Wesleyan University The Honors College

Poetry, Politics, Persuasion:
The Rhetoric of Demosthenes and George W. Bush

by

Heather Cassilda Teixeira
Class of 2008

A thesis submitted to the
faculty of Wesleyan University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts
with Departmental Honors from the College of Letters
and with Departmental Honors in Classical Studies

Middletown, Connecticut April, 2008

Acknowledgements

I would briefly like to thank the many people who have guided, aided and supported me through this process:

First and foremost, my tremendous thesis advisor, Michael Roberts, without whom I'm quite certain this project could never have happened;

My amazing mother, Christine Halkiotis, and my dear friend Elizabeth Weisman for taking the time to read drafts of my work and give me invaluable feedback;

The College of Letters and Classical Studies Departments, especially Paul Schwaber and the my College of Letters friends and classmates for their questions, suggestions and advice;

My fabulous friends, the Estate at 71 Lawn, and my glorious, ridiculous housemates: Elissa, Turner, Joss and Tamar;

B.J. Raymond, a constant source of inspiration;

And of course, all the thanks and love in the world to my wonderful family.

I would also like to dedicate this project to Kathleen Macdonell, who first inspired in me a love of the Greek language.

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

Chapter 1 14
Rhetorical Structure of *Against Aristocrates*

Chapter 2 42
Style: Language, Tone and Figures in *Against Aristocrates*

Chapter 3 67
Say What?! The Rhetoric of George W. Bush

Conclusion 96
Then and Now

Bibliography 100

Appendix A 102

Appendix B 106

Introduction

The influence of rhetoric in public contexts cannot be undervalued in either the ancient world or the modern. Rhetoric, perceived by many ancient philosophers as morally questionable because of its great power to persuade the masses to either good or ill, played a critical role in determining the outcome of all kinds of public affairs. In the modern world, one need look no farther than the current race between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton to understand the crucial role that rhetoric can play in political events. This thesis will be dedicated to an examination of political rhetoric in the form of two speeches, one from the ancient world and one from the modern. By studying these two speeches, I hope to draw conclusions about the function and use of rhetoric in both ancient and modern contexts. To do this, I will first examine a speech of the ancient orator Demosthenes, *Against Aristocrates*, and then George W. Bush's speech from March 17, 2003, in which he declared war on Iraq. I will examine each speech through the framework of ancient rhetorical theory, as only in the ancient world was there a formal, well-evolved system of rhetoric. By examining each speech and its adherence to or deviation from rhetorical theory, I hope to ascertain what makes each speech persuasive, and to determine whether or not political rhetoric functions in the same way in the ancient and modern worlds.

I chose these two speeches because their political contexts and purposes, while not the same, have a degree of similarity to each other. *Against Aristocrates* was Demosthenes' first foray into political oratory, and was an attempt to prevent a decree from being passed that would have Athens grant substantial protection to a foreign mercenary general. Demosthenes' political argument tries to make the central

point that protecting Charidemus, the mercenary general, would be dangerous for Athens because it would strengthen a Thracian rival king, Cersobleptes. One of Demosthenes' central tasks was to convince his audience that Charidemus was dangerous to them, although he had previously appeared as their benefactor. Similarly, Bush needed to convince his audience that Saddam Hussein posed enough of a threat to necessitate going to war with Iraq. In neither case had the individual proclaimed a threat actually attacked the nation at the time of the speech; both speeches, in short, try to convince their audiences of a danger that was not universally recognized.

In determining which ancient orator to focus on, Demosthenes (384-322BCE) was the logical choice; he was the most distinguished ancient Greek orator, whose preeminence was recognized even in the ancient world. His speeches were used as models and deeply influenced the development of speech-making and rhetorical theory in antiquity, and in all of the eras that followed. Demosthenes' life coincided with the period when Philip II of Macedon was gaining power and becoming an increasing threat to the Greek city-states. Athens at this time was an imperial power, and the strongest of those states. An eminent political and judicial orator, Demosthenes exerted great influence over all manner of Athenian public affairs: "his political power stretched over thirty years, and so great was his political influence from 346 to 324 [that] Athenian policy was virtually Demosthenes' policy."[1] Ultimately Athens fell to Philip and Demosthenes, who had strongly advocated an anti-Macedonian foreign policy, committed suicide in 322. Demosthenes' standing as

[1] Worthington, Ian. *Demosthenes, Statesman and Orator*. London: Routledge, 2000. p.1

a politician and orator and his great influence on later rhetorical theory made him a natural choice for an ancient orator on whom to focus.

Against Aristocrates was written in 352, early in Demosthenes' career,[2] shortly before Philip began to demonstrate overt hostility to Athens. The subject matter of the speech pertains to Athens's northern neighbor, Thrace, and the region of land belonging to Athens that bordered Thrace, the Thracian Chersonese. *Against Aristocrates* was written to oppose a decree that had been proposed to the Athenian senate that would make a mercenary general, Charidemus of Euboea, "inviolable." As presented in the sections 100 and 109 of the speech, "inviolability" in this context meant that "anyone who killed him [Charidemus] could be summarily arrested, and that any state or individual harboring the assassin should be excluded from all treaties with

Athens."[3] Charidemus at the time that this speech was given was believed to be a benefactor of Athens. He was, however, intimately linked with Cersobleptes, the king of the rival nation of Thrace, and if Demosthenes is to be believed, primarily acted to benefit himself and Cersobleptes, not Athens.[4] Although he was already an established judicial orator, *Against Aristocrates* was Demosthenes' first foray into the arena of political oratory. Perhaps for this reason, he had the speech delivered by an elder statesman named Euthycles. There is little known about Euthycles' life, but it can be assumed that he was a respected member of the Athenian Senate. For the sake of clarity, I will treat the speech throughout as if it was both written and orated by

[2] Demosthenes was only thirty-two when he wrote this speech.
[3] Vince, J.H. Introduction. *Against Aristocrates*. By Demosthenes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. p.212
[4] A more detailed history of the political events preceding *Against Aristocrates* can be found in Appendix A.

Demosthenes, except in instances where the person of Euthycles may have influenced the content or rhetoric of the speech. The reaction of the Athenian Senate to *Against Aristocrates* is unknown, although the speech appears to have been a success, as the decree proposed by Aristocrates never became law.

George W. Bush's speech, from March 17, 2003, which I will refer to as the March 17th speech, offered an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein that gave him forty eight hours to leave his country. This speech is of the greatest importance in contemporary history; it marked the conclusion of many months of discussion about going to war with Iraq, and began one of the most disastrous foreign policy blunders in recent history, introducing a war that has not yet come to an end. George Bush is certainly not known for his rhetorical prowess, or even his ability to speak English properly, but for this reason he is an interesting choice for an analysis of modern oratory. Despite his decision to go forward with the Iraq war, Bush was re-elected, and this is at least partially due to his ability to speak in an effective way to the American people. By examining this crucial speech more closely, I hope to ascertain what made this speech, one of the most distinctive examples of modern rhetoric, persuasive.

