These objectivizing strategies are further affirmed by the verbal phrases expressing necessity, such as "we cannot deny", "what we need", "we need to seek", "we must admit", "we must attack", or "there is a necessity". Apart

---

[35] Zeman 2017.

from the necessity, other properties of the presented world are quite abundant as well, most often those of coherence and legitimacy. Generally, Miloš Zeman maintains a good contact with his audience by means of contact words and implications ("as you know" being his most frequent parenthesis[36]); however, this is not so apparent in the selected speeches due to their very official nature[37]. Miloš Zeman's choice of vocabulary suggests the imitation of a very formal, almost scholarly, style; he uses words like "historical fluctuations", "assassinations", "annihilation", "consequence", "to eliminate", "to reduce", "to activate", "diffusion of terrorism", "coordinated action", "precedent", "permanent", "standard form", "unilateral actions", "disputable", "evident", "extremisation", "radicalisation", "population", "intentionally", "the spreading of radicalism, terrorism and fanaticism", "failed countries" (the proper term in English is "failed states"), "anti-civilisation", "brain drain". Technical language appears also in the form of lists: president states "two reasons", enumerates "three illusions", "three phases", and "three main risks". To support the general statements and to make his speech more credible, he incorporates factual references and accurate data, too[38]. Yet, the examples he uses are, at the same time, the biggest pitfall of both speeches, as they are only rarely accurate and grounded. Nevertheless, most of the audience could not verify the data on the spot.

For instance, it is very oversimplifying to grasp the migration wave as a direct consequence of terrorist actions in the Middle East and Africa. It is similarly deceiving to argue the existence of an interconnected terrorist network on the basis of listing mutually distinct terrorist organizations and classifying them under the multi-layered reformatory religious movement which is not ruled centrally (the deception is made complete by the 'guaranteed' origin of the information, the two outstanding politicians from the Arab world)[39]. The enumeration of big terrorist attacks starting with the one at the World Trade Centre is, no doubt, impressive but the problem is that incomparable events are put on the same level here. Although I definitely do not want to justify any terrorist act, I suppose that the attacks carried out as protests against oppression do not fall in the same category, especially when it comes to the region of

---

[36] See Kůsová 2015: 29.
[37] Specific instances characteristic of Zeman's speech are less frequent in the afore analyzed speeches, but even here the high frequency of the analyzed figures of speech can be shown. From the words used to directly address the audience, "(as) you know" is mentioned twice, furthermore, phrases such as "if you wish", "you may ask", "let me give you", "anyway", "excuse me", "sure" are uttered; as are the implications: "if so", "so", "contrary-wise", "but of course", "well", "that's why".
[38] Cf. Kůsová 2015: 30.
[39] Zeman 2015: "We reduce the terroristic organization to a so-called Islamic State only, but there are many other terroristic organizations, for instance al-Qaeda, Taliban, al-Nusra, Boko Haram and others, and two outstanding politicians from the Arab world told me that the cover organization is the Muslim Brotherhood". Cf. Cejka, Bureš, and Daniel 2017.

northern Caucasus and the province of Xinjiang. The selection in itself is problematic, too, as the attacks claiming many more victims are completely omitted; for instance, attacks in Dhading district (Nepal) in 2004 (518 victims), in Iraqi Qahtaniya and Jazeera in 2007 (500 Yazidis), in Tora in 2009 (Democratic Republic of the Congo, 400 victims), in Gamboru Ngala in 2014 (Nigeria, 315 victims), in Ukraine in 2014 (Hrabove: 298 victims; Donetsk: 201), in Moscow – Dubrovka Theater in 2002 (170 victims), in Philippinean Manila in 2004 (116), as well as all other attacks taking place in Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, Afghanistan, India, Nigeria, Sudan, Somalia etc.[40] The following list in the second speech makes the misleading impression, as Miloš Zeman associates all the listed attcks with Islamism – in Munich (July 22, 2016), however, the right-wing extremist is supposed to attack). Besides, the stated increase in states afflicted by the Islamic State from six to 35[41] is not supported by facts. The distinguished expert source, the so-called *Global Terrorism Index* (further GTI), states that during the relevant time-span (between the two speeches) only a single state was added to the list of the countries imminently endangered by terrorism[42]. Here Miloš Zeman, as he mentioned in another speech delivered in Czech in August 24, 2016 in front of the ambassadors of the Czech Republic, repeated the words of Donald Trump (most probably his speech dated August, 15, 2016[43]) and claimed this to be in agreement with the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.[44] However, this report speaks of 34 groups, not 35, and also speaks of different units than Zeman's "terrorist

---

[40] The data come from Global Terrorism Database (GTD), collecting the incidents since 1970. See GTD 2017.

[41] Zeman 2016A: "A few years ago, the number of countries which were influenced by Islamic terrorism were only 6. Now it is 35".

[42] See GTI 2015 and GTI 2016. In 2015, there were five most endangered states (Iraq, Afghanistan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria) in the list, in 2016, Yemen was added to them. Cf. GTI 2015: 2: "The report highlights the striking prevalence of lone wolf attacks in the West. Lone wolf attacks account for 70 per cent of all terrorist deaths in the West since 2006. Additionally, Islamic fundamentalism was not the primary driver of lone wolf attacks, with 80 per cent of deaths in the West from lone wolf attacks being attributed to a mixture of right wing extremists, nationalists, anti-government elements, other types of political extremism and supremacism."; and GTI 2016: 4: "Half of all plots with an ISIL connection have been conducted by people who have had no direct contact with ISIL".

[43] Donald Trump delivered several speeches concerning the security policy (April 27, June 13, August 15, and September 7), however, only the speech delivered August, 15, contains precise numbers (see further in the study).

[44] Zeman 2016B: "In his speech regarding the security policy of the United States, American presidential candidate Donald Trump stated that a few years ago, the Islamic State infiltrated into six countries. These countries are most often referred to as failed countries. According to Trump, this year the number of infiltrated countries reached 35! Thirty-five! And, by the way, this data precisely corresponds to those in the report of the United Nations' Secretary-General, which also puts the number of the terrorist organizations directly or indirectly affiliated with the Islamic State throughout the world at 35." (Translated from Czech).

organizations"[45]. The cited source, Donald Trump, does not support Zeman's numbers, either[46]. Moreover, in front of the ambassadors of the Czech Republic, president identified these states with the so-called "failed countries", i.e. he confused two distinct categories, while the increase in the failed states has, in fact, been not so dramatic, which is documented by another professionally recognized Fragile State Index[47]. The reference to the unspecified UN document, "Remarks of the Under-Secretary-General for peace-keeping operations", most probably Hervé Ladsous' Statement from October 30, 2015, or, alternatively, Remarks from June 17, 2014[48], is, albeit not completely wrong, also inaccurate. Even though Mr. Ladsous in both mentioned documents calls attention to the experience with the implementation of new military technologies in the peace-keeping operations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (and in Mali and the Central African Republic, too), he does not do so in association with jihadism[49]. Further, it would certainly be more correct to mention that the listed articles of the United Nations Charter are a compendium taken from Chapter 7, while it is unclear to me how exactly the activation of this general chapter might

---

[45] KI-MOON 2016: 3: "The growing threat posed by ISIL to international peace and security is reflected in its strategy of global expansion, the development of which may reflect a reaction to recent territorial losses inflicted in Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic by international military efforts. As of 15 December 2015, 34 groups from all around the world had reportedly pledged allegiance to ISIL. Moreover, in view of its territorial claims of more "provinces", it is expected that ISIL affiliates will increase in number and that its membership will grow in 2016. This is a matter of considerable concern, since these groups appear to be emulating ISIL's tactics and carrying out attacks on its behalf".

[46] TRUMP 2016: "ISIS has spread across the Middle East, and into the West. In 2014, ISIS was operating in some 7 nations. Today they are fully operational in 18 countries with aspiring branches in 6 more, for a total of 24 – and many believe it is even more than that".

[47] See MESSNER 2016: 7. In 2016, there are eight states with very high alert of collapse.

[48] The most probable from the Hervé Ladsous' comments dated between November 1, 2011, when Ladsous introduced the plan for involvement of new technologies in peace-keeping operations, and the date of the delivery of Zeman's speech, is Ladsous' Statement delivered in October, 2015, where the employment of new technologies in Congo, and the necessity of the involvement of intelligence are stated (see LADSOUS 2015: 4). However, his Remarks of June, 2014, which include the information on the use of new technologies in Congo, can also be considered (cf. LADSOUS 2014).

[49] LADSOUS 2015: 4: "As peacekeeping faces new threats posed by transnational organized crime and violent extremism, we must leverage the technological tools at our disposal to support greater situational awareness and analysis. Ultimately, we must seek to have reliable, actionable intelligence to guide our actions and take informed decisions at the tactical, operational and strategic levels. It is time to de-mystify the term "intelligence". Without it, we will not be able to protect ourselves and others. / We have taken exploratory steps in this direction, including through the All Sources Information Fusion Unit (ASIFU) in Mali, and the use of Unarmed Unmanned Aerial Systems (UUAS) in the Democratic Republic of Congo and we are in the process of procuring long range UAVs for Mali and Central African Republic. Making full use of these tools is still a work in progress, but it is clear that equipping missions with the expertise to acquire a deeper level of knowledge is critical". LADSOUS 2014: "By introducing unmanned unarmed aerial vehicles (UUAVs) in the Democratic Republic of Congo, we have shown that we are able to modernize and use the latest technologies to monitor movements of armed groups and allow us to better protect vulnerable populations".

help the situation. Misleading information presented as a fact forms the background to the exclamation in the third speech[50], as the UN has never had 38 anti-terrorist organizations and institutions. The number mentioned by Zeman refers to the existing organizations within, or affiliated with, the UN (such as UNESCO, World Bank, or Interpol), which adopted the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in 2006. The role of the newly established office is to coordinate the anti-terrorist activities of the individual UN entities and thus make them more effective[51].

The only poignant argument is Zeman's criticism of the UN's inability to reach a resolution against terrorism (Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism); nevertheless, there are distortions of facts here, too. The proposal was formulated by India in 1996 (not 2000), based on which Ad Hoc Committee was established by Resolution 51/210 of December 17, 1996 on Terrorism. In 2014, the agenda of the committee was taken over by a working group of the Sixth (i.e. Legal) Committee[52]. The committee, indeed, did not reach any consensus (the defining proposal of the UN did not meet that of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference); however, it gave rise to three protocols on terrorism[53]. Therefore, we cannot speak of the incompetence of lawyers here; the resolution was impeded by political reasons, as a result of the decision that consensus must be hundred per cent.

As for appealing to fear, the most significant simile of the current situation in Europe is the Nazi Germany of the 1930s (see Note 31). The metonymy of the Islamic State and cancer is elaborated in the same emotional way, which is intensified in the second speech by referring to metastases. The escalation is apparent only when comparing the first and second speeches; the second speech escalates and specifies the theses conveyed in the first one. While the lists used in the speeches are impressive on their own, the overall impression is deteriorated by the too conspicuous associations of the incomparable.

It is obvious from the aforementioned that Miloš Zeman does not omit a single manipulative technique (although we must admit that demonization of a vaguely defined organization is not as impressive as that of a particular individual). The real danger is exaggerated by false arguments, distortion, and half-truths. This is perhaps the reason why president Zeman does not, despite his efforts, succeed in visualizing

---

[50] Zeman 2017: "You must know that under the umbrella of the United Nations there are thirty-eight, I repeat − 38 − anti-terroristic organizations or institutions. Good heavens − 38".

[51] See CTITF 2018 and OCT 2018.

[52] See Legal.un.org 2018.

[53] I.e. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted on 15 December 1997; International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted on 9 December 1999; and International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, adopted on 13 April 2005, see Legal.un.org 2018.

the enemy in front of the audience to such an extent that they would regard them as an imminent threat (however, the distinction is caused by the context of the speeches, i.e. the presence of an individual in Cicero's speeches versus the distance and vagueness of a group in those of Zeman).

There is no doubt that both orators work with the image of public enemy; nevertheless, their personal interests differ: Cicero wants to reinforce the impression of a real imminent threat and to provoke an action, while president Zeman, despite his calls to action, seeks rather to instruct and patronize (bon mots markedly contribute to this). Thus, Zeman's high level of manipulation and untrustworthiness may, in fact, impair the power of the speech on the actual informed audience. On the other hand, an uninformed listener may be astonished by the undeniable force and certainty of Zeman's "solution proposals" for Islamic terrorism (e.g. "what we need is/are", "we must attack", "last year, I proposed", "our French colleague who proposes the same", "for me a terrorist is everybody who kills intentionally innocent civilian people").

The last section of my study focuses exclusively on the two speakers' consolidation of the public enemy image (in modern theories also called 'folk devil' image[54]). Apart from the manipulative techniques described so far, another seemingly harmless, but, nevertheless, very effective strategy helps to serve this aim; it is the use of fixed epithets carrying expressive force, as well as denominations and collocations used in certain contexts. If these expressions are used to denote certain groups or individuals in order to socially distance them, the so-called labels are what we are looking at. Labelling[55], as a form of abridged information, can help the audience to quickly classify the described reality, as well as to sort out their attitudes towards it. However, it can also be intentionally misused, especially in relation to the fear-incitement and the negative framing of the demonized entity.

As far as the sources are concerned, from the preserved works of Cicero, his letters – alongside his speeches –, also proved relevant to the analysis because, in some respects, they can be considered a medium comparable to the modern media, especially the social media. As far as Zeman's statements and utterances are concerned, alongside the official speeches and press releases, also glosses and statements posted on social networks were used. This analysis did not aim at giving a complex linguistic overview, nor conduct a thorough sociological research on the phenomena presented,

---

[54] For the term and theory of 'folk devils', see: Cohen 2002.
[55] The term is of sociological origin (developed for the study of deviance), see its definition in: Petrusek 2018. However, it has been studied more and more in relation to the political discourse, cf. series of papers on terrorism-related labels, e.g. Appleby 2010, Barrinha 2011, van den Broek 2017, and esp. Baele et al. 2017.