II. Introduction to the History of Rhetoric

The importance of rhetoric in Greek and Roman societies cannot be underestimated for any number of reasons. Greek society in particular was based in many regards on oral performance and presentation, as manifested in poetry, religious festivals and civic life. Rhetoric was a central component of education: "in Hellenistic times it [rhetoric] constituted the curriculum... of secondary schools and

acquired an important place in advanced education." The art of rhetoric began to be formulated during the fourth century. The first writings we have about rhetoric date to this period, most notably Plato's *Gorgias* [roughly 387-385BCE][5] and Isocrates' *Antidosis* [354-353 BCE].[6] The importance of rhetoric increased in Athens during the fifth century as the state became more democratic, and the "democratic process [was applied] on a large scale to judicial procedure,"[7] which meant that cases were decided by juries, who could be easily convinced by a gifted orator. Athenian society became increasingly aware of techniques of persuasion, leading to the first steps in formulating rhetorical theory in the fifth and fourth centuries. As rhetoric's importance grew in education, rhetorical theory continued to evolve. The major surviving works on rhetorical theory date to a later period: Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*[8] and Quintilian's *The Orator's Education*. Though other treatises from antiquity survive, including a number by Cicero, these three provide the most comprehensive account of rhetorical theory, and for this reason I will focus exclusively on them.

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is the first full treatise specifically devoted to the art of rhetoric. While the *Rhetoric* appears to have been significantly revised at a later date, the treatise dates roughly to somewhere in the 350s BCE.[9] Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is broken up into three primary books: the first is devoted to a discussion of the three

---

[5] Dodds, E.R. Introduction. *Gorgias*. By Plato. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. p.24.
[6] Norlin, George. Introduction. *Antidosis*. By Isocrates. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929. p.183
[7] Kennedy, George. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963. p.27.
[8] Attributed to Cicero for over a millennium, but later proved not to be his work, the authorship of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is unknown.
[9] Kennedy, George. Introduction. *On Rhetoric*. By Aristotle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. p.5.

forms of oratory, which will be explained later in this introduction, the second to an extensive discussion of ethos and pathos[10], and the third to style and arrangement. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* dates to "the second decade of the first century B.C."[11] and is the oldest Latin work on rhetoric preserved in its entirety. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is broken into four books, which comprehensively cover all the major topics in rhetorical theory. This book differs from Aristotle's in that it does not devote very much attention to the psychological factors that affect the success of rhetoric, as Aristotle does in his second chapter, but presents a later and more formalized theory of rhetoric which developed in the Hellenistic period after Aristotle. Quintilian, who wrote the most comprehensive existing work on ancient rhetoric, was born around 35 CE, and was a noted teacher of rhetoric. He is thought to have composed the *Orator's Education* after his retirement, at the end of the first century. He is thus significantly later than both Aristotle and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. *The Orator's Education* has been frequently referred to since it is the most exhaustive account of the evolved theory of ancient rhetoric.

I have chosen to use all three of these accounts because they collectively provide a reasonably complete understanding of ancient rhetorical theory. Although many of the topics covered in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and the *Orator's Education* overlap, they are treated differently by each author. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* explains in a clear and concise way information that is also presented

---

[10] Ethos and Pathos will be discussed fully later in chapters two and three, but for the moment, this definition should suffice: ethos is the presentation of the character of the speaker, and pathos is the deliberate provocation of a specific emotional reaction from the audience. Aristotle's chapter on ethos and pathos is frequently referred to as an acute study of human psychology, perhaps the first that exists.

[11] Caplan, Harry. Introduction. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. p.vii

more fully in Quintilian's writing, which typically includes a greater variety of examples and more historical background. The brevity of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* makes it an easier resource to access and use effectively, and for this reason I have chosen to refer to it when presenting information found in both texts.

I will use the theories set forth in these three works as the guidelines through which to analyze and understand both Demosthenes' and George W. Bush's speeches. All three major ancient works post-date Demosthenes. As discussed above, however, Demosthenes was regarded as the most prolific and gifted rhetor by the both later Greeks and the Romans, and his speeches had a tremendous influence on the development of rhetorical theory. Because Demosthenes was the standard of greatness to which many later orators and rhetorical theorists looked, his speeches often conform to and illustrate later theory. Thus although comparing an earlier speech with later theory may present some difficulties, and there are places where Demosthenes deviates from later traditions, these differences are not significant enough to seriously hinder an analysis of Demosthenes' speeches from the standpoint of ancient rhetoric.

III. The Basics of Rhetorical Theory

Quintilian defines rhetoric as comprised of three parts: the art, the artist, and the work itself. It is to the first part that his and other authors' treatises are devoted. The art of rhetoric, again according to Quintilian, can be defined as "the science of speaking well."[12] While a certain amount of natural talent or charisma may inform the delivery and composition of speeches, rhetoric can also be boiled down to

[12] Quintilian. *Orator's Education*. Trans: Donald Russell. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001. 2.14.5. p.351.

something resembling a science, or a technical art, and this is what ancient rhetorical theorists attempted to do. They asked the question, 'what makes a speech persuasive?' and answered it in a variety of ways. Aristotle uses a great deal of psychology in his analysis of ethos and pathos, while later Roman writers focused on the technical aspects of rhetoric, down to details of style like construction of grammar and correct word choice. Rhetoric essentially is a codification of techniques of persuasion, in all its aspects. I will now introduce some of the basic concepts of rhetorical theory that will be relevant to a discussion of *Against Aristocrates* and the March 17th speech.

All writings on ancient rhetoric outline three different forms of oratory: forensic, deliberative and epideictic. Forensic oratory refers to all oratory that is judicial in nature. This form is the oratory of court cases, and most routinely seeks to prove the guilt or innocence of a particular party. It can also deal more broadly with issues of illegality and constitutionality. Deliberative speeches are those given on political subject matter. They almost always either urge to or dissuade their audience from adopting a particular course of action. The two central topics of deliberative oratory are expediency and honor. The third form of oratory is epideictic. Epideictic oratory is the speech of praise or blame. The subject of this kind of oratory can be any number of things: specific people, places, even the gods. There are also a number of functions for epideictic oratory. Quintilian describes "funeral laudations... praise and discredit in court... and public speeches" about political candidates. All speeches, according to ancient theorists, are designed in one of these forms. It is also possible

that a speech, while technically belonging to one class, will contain aspects of all three, as is the case of *Against Aristocrates*.