Expressions of impudence and immorality	Verr.	Catil.	Ant.	"Clodianae"	Other speeches
adulter*: adulter/-ium	4	2	-	10	3
effemin*: effeminatus/-ate	-	1	-	1	-1 (about Clodius)
impur*: impurus/-ior/-ius/-issimus/-issime; impuritas	6	1	16	22	4
impudic*: impudicus/-issimus/-itia	1	2	4	4	-
impuden*: impudens, impuden-tior/-ius/-issimus/-issime/-ia	31	3	16	15	55
intemperan*: intemperans, intemperan-tior/-ius/-ia/-er/-issimus	1	-	3	10	2
impi*: impius/-e	4	5	27	12	15
importun* / inportun*: importunus	12	3	6	9	11 (-3Catilina+-followers)
foed*: foedus, foedius/issimus/-e, foedatus	-	3	19	13	3 (-1 Cat.)
facine(/o)ros*: facinerosus/-issimus	-	1	4	9	1
taeter*: taeterrimus/-e, taeterrior/-us	2	-	13	11	1 (Clodian consuls = Piso and Gabinius)
turpissim*: turpissimus/-e	14	1	10	12	22 (-3: consuls + Cat.)
perdit*: perditus/-issimus/-or	34	17	21	43	29 (-5 Cat.)
profligat*: profligatus	3	1	1	4	3
nefari*: nefarius, nefarie	51	18	25	49	55 (-5 Cat.)
nequi*: nequam, nequissimus, nequitia	39	3	14	10	9
helluo*: helluo/-onis	-	-	2	5	1
ganeo*: ganeo/-onis	-	1	-	2	-
leno*: leno, lenocinium	6	1	3	5	4
scurra*	1	-	2	2	4
meretri*: meretrix/-icis	13	-	1	12	-
saltator*: saltator/-oris	-	-	1	4	4
stupr*: stuprum	14	5	4	26	5 (-2 Cat.)
facinus,-oris	21	7	13	36	37 (-7 Cat.)
Expressions of dirt, dread and ruin	Verr.	Catil.	Ant.	"Clodianae"	Other speeches
lue*: lues, luendus, luetuosissimus	1	-	1	3	-2 (Cat.)
Eluvies	-	-	-	1	-
Conluvio	-	-	-	1	-
Sentina	-	2	-	-	1
sord*: sordes, sordidus, sordidissimu	4	-	8	26	13
Squalor	-	-	-	5	-
Labes	2	-	1	16	5 (-1 Cat.)
inquina*: inquinatus/-ior/-issimus	1	-	1	5	1
venefic*: veneficus, veneficium	-	1	4	1	4 (Clu.: poisoning acc.)
Procella	1	1	1	7	1
tempest*: tempestas, tempestivus	13	2	7	24	25 (-2)
pernici*: pernicies, perniciosus/-issimus	7	15	12	23	23

funest*: funestus/-ior, funestari	2	2	1	19	8 (-1)
Flamma	8	4	4	11	10 (-1)
Expressions of health and mental health (incl. exceeding of the limits)	*Verr.*	*Catil.*	*Ant.*	"Clodianae"	**Other speeches**
pesti*: pestis, pestifer, pestilentia	4	8	26	40	14 (-2: Cat.)
furor*/furios*: furiosus/-ior/-issimus	12	13	21	70	33 (-6 Cat.)
effrenat*: effrenatus/ior, effrenatio	2	2	3	7	1
impunit*: impunitus, impunitas	-	1	2	9	4
indomit*: indomitus	1	-	-	2	2
vaecor*: vaecors	-	-	-	6	-
excor*: excors	-	-	2	1	-
demen*: demens/-tior, dementia	1	3	9	13	7 (-1 Cat.)
amen*: amens/-tior/-tissimus, amentia	43	4	16	18	26 (-2 Cat.)
odi*: odium, odiosus	7	1	13	30	29 (-1 Cat.)
furia*: furia, furiatus, furialis / furibundus	1	-	2	19	5
idiot*: idiota	1	-	-	3	-
Expressions of conspiracy and corruption (with general consequences: connected with *res publica, patria, omnis terra, civitas, tota Italia*)	*Verr.*	*Catil.*	*Ant.*	"Clodianae"	**Other speeches**
proditor*	4	-	1	14	3 (-2 Cat.)
corrupt* corruptus, corruptio, corruptor	7	2	2	4	47 (-23 *Cluent.*)
Corruptella	1	1	-	1	1
conscelerat*: consceleratus/-issimus, conscelerator	2	2	1	9	7 (-3 Cat.)
sceleratissim*	1	-	4	14	3
tyrann*: tyrannus, tyrranicus	15	1	10	15	10
Gladiator	2	6	21	36	14 (-10: Cat.)
Archipirata	18	-	1	2	-
evert/s*: evertere, eversor, eversio	28	1	13	46	15
grex, gregis	2	2	5	9	8 (-5 Cat.)
manus (only as a group, in connection)	2	5	7	20	5
consoci*: consocius, consociare	-	-	1	1	-
consci*: conscius, conscientia	13	5	8	20	23 (-16 *Cluent.*)
sacrileg*: sacrilegus, sacrilegium	5	-	1	4	-
insidiator (insidiae)	(12)	1 (6)	(4)	7 (21)	(27)
parricid*	1	5	23	9	22 (- 6 Catil., -11 *Rosc. Amer.*)
sororicid* // fratricid*	-	-	-	1 // 1	-
Expressions mockery and offence	*Verr.*	*Catil.*	*Ant.*	"Clodianae"	**Other speeches**
vorago (3* with gurges)	1	-	1	2	-
gurges (3* with vorago, 1* with helluo)	1	-	1	6	1
Spartacus	-	-	2	1(exemplum S.)	
Belua	2	-	9	8	-1 (Cat.)

but to study and verify the occurrence of labels used by both rhetors[56]. I have studies the repetitive use of loaded expressions as well as epithets and tentatively grouped them according to their shared characteristics into expressions of: impudence and immorality; dirt, dread and ruin; health and mental health (incl. exceeding of limits); conspiracy and corruption (esp. having general consequences); ideology; and, finally, mockery and offence.

Within the categories mentioned above, I have carried out the recherché of all Cicero's speeches found in the database of *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*[57], which showed obvious cumulative occurrence of representative expressions in the speeches against the four particular opponents and their friends or assistants; namely against Verres (*Ver.*), against Catilina (*Catil.* and partially also *Sull.*), against Antonius (*Phil.*) and last, against Clodius (speeches delivered in the interim starting with Cicero's return from exile in AD 57, until the murder of Clodius committed by Milo, and Cicero's defence of Milo: *Red. Sen., Red. Pop., Dom., Har., Sest. Vatin., Cael., Prov., Pis., Mil.*). As it can be seen from the table above, the cumulation of expressions in the speeches directly or indirectly aimed at the four emblematic enemies listed earlier is obvious even in case of the more general adjectives[58]. It is also important to point out that in the rest of the speeches, unlike in the speeches against the four enemies mentioned earlier, the occurrence of these expressions is proportionate (usually one, maximum two occurrences per speech); the expressions do not cumulate, with the exception of cases that are directly connected to the particular expression (for instance, the case of the defence of Roscius of Ameria accused of patricide). Lastly, even the occurrences in other speeches partially involve, or concern, the listed four persons (see Table).

Such labelling serves Cicero to create an imaginary link between the individual cases or, in other words, an image of an enemy network, which could be a proof of an intentional manipulation. However, Cicero's imperativeness is in accordance with the gravity he attributes to their actions. Catilina and Antonius were convicted by the Senate as enemies of the State (Catilina in AD 63, Antonius in the spring of 43). Verres was found guilty *de rependundis*. The only example of manipulation could be a case of a personal animosity towards Clodius and his supporters and followers, which resulted in the series of unique labels, or rather insults. Directly at Clodius are aimed

---

[56] For the same reason, I do not focus on the differences in the length of the speeches (between the speeches of Miloš Zeman and Cicero, as well as in between the different speeches of Cicero himself), nor do I focus on the historic differences regarding modern media and classical letters.

[57] The database has been searched based on search chains (not based on roots or stems of the words).

[58] The exception are the expressions denoting corruption which are occurring evenly, and are only cumulating in the defence of Cluentius (Cɪc. *Cluent.:* 16 occurrences of the cluster *corrupt**), where Cicero refutes the accusation of the corrupted *iudicium*. This speech is an exception also due to the accumulation of expressions denoting shared knowledge (*consci*:* 23 occurrences).

e.g. *familiaris Catilinae,* or *Catilinae praevaricator,* against the consuls from AD 58, Piso and Gabinius (see later) e.g. *duo vulturii paludati, duo inportuna prodigia, furiae Clodianae, beluus immanis* (Piso), *Clodiana canis* (Piso), *Catilinae amator* (Gabinius), *lanternarius Catilinae* (Gabinius) and, finally, against the other persons connected to or affiliated with Clodius, e.g. *armiger Catilinae, stipator tui corporis, signifer seditionis, concitator tabernariorum, damnatus iniuriarum, percussor, lapidator, fori depopulator, obsessor curiae* (Sergius), *struma* (*civitatis:* Vatinius). In the letters *ad Atticum* Clodius is even being mocked and being referred to as *Pulchellus* (four times) or *filiola Curionis*.

Therefore, I would like to explain the Clodius' case in more detail now. Clodius Pulcher was a noble Patrician from the ancient lineage of Claudii, however scandalous and violent. Probably the biggest scandal was Clodius' intrusion into sacrifice honouring Bona Dea in 62 BCE when he is said to have infiltrated the house of C. Iulius Caesar in women's clothing to meet his mistress, Caesar's wife and Clodius' sister. In the following process accusing Clodius of *incestum*, Cicero testified against Clodius. Privately, Cicero saw Clodius' actions as morally eccentric and deviating from normality (disrupting *concordia ordinum* to Cicero: cf. Att. 1.13.3), but did not take him too seriously (*Att.* 1.16.10: *pulchellus puer*; cf. *Att.* 2.1.5: *Quid quaeris? Hominem petulantem modestum reddo non solum perpetua gravitate orationis sed etiam hoc genere dictorum. Itaque iam familiariter cum ipso cavillor ac iocor…*)[59]. Clodius' revenge was striking, he did not hesitate to violate customs and purposely retained the status of Plebeian. Holding the *tribunus plebis* office in 58, he persuaded consuls (already mentioned Piso and Gabinius) and senators to punish Cicero for his consulate and forced him to escape. After his return from exile, Cicero gave way to an open animosity which broke out from mild ridicule, defence, and pain towards anger and desire to punish Clodius for humiliating and criminalizing his consulate and the loss of all estates too.

After Cicero returned in 66 BCE (which Clodius tried to impede in every possible way), he delivered several speeches (*post reditum*), from which two are relevant to my topic, *De domo sua* and *De haruspicum responso*. The speeches were delivered with a more than half year gap, in autumn 67 and spring 66 BCE.

De domo sua is addressed to the *pontifici* who are appealed to right in the allocution. This is immediately followed by a *captatio benevolentiae*[60] using the epithet *amplissimi et clarissimi cives*, although in an impersonal way referring to the ancestral link. Soon after, Cicero demonstrates how important and grave the case is for him (*Dom.*

---

[59] He started to perceive that he himself was jeopardized only unwillingly (Cic. *Att.* 1.19.1: *Minae Clodi contentionesque quae mihi proponuntur modice me tangunt. Etenim vel subire eas videor mihi summa cum dignitate vel declinare nulla cum molestia posse.*).

[60] There is no room to examine this rhetorical tool – also empowering the distance between the rhetor and the audience on the one side and the third person – in detail here, I recommend the comparison of ancient and present days by Andoková 2017, 1-14.

1: *omnis rei publicae dignitas*), which justifies the non-standard way of pronouncing the speech (*Dom. 3: omittam ordinem dicendi meum*). Clodius is gradually included among the corrupted officials (*Dom. 2: amentis ac perditos magistratus*), individualized as tribunus (*Dom. 2: illa labes ac flamma rei publicae suum illum pestiferum et funestum tribunatum*; 3: *ille demens*), indirectly addressed in the 2nd person (*Dom. 3: respondebo hominis furiosi … convicio;* a *a te, homine vaesano ac furioso…*) and, finally, exposed (*Dom. 12*). The extensive apostrophe provides Cicero with an opportunity to do away with Clodius on personal terms, while he shows a great deal of creativity in contrasting and listing the negative epithets both when it comes to Clodius (*Dom. 26: patricida, fratricida, sororicida*) as well as to his accomplices[61].

The paragraph 32, in which Cicero defends his house as unconsecrated, goes back to *pontifici* and the case itself. The fact that Clodius did not join Plebeians in a proper way meant that he, as a Patrician, was not permitted to consecrate a shrine in a place of Cicero's house. Cicero continues to address both *pontifici* and Clodius (a sample of epithets: *portentosa pestis, ereptor civitatis, furia, nefanda et perniciosa labes civitatis…*), reminds the audience of the course of the tribunate and his exile, and finally returns to the year 62 and Clodius' defilement of the Bona Dea festival (*Dom. 104*). This allows him to ridicule and mock Clodius as well as the statue of freedom to which he dedicated the shrine.