Rhetorical theory also identifies five central components of rhetoric. These are the basic elements, which together cover every aspect of speaking well: The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines them as Invention, Arrangement, Delivery, Memory and Style. Ancient speeches were evaluated on the basis of their success in all five categories. Invention refers to the creation of the arguments that will prove the central point: "the devising of the matter, true or plausible, that would make the case convincing."[13] Arrangement, or Disposition, is defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as "the ordering and distribution of the matter, making clear the place to which each thing is to be assigned."[14] Thus, it is the order by which all parts of the speech are joined. Style, or Elocution, is the "adaption of suitable words and sentences to the matter devised."[15] Memory is "the firm retention in the mind of the matter, words and arrangement."[16] Delivery is the "graceful regulation of voice, countenance and gesture."[17] Because memory and delivery cannot be judged in an analysis of an ancient speech, I have chosen not to incorporate these two elements of rhetoric into my analysis.

I will focus specifically on Invention, Arrangement and Style as they are manifested in the two speeches. My discussion of Invention will be based on an analysis of the main arguments that the speeches make, and the ways in which those

---

[13] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Trans: Harry Caplan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. 1.2.3. p.7.
[14] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 1.2.3. p.7.
[15] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 1.2.3. p.7.
[16] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 1.2.3. p.7.
[17] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 1.2.3. p.7. .

arguments are constructed. Arrangement refers to the disposition of subject matter in an ordered sequence of the parts of the speech. In the ancient tradition, these parts were defined in a formal system of rhetoric. Although more subdivisions of the speech are possible, the central ones, which will be discussed in this thesis, are as follows: prooimion, statement of facts, partition, proofs and conclusion. The prooimion is the introduction; the statement of facts is a brief summation of all the relevant facts and history that pertain to the argument at hand; the partition briefly outlines the course that the argument will follow; the proofs are the most substantive section of the speech where the rhetor makes his argument; and the conclusion summarizes the most important aspects of the argument and normally includes elements of an emotional appeal. I will also pay special attention to Style, as my main task is to determine persuasiveness, and style plays a significant role in the determining the persuasive force of a speech. Style is primarily comprised of figures of thought, figures of diction and tropes. Figures of diction refer "to the fine polish of the language itself," while figures of thought "derive a certain distinction from the idea, not from the words."[18] A trope, defined in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as a specific kind of figure of diction, deviates from other figures of diction in that "the language departs from the ordinary meanings of words;"[19] this typically involves lexical substitution. Invention, Arrangement and Style will be crucial in my analyses of *Against Aristocrates* and the March 17th speech.

Because *Against Aristocrates* is much longer than George Bush's speech, and displays a level of argumentation that far surpasses anything found in the March 17th

[18] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.12.18. p.275.
[19] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.31.42. p.333.

speech, I have chosen to devote the entirety of my first two chapters to an analysis of Demosthenes, and only the third to Bush. The first chapter of my thesis will present the main sections of *Against Aristocrates* as they correspond to the concepts of structure expressed in ancient rhetorical theory. The purpose of this chapter will be to illuminate how Demosthenes makes and orders his arguments; this will mean analyzing each section of the speech to determine what makes it persuasive and how that compares with the guidelines of theory. The second chapter will be devoted entirely to a discussion of Demosthenes' style: specifically, this chapter will analyze Demosthenes' overall use of language and tone, and the specific rhetorical figures that function to make his speech persuasive. The third chapter will be an analysis of the March 17th speech. In this chapter I will analyze the content, structure and style of the speech, as well as include a discussion of the impact of the modern world, and specifically modern media, on its form and content. Because *Against Aristocrates* in many ways exemplifies the principles of ancient rhetorical theory, although it does deviate in certain places, I will be able to analyze the March 17th speech through both the theoretical guidelines explained in the writings of authors like Aristotle and Quintilian and through a practical understanding of how those precepts applied in antiquity. By comparing the March 17th speech with both theory and ancient rhetorical practice as exemplified by *Against Aristocrates*, I hope to be able to closely analyze those areas where modern oratory conform or are similar to practices in the ancient world, and the ways in which they are different, and most of all to ascertain what is the most persuasive in each.

Chapter 1: Rhetorical Structure of *Against Aristocrates*

The most useful point of departure in an analysis of an ancient speech is to break the speech down into its parts: the prooimion, narration, partition, proofs and conclusion. This introductory step will provide the framework from which one can analyze the many ways a speech is crafted to be persuasive: the arguments, how they are created and sustained throughout the speech, and the rhetorical figures that used to make the speech convincing and powerful. The following chapter breaks *Against Aristocrates* down into these parts, describing the functions of these parts according to ancient rhetorical theorists, analyzing the ways in which Demosthenes conforms to or deviates from these traditions, and presenting an analysis of his persuasive methods. It is only through first analyzing the speech in this fashion that one can begin to understand how the rhetorical tools that Demosthenes employs function, and how he structures his arguments to be as persuasive as possible.

I. Prooimion

The prooimion is the introduction of the speech. Traditionally brief, its main function, according to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, is to put the "judge" into a certain frame of mind. In later writing on rhetorical theory this became even more specific: Quintilian writes that the purpose of the prooimion is "simply to prepare the hearer to be more favorably inclined towards us for the rest of the proceedings. Most authors agree that there are three main ways of doing this: by making him well-disposed, attentive and ready to learn."[20] Demosthenes succeeds in securing the goodwill of his

[20] Quintilian. 4.1.5. p.181

jury by immediately presenting Euthycles[21], in the first section of the speech, as a man interested only in the well-being of Athens, and one who has no enmity towards Aristocrates. This immediately separates the speaker from other, less scrupulous rhetoricians, and helps to create goodwill on the part of the audience. The prooimion, the first seven sections of the speech, also introduces all three of the major points that Demosthenes will make in the later proofs sections: that the decree is illegal, disadvantageous and for an undeserving man. He relates his wish "to prove that, so far from being our benefactor, he [Charidemus] is particularly ill-disposed to us, and that exactly the wrong conception has been formed of his character."[22] He calls the proposed decree "illegal," which foreshadows the arguments he will make in the judicial sections of the proofs. The point he emphasizes as the most crucial in the introduction, however, corresponds to those arguments Demosthenes presents in the deliberative proofs: that the decree "really robs our city of an honest and effective safeguard for the Chersonese."[23] Demosthenes gains the attention of the audience by suggesting that the decree has grave political implications. Thus the proem fulfills the traditional central purpose of the introduction, and paves the way for the rest of the speech.

II. Statement of Facts

The next sections of the speech, the statement of facts, or narration, and the partition both lead up to the most substantive and important section, the proofs. Quintilian describes the purpose of the narration as "to point out the facts on which

---

[21] Again, Demosthenes did not give the speech himself. He actually makes Euthycles, the speaker, appear in this way.
[22] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. Trans: J.H.Vince. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. 6. p.217
[23] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 3. p.215

the judge is to pronounce as soon as he has been prepared for it."[24] Quintilian's discussion of the statement of facts presupposes a forensic speech, but the central purpose of the statement of facts here is the same: to give the audience the basic information they need to know so as to understand his later arguments. It is necessary for Demosthenes to ground his political argument in iterated facts and events for one to understand the more complex arguments he makes later on in the deliberative section of the proofs. In the narration in *Against Aristocrates*, sections 8-17, Demosthenes presents a series of political facts with the aim of exposing the actual intentions of Aristocrates in passing the decree, namely to aid the political position of the Thracian king Cersobleptes. By presenting factual information in way that would bias the audience against Aristocrates, Demosthenes gives his audience relevant historical information in a way that is also extremely persuasive.