In *De haruspicorum responso*, his invective loses the main aspect of the previous speech, i.e. the apostrophe. The speech maintains the objective level of Cicero – the Senate; however, right from the beginning, one can observe framing with the use of the Catilinian expressions (*Har. resp. 2: ecfrenatus ac praeceps furor*[62]; 3: *nihil feci…, nihil… nihil…*[63];

---

[61] See esp. the exemplary asyndetic sentence in Cɪᴄ. *Dom. 13: Armiger Catilinae, stipator tui corporis, signifer seditionis, concitator tabernariorum, damnatus iniuriarum, percussor, lapidator, fori depopulator, obsessor curiae.*

[62] Cɪᴄ. *Cat.:* 1,1: *Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia? Nihil ne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium, nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora voltusque moverunt?; Cat. 1,25: Ibis tandem aliquando, quo te iam pridem tua ista cupiditas effrenata ac furiosa rapiebat; neque enim tibi haec res adfert dolorem, sed quandam incredibilem voluptatem.* Versus *Har. resp. 2: Cuius ego de ecfrenato et praecipiti furore quid dicam?; 115: At videte hominis intolerabilem audaciam cum proiecta quadam et effrenata cupiditate.*

[63] Cɪᴄ. *Har. resp. 3: Nihil feci iratus, nihil impotenti animo, nihil non diu consideratum ac multo ante meditatum, ego enim me, patres conscripti, inimicum semper esse professus sum duobus, qui me, qui rem publicam cum defendere deberent, servare possent, cumque ad consulare officium ipsis insignibus illius imperi, ad meam salutem non solum auctoritate sed etiam precibus vestris vocarentur, primo reliquerunt, deinde prodiderunt, postremo oppugnarunt praemiisque nefariae pactionis funditus una cum re publica oppressum exstinctumque voluerunt; qui quae suo ductu et imperio cruento illo atque funesto supplicia neque a sociorum moenibus prohibere neque hostium urbibus inferre potuerunt, excisionem, inflammationem, eversionem, depopulationem, vastitatem, ea sua cum praeda meis omnibus tectis atque agris intulerunt.* Versus *Cat. 1,1: Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia? Nihil ne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium,*

4: *tum, inquam, tum vidi*; 4: *quanta tempestas*[64]; *illaqueatus*), which is made explicit in paragraph 5: *Nihil enim contra me fecit odio mei, sed odio severitatis, odio dignitatis, odio rei publicae. Non me magis violavit quam senatum, quam equites Romanos, quam omnes bonos, quam Italiam cunctam; non denique in me sceleratior fuit quam in ipsos deos immortales. Etenim illos eo scelere violavit quo nemo antea; in me fuit eodem animo quo etiam eius familiaris Catilina, si vicisset, fuisset*[65]. Cicero called Catiline Clodius' man also in *De domo sua* (12,7: *eius vir Catilina*) and the tendency to link the two appears in his correspondence, too, but rather as the two examples of the same kind (see *Att.* 1.16 from 61 BCE). Nevertheless, in this speech Cicero makes Clodius an even worse follower of Catiline, as if he only then realized his destructive potential. One cannot neglect the personal basis of the negation as well as its legitimacy. Whereas Clodius' first excess in 62 could be regarded an act of impetuosity and, perhaps, idleness towards gods, his purposeful misinterpretation of *haruspicia* to deprive Cicero again of his house and social standing, together with an utter unwillingness to admit political defeat and the continuous efforts to change the situation violently, gave Cicero a legitimate reason to objectively depict Clodius as a public enemy.

We can conclude that, concerning his public enemies, Cicero is transparent; he does not imply but explains and defends his fames and labels, thus fulfilling the principle of appropriateness and suitability.

If I am to speak about the public enemy image in Miloš Zeman's discourse, I have to state first that, compared to Cicero whom one can analyze from his preserved speeches and correspondence, other sources come into play in Zeman's case. Apart from rhetorical performances, reporter and publicist interviews and, especially, social networking have to be taken into account. The significance of the latter overshadows the others. Besides, there is another important factor, i.e. the role of president's spokesman speaking on behalf of the president, not so much in the official press releases where the president's spokesman speaks for himself, but rather in social networking. Here, he is regarded the second "mouth of the president", as Miloš Zeman ended his personal activities in this area after his accession to the office. His personal profile contains only neutral information on his activities and photos[66], while his ideas are conveyed through his spokesman, even though this was officially denied by the Prague

---

nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora voltusque moverunt? Cat. 1,8: *Nihil agis, nihil moliris, nihil cogitas, quod <non> ego non modo audiam, sed etiam videam planeque sentiam.*

[64] Cɪᴄ. *Cat.* 1,22: *Utinam tibi istam mentem di immortales duint! Tametsi video, si mea voce perterritus ire in exsilium animum induxeris, quanta tempestas invidiae nobis, si minus in praesens tempus recenti memoria scelerum tuorum, at in posteritatem impendeat.*

[65] See also Cɪᴄ. *Har. resp.* 7: *... inlaqueatus iam omnium legum periculis, inretitus odio bonorum omnium, exspectatione supplici iam non diuturna implicatus …*

[66] Cf. Zᴇᴍᴀɴ 2018.

Castle[67]. There is no space here to argue for this but it is obvious stylistically as well as in metaphors used; the speaker himself admits it.

Considering the aforementioned, I will now omit the speeches and focus more on the interviews president Zeman gives the media, especially those regularly given to the private TV Barrandov. Their form does not differ from the speeches distinctively. Of course, the performance is, at least outwardly, spontaneous, president often reinvigorates it by counter-questions, direct addresses to the interviewer ("Mr. Soukup", "Alex"), additions, and emendations, or completely takes over the role of an interviewer ("you know", "you think", "guess"[68]). He uses technical language sporadically mixed up with vulgarism ("the most stupid", "he beat out of", "disgusting little dances", "eco-booby", "do Prčic /approx.: get lost, fuck it/"), more frequently with bon mot, provocative gloss, joke[69], biased question, quotation, etc. He also takes the liberty of more general contemplations which he usually projects onto the interviewer[70]. The interviews contain a relatively rich scale of expressions with vocabulary from the neutral part of spectrum to the expert language complemented by expressive terms. Labelling is not as common as in social networking (only ten of them appeared in speeches delivered between April 6 and June 29, 2017: businessmen in solar energetic = "solar barons"; a lot of migrants = part of them "Jihadists", i.e. "lonely wolves" and "dormant cells"; fighters for women's rights = "frigid suffragettes"; intellectuals = "Prague cafeteria"; Prime Minister = "little boy", "an opposite of man"; "some unsuccessful politician"; government's demise = "the act of desperation"; political party called 'Mayors and Independents' = "imposturous club"; ecologist = "eco-jerk" / "eco-terrorist"). The chronic exception to this is represented by the media not loyal to the president, which he treats very negatively (the journal Lidové Noviny, or People's Newspaper = "the stupidest journal in the Czech Republic"; the owner of the opposing media =

---

[67] Official webpage of the spokesman, see Ovčáček 2018. On the issue of the status of Ovčáček's twitter account see Bohuslavová 2016. Cf. also Ovčáček's statement: Ovčáček 2017.

[68] I am translating all the labels into English, though I am aware of the sometimes hardly sustainable expressivity.

[69] E.g. Soukup and Zeman 2017d: "The stupidity of our commentators is endless; because in reality it was a trivial comment; when we were pushing our way through the crowd of journalists who obstructed our way to the adjacent room, we both said to ourselves that it is necessary to either restrict them, or, annihilate them." Since I do not find the Czech original relevant for the purposes of this study, I am providing the English translations of all the following interviews.

[70] Soukup and Zeman 2017f: "So, as logic would have it, if someone earned their money in an honest way, they should boast themselves about having earned it. I will tell you about the American way, which is dramatically different from the Czech one. An American boasts about his wealth, as you, Mr. Soukup, already know… But if you ask an American how they are, they will respond with "I'm fine", even if they were considering suicide just a minute ago. If you ask a Czech, they will respond with "it is so (beep beep beep, **** up)…" if someone tries to hide something, it means they have acquired their wealth by dubious means".

"a cheater named Zdeněk Bakala"; Respekt magazine = "deceitful tabloid", "Bakala's Respekt is lying"; "Czech journalist is the stupidest creature on Earth after the extinction of the Dodo bird and, regardless various phone calls and e-mails, I wish that some Czech journalists visited Madagaskar and enriched its fauna"; Jiří Pehe and Alexandr Mitrofanov = "comic commentators of the Právo, or Law, journal" /these two are even ridiculed by pejorative derivations of their names "Šáša and Hehe"/; news of the inconvenient media = "fake news"). The framing of responses is more accentuated to invoke the sense of imperilment; in the observed samples, this applies especially to the stability of the Czech Republic under its then Prime Minister Bohuslav Sobotka,[71] all civilized world, especially the threat of Islamic terrorism associated with migrants[72] to the Czech Republic and, finally, the danger to freedom and truth obligatorily represented by journalists[73].

The activity of president's spokesman in social networking – esp. on Twitter – is, no doubt, remarkable (even two theatre plays were written on its motifs). From the beginning of 2017 to August 30, 2017, 2699 tweets were published. The analysis of these is based on the same categories as in Cicero, since labelling plays a significant role in the limited scope of tweets, i.e. the choice of specific negative epithets complemented by the category of ideology and unclassifiable offences and derogatory expressions. The outcomes are as follows: most of the epithets in tweets (particularly 25%) are aimed at Zeman's political and intellectual opposition, regardless political parties, which imply primarily the mutual cooperation and potential conspiracy as well as ideological subtext. In these, we find explicit insults and ironic ridicule ("freak show of wax figurines"). The most frequently mentioned politician in tweets is Bohuslav Sobotka, especially when it comes to the so-called government crisis (labelled e.g. "industrious

---

[71] Soukup and Zeman 2017c: "Then, if the Ministry of Finance will be without the head (director), then the Prime Minister jeopardizes the economic stability of the Czech Republic, especially its budgetary policy."; or Mynářová and Zeman 2017: "All this leads me to the conclusion that a person acting in a hurry – here I mean the demission; someone who does not keep his word – here I mean his not coming to the Castle to hand the demission in – and, finally, someone who does not abide by the coalition agreement, which he himself previously signed, is not a person whom I would trust, full stop".

[72] Soukup and Zeman 2017a: "As you know, a number of Chechenians joined the Islamic State as fighters, so these groups are interconnected and should be looked upon as a single terrorist network…"; Soukup and Zeman 2017b: "And if there (i.e. in Sweden, KP) is a lot of migrants, then part of them are the so-called jihadists, whether we call them lone wolfs, or sleeper cells".; Soukup and Zeman 2017e: "But all the time, Mr. Soukup, all the time I repeat, that every country in Europe, Czech Republic included, is exposed to a similar threat. Britain also used to be sure they are an exception, that this cannot happen to them, so did Belgium, Germany and France".

[73] Soukup and Zeman 2017f: "Before my term, there was a president who kept saying that the truth and love must win over the lies and hate. I, just like this president, am saying, that the common sense must prevail over stupidity. And that is all: in other words, if anyone spreads – as Donald Trump calls them – fake news, all we could do is smile, ask where they have it from, request the evidence, and, in case there is no evidence, to tell them to go and get lost."

little ant", "silent as a stump"). With the approaching presidential elections, there is an increasing number of negative statements about the other candidates and, most recently, referring to 'Úřad pro dohled nad hospodařením politických stran a hnutí'[74], the new institution whose function is to oversee the transparency of election campaign and the activities of its head are described by Zeman's spokesman as personal revenge (almost 2 additional % of tweets). Considering the expressive force, there is also a relative abundance of redundant metonymies. Generally, the epithets referring to political opponents are strong, even mocking (esp. diminutives); however, not vulgar, unlike the epithets denoting the media (e.g. "lovelorn Tabery /i.e. editor-in-chief of the weekly newspaper Respekt/", "idiot", "cripple mind", "harsh bizon"). As for the media, which are the second most criticized category (24%), Zeman's spokesman makes a significant use of accusations of lies and deceptions ("lampoon", "Bakala-leaks", "hackers", "journalist prostitutes", "mendacious sheet") as well as the ideology (e.g. "neonormalized Svazák" /i.e. the member of former communist Czechoslovak Union of Youth/, "Czech Socialist Television" /i.e. the former name used for the present-day Czech TV/, "anti-Zeman club") and tort of conspiracy, often in connection with uneconomic or inappropriate use of financial sources (e.g. "Bakala's silky little hands", "mutually supporting gang"). The non-profit sector, if it is not associated with the media, is labelled almost exclusively in the area of conspiracy (including non-transparent management: e.g. "financial wizardry", "interconnected supportive guild", "lobbing organizations disguised as civilian associations"). The non-profit sector, together with the public opposition, forms the third most criticized category (16%), represented as manipulators or manipulated mass led by George Soros (e.g. "bloodsuckers", "philanthropist who has a finger in every pie"), often also in terms of ideology (e.g. "fascistic humour of Prague cafeteria"). Unfriendly labels are further extended towards the EU or, rather, its migration policy (14%), and radical extremists apart from radical Muslims (2%). Remaining 17% are positive labels and frames commending Russia, China, Israel, and the politics of Andrej Babiš (at that time the Minister of Finance, nowadays the Prime Minister), they are, however, not the part of my study[75].

Thus, president Miloš Zeman makes public enemies of those who disagree with him and also of those who observe him in any way, whether from professional reasons (journalists, the office overseeing the financial management of the presidential campaign team) or within the frame of civic, non-profit initiatives. These are further joined into a continuous chain of public animosity. From this, we can deduce that

---

[74] Office for Economic Supervision of Political Parties and Political Movements. See https://udh-spsh.cz. The appropriate English version of the page does not exist.

[75] Herewith, I would like to thank Mgr. Markéta Mičánková, for her diligent analysis of the Twitter statuses of Jiří Ovčáček.

the enemies are perceived as more numerous and as a general category, while its representatives are mere variables in the political discourse.

Islam and Islamic terrorism deviate from the observed topics, except for when they are directly linked with migration and the consequent rejection of migrants. This, however, appears outside Twitter, president himself speaks of the topic, while the tweets refer to his statements and label only the previously mentioned enemies.

For the sake of completeness, I would like to point out that another public enemy is going to join the list after this study is published.

Bibliography

Andoková, M. (2016). The role of *captatio benevolentiae* in the interaction between the speaker and his audience in Antiquity and today. *Systasis,* 29, pp. 1-14. Available at: http://www.systasis.org/pdfs/systasis_29_1.pdf [Accessed 15 Apr. 2018].

Appleby, N. (2010). Labelling the innocent: how government counterterrorism advice creates labels that contribute to the problem. *Critical Studies on Terrorism,* 3(3), pp. 421-436. DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2010.521643.

Atkinson, M. (1984). *Our Masters' Voices: The Language and Body Language of Politics.* London and New York: Methuen.

Baele, S.J., Sterck, O.C., Slingeneyer, T. and Lits, G.P. (2017). What Does the "Terrorist" Label Really Do? Measuring and Explaining the Effects of the "Terrorist" and "Islamist" Categories. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, [pdf] 21 pages. DOI: 10.1080/1057610X.2017.1393902.