III. Partition

The third section of the speech, referred to as the partition, briefly outlines the structure of the different proofs sections that follow immediately afterwards. The partition resembles a table of contents by presenting the points a speaker will argue. The purpose of the partition is "the orderly enumeration of our propositions."[25] The "propositions" Quintilian refers to here are the central points of each section of the proofs, which follow this section. Demosthenes describes, in sections 18-21, the arguments he will use in the proofs: he will "prove three propositions—first that the decree is unconstitutional, secondly that it is injurious to the common weal, and thirdly that the person in whose favor it has been moved [Charidemus] is unworthy of

[24] Quintilian. 4.2.1. p.219
[25] Quintilian. 4.5.1. p.299

such a privilege."[26] Demosthenes then goes on to address the audience in dramatic fashion.[27] He asks the audience which section of the speech they would like to hear first, and then answers his own question, attributing to the jury a preference for hearing the judicial section first. This section's primary purpose is to succinctly outline for the audience the major points of the proofs section, so that the audience will be prepared and know what to expect. Although small, this section is crucial; the audience can much more easily understand what Demosthenes says in the proofs sections because they have been prepared by the partition.

These first three sections, the prooimion, statement of facts and partition, only encompass the first 21 sections of the speech, but together serve an important purpose. They establish in the minds of the audience an initial understanding of who the speaker is and the arguments he will make. This introduction prepares them and provides them with all of the information necessary to understand the points that will be made in the proofs sections. Without these introductory three sections the audience would be left adrift, uncertain about the overall arc of the speech and unclear about how the arguments that Demosthenes presents relate to each other or build a comprehensive central point. While the proofs sections of the speech are the most considerable, and it is here that Demosthenes really makes his arguments, the first three sections create the necessary groundwork from which Demosthenes can substantiate his arguments.

---

[26] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 18. p.225

[27] This address is an example of apostrophe. Demosthenes' use apostrophe will be discussed in chapter two.

IV. The Proofs

The proofs section of *Against Aristocrates* is unique in that it combines all three forms of rhetoric: it has elements of the judicial, deliberative and epideictic. Demosthenes' aim, in making this speech, is to convince his Athenian audience not to pass the decree proposed by Aristocrates. The speech takes a judicial form, but is not a typical judicial case in that there is no one on trial. In order to present a comprehensive case Demosthenes constructs a three-pronged argument: he presents the decree as unconstitutional since it contravenes a number of Athenian laws (judicial), as disadvantageous politically for Athens (deliberative), and also as an honor about to be bestowed on someone deeply unworthy of Athens' protection (epideictic). The proofs section begins with his judicial argument. In this section the argument depends on the speaker presenting a series of Athenian laws and discussing how the proposed decree breaks each law. The judicial section of the speech encompasses sections 22-101. From there, he goes about presenting the decree as not merely unconstitutional, but certain to put Athens in an undesirable political situation in terms of foreign policy. He presents both potential damaging situations in the future that the decree will make likely to happen and examples from the past that support the idea, which he presents as fact, that the decree was proposed because of its benefits to Charidemus, not to Athens. Demosthenes then, in the most emotional section of the speech, goes on to thoroughly condemn Charidemus' character: the epideictic section is the icing on the cake, making the proposed decree not only unconstitutional and disadvantageous, but downright outrageous.

IV. 1. The Judicial Proofs

The judicial section of the proofs in *Against Aristocrates* is in many senses not comparable to other forensic speeches because the task at hand was to prove the illegality of a decree, not to determine the innocence or guilt of a particular person. To make his case, Demosthenes demonstrates that the decree is illegal by systematically presenting different Athenian law statutes that the decree breaks. Quintilian divides proofs into two main types: non-technical and technical. A non-technical proof consists of "previous decisions, rumors, evidence from torture, documents, oaths and witnesses."[28] In short, non-technical proofs include any sort of evidence that does not rest solely on rhetorical skill and the creation of rhetorical arguments. Arguments which do rest on rhetorical skill are called technical proofs. The judicial section of *Against Aristocrates* might best be described as technical proofs serving the purpose of overarching greater non-technical proofs. Demosthenes structures the judicial section of the proofs by presenting a series of Athenian law statutes, many of which pertain to the protocol for homicide cases, and then systematically goes about showing how the "inviolability" proposed for Charidemus breaks the law, either in word or in spirit. Demosthenes presents law statutes (non-technical proofs) and then uses rhetorical arguments (technical proofs) to expound his points.

Demosthenes structures the judicial section of the proofs to create three large arguments: that the decree violates a number of Athenian laws that prescribe the treatment for murderers, that it circumvents the use of venerated Athenian legal

[28] Quintilian. 5.1.1. p.157.

institutions, and that the very act of proposing an illegal decree is, in fact, illegal. Demosthenes begins this section by bringing up laws that prescribe the treatment of those accused of murder: the first two laws he presents are those that place the power of trial and punishment in the hands of the law and of respected Athenian legal institutions. The first statute states that: "The Council of Areopagus shall take cognizance in cases of homicide, of intentional wounding, of arson, and of poisoning, if a man kills another by giving poison."[29] Demosthenes proves that Aristocrates' decree violates this law because it removes the power of prosecution from an Athenian law court and places it into the hands of the accusers of Charidemus' hypothetical future murderer. The arguments that he builds upon the following four statutes are very similar. They deal with the prescribed treatment of murderers, and Demosthenes outlines, in different ways, the same basic tenet: that the proposed decree is unlawful because it does not require the use of Athenian legal institutions and breaks with Athenian tradition and practice that pertains to the prosecution of homicide.

In section 53, Demosthenes changes tactics and begins to examine situations in which murder is lawful. He first brings up the decree: "If a man kill another unintentionally in an athletic contest, or overcoming him in a fight on the highway, or unwittingly in battle, or in intercourse with his wife, or mother, or sister, or daughter, or concubine kept for procreation of legitimate children, he shall not go into exile as a manslayer on that account."[30] Demosthenes presents both this statute and the one that follows, which allows for murder in self-defense, and points out that Aristocrates'

[29] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 22. p.227
[30] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 53. pp.247-249

decree does not allow for the possibility of legitimate murder: the decree states "whoever kill Charidemus" without any qualifications. Thus Demosthenes proves that Aristocrates' decree violated Athenian laws that prescribe the method of prosecuting a homicide, and those laws that allow murder under specific circumstances.

Demosthenes constructs the judicial proofs by having the various Athenian laws read aloud according to normal court procedure, and then systematically employs rhetorical techniques to prove how the proposed decree violates each law. In section 44, Demosthenes has the following decree read:

> If any man outside the frontier pursue and violently seize the person of any homicide who has quitted the country, and whose goods are not confiscate, he shall incur the same penalty as if he acted within our own territory.[31]

Demosthenes begins his rhetorical criticism by lauding the law, calling it "humanely and excellently enacted."[32] There is then an explanation of specific terms used in the law, and what the law means in the context of the decree: "what is the significance of 'outside the frontier'? For all homicides alike the frontier implies the exclusion from the country of the person slain."[33] Although the meaning of this law may have initially been unclear to his audience, Demosthenes crafts a meaning that will suit his argument: that the law protects those murderers who have gone into exile from violent persecution where they reside, "outside the frontier." On this interpretation of the law Demosthenes builds the argument that because the decree proposed by

[31] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 44. p.241
[32] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 44. p.241
[33] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 46. p.243

Aristocrates allows for any man who kills Charidemus "to be seized anywhere,"[34] the decree violates the law stated above. By presenting sections of Athenian laws in a particular way, and by not allowing the possibility of any other interpretations, Demosthenes makes his case that the decree is unlawful. Through this methodology Demosthenes proves that Aristocrates' decree violates many different Athenian law codes that regulate homicide.

Demosthenes also structures the progression of the laws relating to homicide, in sections 22-62, in a way that builds up the audience's emotions. He begins with laws that are more technical in nature, and progresses to those laws that are most dramatic and most directly pertain to his audience. The first law Demosthenes chooses to present designates the Court of Areopagus as the authority in cases of wrongful death. He points out that the "inviolability" proposed by Aristocrates for Charidemus allows for the culprit of Charidemus' hypothetical murder to be liable to immediate seizure and prosecution: "when they have got him, they are allowed to torture him, or maltreat him, or extort money from him,"[35] actions that contradict Athenian judicial procedure. While this argument is certainly engaging to the audience, it may have appeared a technical argument, and since it involved how to treat a murderer, unlikely to engage their sympathies.

From a statute like this one, Demosthenes builds to statutes certain to evoke a strong emotional reaction from the audience. In section 61 Demosthenes asks his audience: "Who will be 'violently and illegally' seized by Charidemus? Everybody. Surely you are aware that any man who has troops at command lays hands on

[34] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 49. p.245
[35] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 27. p.231

whomsoever he thinks he can overpower."[36] Demosthenes then erupts in a crescendo of emotion: "Heaven and Earth! Is it not monstrous, is it not manifestly contrary to law,-I do not mean merely to the statute law but to the unwritten law of our common humanity,-- that I should not be permitted to defend myself against one who violently seizes my goods as though I were an enemy?"[37] The emotion of this outburst is more effective because of the way Demosthenes personalizes the danger presented by the proposed decree. By structuring the order of the Athenian laws presented, Demosthenes is able to transform a process that might otherwise have been repetitive and boring into one that grows in relevance to the audience and in emotional force, thus ensuring the jury's attentiveness and personal involvement in the outcome of the proposed decree.

The second main argument of the judicial portion of the speech examines different Athenian legal institutions. This section of the speech plays heavily upon Athenian patriotism and tradition: Demosthenes extols the virtues of the institutions that he has just proved Aristocrates' decree supersedes. He begins this section with the statute in section 62, which reads: "whosoever, whether magistrate or private citizen, shall cause this ordinance to be frustrated, or shall alter the same, shall be disenfranchised with his children and his property."[38] Demosthenes uses this statute to launch a polemic against Aristocrates himself, claiming that by proposing his decree he is attempting to undermine Athenian law codes.

Demosthenes then moves from his scathing examination of Aristocrates to discussing the virtues of the institutions that Aristocrates would circumvent if his

---

[36] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 61. p.253
[37] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 61. p.253-255
[38] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 62. p.255

decree were made legislation. "There are many institutions of ours the like of which are not to be found elsewhere, but among them one especially peculiar to ourselves and venerable—I mean the Court of Areopagus."[39] Framing the court in this light appeals to the jury's patriotism and the pride that they as Athenians should have in their institutions. Demosthenes further remarks that "this is the only tribunal which no despot, no oligarchy, no democracy, has ever dared to deprive of its jurisdiction in cases of murder."[40] He wants to point out the historical precedent that his audience will set if they pass Aristocrates' decree: more than violating a few Athenian laws, the decree will break with a proud Athenian tradition that survived even through its most troubled times. Demosthenes then discusses five other Athenian law courts, each time relating stories that emphasize the historical importance and power of the institution. He goes on to sum up his arguments against Aristocrates' decree, and ends on a dramatic note: "Could any decree be more monstrous and more unconstitutional?"[41]

Finally, Demosthenes relates three more decrees that conclude his section of judicial proofs. The first of these relates the accepted practice for the kinsmen of those who die violent deaths: Demosthenes' purpose here is to again iterate the point that Athens already has just laws that address homicide, and that the decree proposed by Aristocrates does not allow for these laws to be followed. This statute refreshes for the audience the point Demosthenes has already made, and prepares them for the argument he will make with the next two statutes. These introduce the idea that the very act of proposing Aristocrates' decree is illegal. These statutes are "It shall not be

[39] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 66. p.259
[40] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 66. p.259
[41] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 81. p.271

legal to propose a statute directed against an individual, unless the same apply to all Athenians" and "No decree either of the Council or of the Assembly shall have superior authority to a statute."[42] Demosthenes uses the statutes to argue that Aristocrates has broken the law by proposing a decree that a) only applies to one person and b) circumvents already existing laws in an illegal fashion. This clever argument provides a fitting end to Demosthenes' judicial approach. By moving from presenting the ways in which the decree itself violates Athenian laws to an examination of the historical prestige of the Athenian law courts to an analysis of the illegality of even proposing the decree, Demosthenes thoroughly achieves his purpose in the judicial proofs, and proves beyond any doubt that the decree is unconstitutional. Demosthenes' arguments in the judicial proofs rely both on the emotional sentiments of the audience and on rational persuasion.

IV. 2. The Deliberative Proofs

The transition between the judicial and deliberative proofs demonstrates Demosthenes' rhetorical skill extremely well. This transition takes place in sections 100-102. Demosthenes uses the judicial decree in section 87, reading "No decree of the Council or of the Assembly shall have superior authority to a statute"[43] to build an argument against Aristocrates. He claims that by proposing a decree that would break so many Athenian statutes, as Demosthenes has just proven is the case, Aristocrates is himself breaking the law. From there, Demosthenes sets up something of a straw man argument.[44] He supposes, in section 100, that Aristocrates will claim that the illegality of his decree will be outweighed by the expediency of such a decree: "but

[42] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 86-87. p.275
[43] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 87. p.275
[44] The rhetorical figure used here, hypophora, will be discussed in the second chapter.

before now, men of Athens, I have seen a man contesting an indictment for illegal measures, who, though convicted by law, made an attempt to argue that his proposal had been to the public advantage."[45] In response Demosthenes argues that any decree that breaks with Athenian laws is by nature disadvantageous, but beyond that, that the decree proposed is in and of itself distinctly disadvantageous to the Athenian state. Demosthenes' imagined counter-argument allows him to smoothly move into the political proofs, which follow.