Barrinha, A. (2011). The political importance of labelling: terrorism and Turkey's discourse on the PKK. *Terrorism and Political Violence,* 4(2), pp. 163-180. DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2011.586203.

Beck, G. (2005). *Verbotene Rhetorik: Die Kunst der skrupellosen Manipulation.* Eichborn Verlag: Frankfurt am Main.

Bohuslavová, R. (2016). Mluví Ovčáček na Twitteru místo prezidenta? Jasno nemají ani na Hradě [Does Ovčáček speak instead of President on Twitter? They do not know even at the Castle]. *Echo.24,* [online] 26. 12. 2016. http://echo24.cz/a/iUU5h/mluvi-ovcacek-na-twitteru-misto-prezidenta-jasno-nemaji-ani-na-hrade [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

Bralczyk, J. (1987). *O języku polskiej propagandy politycznej lat siedemdziesiątych* [*The language of Polish political propaganda in the 1970ies*] (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Slavica Upsaliensia; vol. 24). Stockholm: Almqvist och Wiksell.

Čejka, M., Bureš, J., Daniel, J. (2017). *Muslimské bratrstvo v současnosti [Muslim Brotherhood Today].* Praha: Academia.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Cohen, S. (2002). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers.* 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

CTITF 2018: Un.org/en/counterterrorism, (2018). *Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force: Entities.* [online] United Nations. Available at: https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ctitf/en/structure [Accessed 10 Apr. 2018].

ČTK and Kubištová, P. (2016). Skvělý rétor i podporovatel propagandy: Politiky Zemanův projev rozdělil [Brilliant rhetor and supporter of propaganda: Politicians divided by Zeman's speech]. *iDnes.cz,* [online] 26. 12. 2016. Available at: http://zpravy.idnes.cz/reakce-politiku-na-projev-prezidenta-zemana-fzh-/domaci.aspx?c=A161226_135753_domaci_pku [Accessed 2 Apr. 2018].

David, M.K. (2014). Language, Power and Manipulation: The Use of Rhetoric in Maintaining Political Influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 2014, 5(1), 164-170.

Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication,* 43(4), pp. 51-58. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x.

Fairclough, N.(1989). *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fendrych, M. (2013). Komentář: 14 pozitiv prezidenta Miloše Zemana [Commentary: 14 positives of Mr. President Miloš Zeman]. *Aktuálně.cz,* [online] 11.3.2013. Available at: https://nazory.aktualne.cz/komentare/komentar-14-pozitiv-prezidenta-milose-zemana/r~i:article:773527/?redirected=1504022404 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Gass, R.H., Siter, J.S. (2015). *Persuasion: Social Inflence and Compliance Gaining.* 5th ed. London: Routledge.

Gregor, M. and Vejvodová, P. (2017). *Analýza manipulativních technik na vybraných českých serverech [Analysis of manipulative techniques on the selected Czech servers].* [online]. Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University. Available from: http://www.evropskehodnoty.cz/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Vyzkumna_zprava_Analyza_manipulativnich.pdf [Accessed 10 Sept. 2017].

Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation, [in:] Cole P., Morgan J.L. (eds.), *Syntax and semantics, 3: Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.

GTD 2017: National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism. (2017). *Global Terrorism Database* [online]. Available at: https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd [Accessed 11 Apr. 2018].

GTI 2015: Institute for economics & peace (IEP). (2015). *Glogal Terrorism Index: Measuring and understanding the impact of terrorism.* 1st ed. [pdf] (NOV 2015 / IEP REPORT 36). Available at: http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Global-Terrorism-Index-2015.pdf [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

GTI 2016: Institute for economics & peace (IEP). (2016). *Glogal Terrorism Index: Measuring and understanding the impact of terrorism.* 1st ed. [pdf] (NOV 2016 / IEP REPORT 43). Available at: http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Global-Terrorism-Index-2016.2.pdf [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

Hoffeld, D. (2018). *The Difference Between Persuasion & Manipulation.* [online] Hoffeld Group. Available at: https://www.hoffeldgroup.com/sales-articles/the-difference-between-persuasion-manipulation/ [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Ki-moon, Ban (2016). *Report of the Secretary-General on the threat posed by ISIL (Da'esh) to international peace and security and the range of United Nations efforts in support of Member States in countering the threat.* 1st ed. [pdf] New York: United Nations Security Council, S/2016/92, 29 January 2016, p. 3. Available at: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2016/92 [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

Kůsová, L. (2015). *Prezidentské projevy Miloše Zemana [Miloš Zeman's Presidential Speeches].* B.A. Charles University.

Ladsous, H. (2014). *Remarks by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on new challenges and priorities for UN Peacekeeping at the Brookings Institution (17 June 2014).* [online] United Nations Peacekeeping: USG Peacekeeping. Available at: https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/remarks-under-secretary-general-peacekeeping-operations-new-challenges-and-priorities-un [Accessed 12 Apr. 2018].

Ladsous, H. (2015). *Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous' Statement to the Fourth Committee (30 October 2015).* [online] United Nations Peacekeeping: USG Peacekeeping. Available at: https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/statement-under-secretary-general-peacekeeping-operations-herve-ladsous-to-fourth-committee-1 [Accessed 12 Apr. 2018].

Leech, G. (1983). *The interpersonal role of the Cooperative Principle, The Tact Maxim, A survey of the Interpersonal Rhetoric,* [in:] *Principles of pragmatics.* London, New York: Longman Group Ltd., pp. 79-151.

Legal.un.org, (2018). *Ad Hoc Committee established by General Assembly resolution 51/210 of 17 December 1996.* [online] Available at: http://legal.un.org/committees/terrorism/ [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

Lotko, E. (1999). *Kapitoly ze současné rétoriky* [*Chapters from today's rhetoric*]. Olomouc: Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého.

McGinnis, A.L. (1985). *Bringing Out the Best in People: How to Enjoy Helping Others Excell.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publ. House.

Messner, J.J. (ed.) (2016). *Fragile State Index Annual Report 2016.* 1st ed. [pdf] Washington, D.C.: The Fund for Peace, p. 7. Available at: http://fundforpeace.org/up-content/uploads/2018/08/fragiles-tatesindex-2016.pdf [Accessed 5 Nov. 2019].

Mukařovský, J. (1948). *Kapitoly z české poetiky: Díl I. Obecné věci básnictví [Chapters from Czech Poetics: Part 1. General aspects of poetry].* 2nd ed. Praha: Svoboda.