In the political proofs, which begin at section 101, Demosthenes examines Aristocrates' decree in terms of its impact on foreign policy. In discussing deliberative oratory, Quintilian outlines two main sources of arguments for the deliberative speech: expediency and honor. While the primary emphasis of Demosthenes' deliberative proofs section appears to be expediency, he does include a brief argument that stipulates that the decree is not only disadvantageous but dishonorable as well. The political proofs section can be broken up into two major divisions of argument. The first, in which Demosthenes presents a series of arguments about the ways in which the decree would be disadvantageous, spans sections 102-137, while the second, in which Demosthenes presents the argument that passing the decree would be dishonorable, occupies sections 138-143. Most of Demosthenes' arguments in this section of the proofs rest on the use of the rhetorical figure paradigm: he compares the present situation with Charidemus to roughly comparable past situations that had adverse consequences, and suggests that

[45] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 100. p.285

Charidemus will behave in the fashion exemplified.[46] The deliberative proofs are perhaps the most important section of the three areas of proofs that Demosthenes puts forward. His prooimion and statement of facts both point to the importance of the political proofs. This section also contains the most persuasive argument; while the illegality of the decree and the unworthy nature of Charidemus might carry weight with his audience, it is his claim that the decree will be dangerous for Athens that carries the greatest sense of urgency and speaks of immediate and undesirable consequences.

Demosthenes approaches the task of convincing his audience that the decree will be seriously disadvantageous to Athens by presenting a variety of inexpedient future situations that are likely to come to pass if Aristocrates' decree goes into effect. His first point, in sections 102-110, is that the security of the Chersonese rests on having no power gain predominance in Thrace.[47] The decree, by strengthening Charidemus, and thus Charidemus' bosom buddy Cersobleptes, would make it impossible for the other Thracian kings to oppose Cersobleptes in war, because of the fear of Athenian retribution. Demosthenes then imagines that someone might argue against him by suggesting that Athens need not fear Cersobleptes making war against them, as he would gain nothing from doing so. He uses this as a jumping off point from which to build his next point (sections 110-117): that men often behave irrationally. He illustrates this point with a historical example. Although it would not

[46] Demosthenes' use of paradigm will be discussed at length in the second chapter.
[47] The Chersonese is the region between Athens and Thrace. Athens and Thrace frequently fought over this territory, but at the time of the speech the Chersonese rested in Athenian hands. Thrace at this period was ruled by three separate kings: Cersobleptes, Bersiades and Amodocus. Demosthenes claims in the Statement of Facts (sections 9-11) that Cersobleptes is on the verge of war with Bersiades and Amodocus, and needs Aristocrates' decree to be passed to help ensure his victory.

be wise for Cersobleptes to attack Athens, one cannot suppose that he will not do so. Demosthenes then makes the point, in sections 118-122, that previous judgments of character can be faulty; he states that it would be "sheer lunacy" to engage in a decree on such an unreliable perception of character.

Demosthenes' second and third major points both deal with the future. In both cases he claims that the decree is disadvantageous because it may help one of Athens' neighbors to wage war upon them. Demosthenes then changes tactics to propose in sections 123-125 that this decree would be disadvantageous because it sets a dangerous precedent; if Athens offers this protection to Charidemus, must it not do so to all of its benefactors in the future? Demosthenes also stipulates that one cannot trust Charidemus' motives because Charidemus has demonstrated no particular attachment to Athens as he chooses to keep his home elsewhere. Demosthenes then reiterates how powerful Charidemus will become if the decree is passed. All of these arguments present the ways in which the decree will be harmful to Athens: whether by making one of the Thracian kings more powerful than the others, by setting a dangerous precedent for the behavior of Athens to its benefactors or simply through making the untrustworthy Charidemus inordinately powerful.

After presenting arguments that the decree will be disadvantageous to Athens, Demosthenes then changes approaches yet again, and in sections 133-137 relates the idea that the decree would not serve its stated purpose, and would actually harm Charidemus in the long run. He relates what would happen "should [Cersobleptes] disdain that man, and initiate plots and disturbances against you."[48] He suggests that

[48] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 133. p.305

Cersobleptes, having no attachment to Athens, would not hesitate to dispose of Charidemus, and that the decree is likely to bring Charidemus into peril. This argument is slightly disconcerting because up until this point, and in fact in the sections directly preceding this argument, Demosthenes operates under the assumption that Charidemus is entirely unworthy of Athenian protection, but here he pretends to look to Charidemus' interests. Instead of continuing along the path he has set for Charidemus' character Demosthenes takes a moment to say 'well, let us suppose that Charidemus is the great benefactor he has been presented as, this decree would actually offer no benefit to him, and we as his friends should not pass it.' This is an excellent example of the comprehensive nature of the arguments Demosthenes makes: he first persuades the audience that the decree will be disadvantageous for a number of reasons, but in case they are not convinced by his previous arguments, he then asserts that if passed the decree will not even be able to serve its purpose and protect Charidemus from those most likely to harm him. Demosthenes will not pass up any means of persuasion, and thus proves the decree not only disadvantageous but ineffective.

While Demosthenes deals explicitly with the question of honor only in the last part of the deliberative proofs, sections 139-143, he at various points chides his audience, in a way that implies that passing Aristocrates' decree would be dishonorable. According to later rhetoricians like Quintilian it is advisable to address one's audience in flattering tones so as to encourage in them goodwill toward the speaker, but here Demosthenes instead chastises the Athenians for their perception

that this decree might be in their best interest.[49] He compares Cersobleptes' treatment of Athens to Philip's treatment of Olynthus, as Cersobleptes restored the Chersonese to Athens and Philip restored Potidaea to Olynthus. Despite this Olynthus did not pass a decree analogous to that proposed by Aristocrates, but instead, having recognized Philip's power and the threat it presented, allied themselves with the Athenians, Philip's enemies. Demosthenes berates his Athenian audience, saying; "It is discreditable to you, who have a reputation for superior ability in political deliberation, should be convicted of a duller perception of your own advantage than Olynthians."[50] Demosthenes here refers to Athens' traditional role as a great international power, and in doing so touches on Athenian pride, but chastises his audience for lacking the political foresight of either a foreign people or their own ancestors. This strategy breaks with later rhetorical tradition, but is perhaps appropriate here; by critiquing his audience in this way, Demosthenes makes the point that his audience, by passing the decree, would hurt Athens' reputation for excellence and thereby act dishonorably.

Demosthenes addresses honor directly in the last section of the deliberative proofs. He begins with Athenian reputation, asking "Men of Athens, is it creditable to you, is it dignified, that you should be known to have carried such a measure for the protection of a fellow who, to satisfy his greed, is ready to fall foul of anybody who comes his way?"[51] Clearly, if one believes Demosthenes' earlier assertions about Charidemus' character, and the assertions that will follow in the epideictic proofs section, this decree could do nothing but disgrace Athens in the eyes of the rest

[49] This is another rhetorical figure, Frankness of Speech, that will be discussed in the second chapter.
[50] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 109. p.291
[51] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 139. p.309

of the world. Demosthenes intensifies his argument by stating that it is the plain duty of his Athenian jury to strike down the decree: "I would like to relate a piece of history which will make it still more evident to you that it is your bounden duty to abrogate this decree."[52] Demosthenes presents a paradigm of a man, Philiscus, who was granted citizenship by Athens and who went on to embarrass them by "committing many outrages, mutilating free-born boys, insulting women and behaving in general as you would expect a man, who had been brought up where there were no laws... to behave if he attained to power."[53] Through this example Demosthenes suggests that Charidemus will behave in the same way. Demosthenes makes a strong case for the dishonor that would follow the passage of the decree, through both implication and outright statement, and also sets up an easy transition to the epideictic proofs.

IV. 3. The Epideictic Proofs

The epideictic part of *Against Aristocrates* begins with section 144. Demosthenes clearly marks both his change in approach and his purpose in this third and final proofs section; he states that his "next purpose is to examine the past history of Charidemus, and to unmask the extraordinary audacity of his flatterers."[54] For the vast majority of the epideictic section of the speech he presents a history of Charidemus' behavior, specifically calculated to present him in the worst light possible. His ultimate aim, it seems, is to prove that Charidemus is untrustworthy, and even beyond that, is entirely self-interested; in short, not only is he not the great benefactor he had been made out to be, but he is actually one of Athens' enemies, and

[52] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 141. p.311
[53] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 141. p.311
[54] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 144. p.313

not deserving of the honors that had bestowed upon him previously. Demosthenes concludes his chronicle of Charidemus' past actions in section 178, at which point he brings up the proposed decree and again explains the ways in which the decree benefits Charidemus to Athens' detriment.

In section 187-195 Demosthenes presents two counterarguments to the arguments he anticipates that his opposition will invoke against him; he explains why he had not previously denounced Charidemus' character, and also addresses the objection that Charidemus had been dangerous to Athens in the past, but had reformed and was now to be considered a friend. These counterarguments are sometimes described in rhetorical theory as a specific subsection of the speech, the refutations. In section 196 Demosthenes again changes approaches, and here discusses Athens' past treatment of its heroes, both benevolent foreigners and its own citizens. This portion, which ends in section 214, does not directly deal with Charidemus' character, but instead seeks to achieve what Demosthenes outlines as his second purpose: to "unmask the extraordinary audacity of his flatterers." These sections are designed to make the very idea of putting forth such a decree, which had no equivalent even in the cases of the greatest figures of Athens' past, seem ludicrously inappropriate.

The epideictic section of the proofs is interesting in that it conforms to rhetorical theory's category of invective but also has the greater purpose of supporting the points put forward in the deliberative section of the proofs. Epideictic speeches are divisible into two sorts: speeches of praise and of blame. This section of the proofs clearly deals with blame. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states that there are

three major sources for the epideictic speech, whether of praise or of blame: these are "external circumstances, physical attributes and qualities of character."[55] Demosthenes exclusively deals with Charidemus' qualities of character. The author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, in discussing qualities of character, writes that "[they] rest upon our judgment and thought; wisdom, justice, courage, temperance and their contraries."[56] The first major argument that Demosthenes makes is that Charidemus is unworthy of the honors that Athens both has in the past and may yet bestow upon him. This argument is made through a deconstruction of Charidemus' past actions, designated to make him appear by turns opportunistic, untrustworthy, villainous and stupid. Although the contraries to the cardinal virtues listed above are never named, one may assume that the personality characteristics Demosthenes attributes to Charidemus roughly correspond with rhetorical theory. In this sense Demosthenes constructs his argument in accordance with later rhetorical theory; he does so, however, not only thoroughly to condemn Charidemus' character, but to reinforce his earlier point that Charidemus is deeply untrustworthy, and that passing the decree Aristocrates proposed would be directly harmful to Athens' position in the Greek world.

Demosthenes begins his account of Charidemus' history with an interesting maxim.[57] He remarks that he will not begin with the early history of Charidemus, although he did harm to Athens then, because "hard necessity does away with all consideration of what anyone should or should not do; and therefore in such matters a

---

[55] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 3.6.10. p.173
[56] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 3.6.10-11. p.175
[57] A maxim is a short statement that is meant to express some generally accepted truth. Maxim is a rhetorical figure, and will be discussed in chapter two.

candid examiner must not be too fastidious."[58] This statement serves two purposes: it suggests a comparison with Charidemus' subsequent actions that were not the result of necessity, but of his devious character, and also has the benefit of making Demosthenes himself look like a fair judge, not to hold Charidemus responsible for involuntary actions. It is especially important for Demosthenes to secure the goodwill of his audience through this section, as he makes for himself the difficult task of presenting an acknowledged benefactor of Athens as unscrupulous and dishonorable. This statement reiterates the speaker's self-image as simple, honest and fair-minded and in this sense helps to keep the goodwill of his audience.

Demosthenes then presents the military career of Charidemus. It is not necessary to relate the entirety of what Demosthenes says about Charidemus here; there are, however, a few passages worth examining. He tells of Charidemus' entanglement with the army of Artabazus, a commander from Asia Minor, and how he finally found himself helpless and besieged without any resources: "he had a misadventure into which even an ordinary person, not to say a man calling himself a commander, should never have blundered.... although he had no means of supplying his troops with provisions, and had no food in the towns, he remained within the walls."[59] Demosthenes describes this situation as entirely the fault of Charidemus, with the result that Charidemus appears an incompetent military leader who exercises poor judgment. Demosthenes then uses this example to further undermine Charidemus, by suggesting that the only reason Charidemus extended a gesture of friendship to Athens in the first place was to get himself out of these miserable straits:

---

[58] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 148. p.315
[59] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 155. p.321

"when he realized what trouble he was in... he made the discovery, whether by suggestion or by his own wits, that his only chance of salvation lay.... In your good nature, if that is the right term, men of Athens."[60] Demosthenes' most startling revelation about Charidemus' character, however, comes later on, when he relates the story of Miltocythes, an ally of Athens, whom Charidemus without compunction handed over to the bloodthirsty Cardians. They "took Miltocythes and his son, put out in a ship to deep water, cut the boy's throat, and then threw the father overboard, after he had witnessed the murder of his son."[61] Demosthenes relates that Charidemus had the option of giving Miltocythes to Cersobleptes, who would not have killed him, but instead chose to surrender him to the Cardians. In this way Demosthenes not only represents Charidemus as exclusively self-interested and not very intelligent, but also depicts him as morally reprehensible. Aside from demonstrating thorough disgust at Charidemus' character and actions, Demosthenes purpose in this portion of the epideictic section is best summed up by his own conclusion: "he always acted inconsistently, never like an honest [dikaiwj], straightforward man."[62] Demosthenes chooses to highlight Charidemus' untrustworthy nature above his other flaws because it also supports his political ends; by showing Charidemus unreliable and dishonest, he hearkens back to the political proofs and demonstrates the disadvantageous nature of offering immunity to such an unreliable character.