Mynářová, A. and Zeman, M. (2017). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 1 June 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-10-13427 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Ovčáček, J. (2017). *Pro vykladače VH, Strakovku a nečestná média. Má trojjediná úloha: 1) Prezentuji názory p. prez. 2) Hájím názory p. prez. 3) Hájím p. prez. [For expositors of Václav Havel, Straka's Academy and dishonest media. My trinitarian role: 1) I represent opinions of Mr. President 2) I defend opinions of Mr. Pres. 3) I defend Mr. Pres.] February 5, 2017, 15:33.* [Twitter status update] Available at https://twitter.com/PREZIDENTmluvci/status/828386127027507207 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Ovčáček, J. (2018). *Jiří Ovčáček: Tiskový mluvčí prezidenta republiky a ředitel Tiskového odboru Kanceláře prezidenta republiky [Jiří Ovčáček: President of the Czech republic Spokesman and Director of the Press Department].* Twitter. [online] Available at https://twitter.com/prezidentmluvci [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Petrusek, M. (2018). s. v. Labelling, [in:] Nešpor Z.R. (ed.), *Sociologická encyklopedie online* [*Online encyclopedia of sociology*]. Sociologický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i. Available at: https://encyklopedie.soc.cas.cz/w/Labelling [Accessed 2 Sept. 2017].

Petrů, E. (2000). *Úvod do literární vědy [Introduction in the literary studies].* Olomouc: Rubico.

Ross, R. (1994.) *Understanding Persuasion.* 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Soukup, J., Zeman, M. (2017a). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 6 April 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-3-13286 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Soukup, J., Zeman, M. (2017b). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 13 April 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-4-13304 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Soukup, J., Zeman, M. (2017c). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 11 May 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-8-13362#from-list [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Soukup, J., Zeman, M. (2017d). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 18 May 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-

prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-9-13371 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Soukup, J., Zeman, M. (2017e). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 8 June 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-11-13438 [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

Soukup, J., Zeman, M. (2017f). *Rozhovor prezidenta republiky pro pořad TV Barrandov „Týden s prezidentem" [Interview with the president of CR for the broadcast of TV Barrandov "The week with Mr. President"]. 31 August 2017.* [online] Available at https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/rozhovor-prezidenta-republiky-pro-porad-tv-barrandov-tyden-s-prezidentem-16-13566#from-list [Accessed 1 Apr. 2018].

STEM/MARK (2013). *Prezidentské volby 2013: 2. kolo [Presidential election 2013: Round 2].* [online] Závěrečná zpráva z exkluzivního výzkumu pro ČT [Exclusive research final report for Czech Television], pp. 5 and 44. Available at: http://img2.ct24.cz/multimedia/documents/44/4325/432431.pdf [Accessed 13 Apr. 2018].

Trump 2016: White, D. (ed.) (2016). Read Donald Trump's Ohio Speech on Immigration and Terrorism. *TIME: Politics,* [online] 15 Aug. 2016. Available at: http://time.com/4453110/donald-trump-national-security-immigration-terrorism-speech/ [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

UN OCT 2018: Un.org/en/counterterrorism, (2018). *United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism.* [online] United Nations. Available at: https://www.un.org/en/counterterrorism/ [Accessed 10 Apr. 2018].

van den Broek, H.-P. (2017). Labelling and Legitimization: Justifying Political Violence in the Basque Country. *Terrorism and Political Violence,* 29(1), pp. 119-136. DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2014.995788.

Zeman, M. (2015). *Address of the President of the Czech Republic at the 70th Session of the UN General Assembly. 29 September 2015.* [online] Pražský hrad: Prezident ČR [Prague Castle: President of the CR]. Available at: https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/address-of-the-president-of-the-czech-republic-at-the-70th-session-of-the-un-general-assembly-12264 [Accessed 10 Apr. 2018].

Zeman, M. (2016a). *Speech of the President of the Czech Republic at the 71st session of UN General Assembly. 21 September 2016.* [online] Prague Castle: President of the CR. Available at: https://www.hrad.cz/en/president-of-the-cr/current-president-of-the-cr/selected-speeches-and-interviews/speech-of-the-president-of-the-czech-republic-at-the-71st-session-of-un-general-assembly-12939 [Accessed 10 Apr. 2018].

Zeman, M. (2016b). *Projev prezidenta republiky při setkání s vedoucími zastupitelských úřadů ČR v zahraničí. 24. srpna 2016 [Speech of the President of the Czech Republic at the Meeting with the Heads of CR Missions Abroad].* [online] Pražský hrad: Prezident ČR [Prague Castle: President of the CR]. Available at: https://www.hrad.cz/cs/prezident-cr/soucasny-prezident-cr/vybrane-projevy-a-rozhovory/projev-prezidenta-republiky-pri-setkani-s-vedoucimi-zastupitelskych-uradu-cr-v-zahranici-12846 [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

Zeman, M. (2017). *Speech of the President of the Czech Republic at the 72nd session of UN General Assembly. 19 September 2017.* [online] Prague Castle: President of the CR. Available at: https://www.hrad.cz/en/president-of-the-cr/current-president-of-the-cr/selected-speeches-and-interviews/speech-of-the-president-of-the-czech-republic-at-the-72nd-session-of-un-general-assembly-13609 [Accessed 10 Apr. 2018].

Zeman, M. (2018). *Miloš Zeman – prezident České republiky [Miloš Zeman – President of the Czech Republic].* Facebook. [online] Available at https://www.facebook.com/prezidentcr/ [Accessed 15 Mar. 2018].

US AND THEM.
THE ROLE OF PERSUASIVE AND MANIPULATIVE STRATEGIES
IN CREATION OF PUBLIC ENEMIES

S u m m a r y

Cicero was during his live one of the most successful orators in Rome. His ability to express his meanings and ideas in the most persuasive way did not impress only his contemporaries, but influenced the art of rhetoric generally. We admire the argumentative strength, the verbal copiousness, the most striking rhetorical skill is, however, his manipulative force, the allocution of the listener, "ut moveatur vehementius" (Cic. Brut. 49, 185). In the paper, I would like to analyze Cicero's persuasive and manipulative strategies, particularly his ability to indicate a public enemy, in order to make a comparison between Cicero's speeches and speeches and statements of our current president Miloš Zeman, who is considered to be an appropriate counterpart to Cicero discourse (using and abusing such rhetorical devices).
Keywords: rhetorics, political discourse, persuasion, manipulation, labelling, public enemy, Cicero, Miloš Zeman

MY I ONI.
ROLA STRUKTUR OSOBISTYCH I MANIPULACYJNYCH
W TWORZENIU WROGÓW PUBLICZNYCH

S t r e s z c z e n i e

W swoim czasie Cyceron był jednym z najlepszych mówców w Rzymie. Jego zdolność do wyrażania swoich myśli i idei w najbardziej przekonujący sposób nie tylko robiła wrażenie na jemu współczesnych, lecz również wpłynęła na sztukę retoryki w ogóle. Podziwiamy siłę argumentu, obfite słownictwo, jednak jego najbardziej uderzającą zdolnością retoryczną jest siła manipulacji, zwrócenie się w kierunku słuchacza, "ut moveatur vehementius" (Cic. Brut. 49, 185). W niniejszym artykule chciałabym przeanalizować strategie perswazyjne i manipulacyjne Cycerona, a zwłaszcza umiejętność wskazywania wroga publicznego, w celu porównania jego przemów z przemowami i wypowiedziami naszego obecnego prezydenta Miloša Zemana, który, jak się uważa, używa i nadużywa narzędzi retorycznych właściwych dyskursowi Cycerona.
Słowa kluczowe: retoryka, dyskurs polityczny, perswazja, manipulacja, etykietowanie, wróg publiczny, Cyceron, Miloš Zeman