---

[60] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 156. p.321
[61] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 169. p.333
[62] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 178. p.339

In section 179 Demosthenes moves to the current political situation in Athens' relations with Charidemus; sections 179-186 perfectly combine deliberative and epideictic proofs. Demosthenes argues that Charidemus has positioned himself and his army in Cardia, from which it would be extremely easy to attack the Chersonese should Cersobleptes ever decide to do so. Demosthenes implies that Charidemus is just waiting for the orders to attack the Chersonese, which is Athenian territory. He approaches this section from the standpoint of epideictic proofs: his central point is that Charidemus is untrustworthy and acts for his own benefit, not Athens'. This argument is undoubtedly extremely damning for Charidemus' character, and also reinforces for the audience the great political danger posed by the passage of Aristocrates' decree.

After this reiteration of what he has already proposed in the deliberative proofs, Demosthenes presents two counterarguments that he supposes his opposition might make. This section is no longer really a portion of the proofs, but might better be termed the "refutations." Quintilian discusses refutations from the standpoint of forensic oratory. The majority of his discussion does not apply here, but his basic premises are applicable: Quintilian writes that if the point brought against the person on trial "is relevant, we must either deny or justify."[63] Demosthenes anticipates that he will be asked why he has not condemned Charidemus previously, and in answer he states that "in the first place, men of Athens, I imagined that a great many men glibly telling lies about him would overpower one man, namely myself, telling the truth

[63] Quintilian. 5.13.4. p.469

alone."[64] This statement both justifies the speaker's lack of previous actions, but also sets up an opposition between the speaker and other dishonest rhetors. Demosthenes communicates again the speaker's honesty, and his earnest desire to better only the interests of Athens.[65]

His second response, in sections 191-195, rejects the other claim, that Charidemus was dangerous to Athens in the past, but is now Athens' friend. Demosthenes supposes that if Charidemus is actually Athens' friend, he will continue to behave as such even without the decree being passed, and thus prove his friendship; or if he is not truly a friend, and the decree is not passed, he will "abandon his impostures on the ground that they can no longer escape detection."[66] Demosthenes describes friendship here as something that should neither depend on nor be created by honors such as the one proposed for Charidemus; he argues that Athens has nothing to gain by passing the decree.

Demosthenes goes on to argue that the very idea of such a decree, even for someone of the highest character, is inconsistent with and a dishonor to Athenian history. Demosthenes begins section 196 by stating that it is "opportune... to inquire how our forefathers bestowed distinctions and rewards upon genuine benefactors, whether they were citizens or strangers."[67] Demosthenes then chooses a series of Athenian heroes and benefactors to discuss, all of whom are from the fifth century, when Athens was at the peak of its powers. He makes the point that at the height of

---

[64] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 188. p.345
[65] This is an example of ethos, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter two.
[66] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 195. p.351
[67] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 196. p.351

its glory Athens did not bestow decrees like the one proposed by Aristocrates, and describes the fact that modern Athens is considering such an act as shameful:

> Tou mentoi tauq outwj aisxrwj proelhluqenai, ei dei parrhsiaj eipein talhqh, oudenej umwn, w andrej Aqhnaioi, mallon eisin aitioi.[68]

Demosthenes chooses blunt, strong words here: he uses the loaded term aisxrwj, which translates literally as "shameful" or "dishonorable." By using examples from the past Demosthenes both doffs his hat to Athenian history, perhaps to evoke patriotic sentiments from his audience, and criticizes in strong language the behavior of contemporary Athenian society. While later rhetorical criticism emphasizes the need to create goodwill on the part of the jury, and suggests doing so through at least a little flattery, Demosthenes instead chooses to find fault with his jury. This ran the risk of antagonizing some members of the jury, but has the benefit of making him appear both patriotic and honest: he gives his opinion, even if controversial, and in this way distinguishes himself from the typical sophist or dishonest rhetor. These sections, because of their vehement language and evocative subject matter surely gave rise to a strong emotional response from the audience. Demosthenes concludes this section of the proofs with an analysis of the proposed decree in the context of Athenian history, and ultimately makes the point that passing such a decree is an inherently dishonorable act, regardless of its beneficiary, but is especially dishonorable because the decree is meant to benefit Charidemus.

[68] This passage translates as: "For this progress along the road of dishonor, men of Athens, if I am to tell the truth in all candor, nobody is to blame more than yourselves." Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 204. p.354-356

V. Peroration

Demosthenes' peroration is quite brief, and quite unusual. Rhetorical theory describes the peroration as something which "in the main consists of appeals to the emotions."[69] The peroration of the speech, sections 215-220, reiterates the main points of Demosthenes' judicial proofs, and contains no element of emotional appeal. This is probably due to the heightened emotionality of the part of the epideictic proofs that directly precede the peroration. He ends this section by asking,

> Will you, men of Athens, after giving him your full franchise and honoring him with other distinctions- will you bestow upon him this immunity into the bargain? For what? What ships has he taken for you... what cities has he captured and handed over to you? What perils has he countered in your defense? When has he chosen your enemies as his own? No man can tell you.[70]

The peroration, by comparison, is quite dry and emotion-less. It does demonstrate Demosthenes' frustration and perhaps disgust with Aristocrates' proposition, but is clearly not meant to evoke a strong emotional reaction from the audience. It is a straightforward summary of what Demosthenes presents in the judicial proof, and then ends with Demosthenes urging his audience to choose rightly: "dismiss all the fallacious reasons they will allege; do not allow them to be uttered. Tell them to show you the clause in which he has proposed a trial, or the clause that punishes a man duly convicted of murder."[71] It is unusual that Demosthenes does not conclude in a more dramatic or emotional fashion, or with a stronger appeal to his audience.

---

[69] Quintilian. 6.2.55. p.417
[70] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 214. p.363
[71] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 219. p.365-367

While it is typical that a peroration will include a recapitulation, it is puzzling that he does not reiterate the arguments that he has made in either the political or epideictic proofs. It is worth noting that this speech was Demosthenes' first foray into the arena of deliberative oratory, and he may have felt more comfortable presenting a conclusion more appropriate to an exclusively legal oration, although one would still expect to find here an emotion appeal. The last line of the speech is certainly explicitly focused on the unlawfulness of the decree: "Do not be led astray" Demosthenes urges his audience, "but be assured that in this decree the laws have been absolutely contravened."[72] With these words Demosthenes brings his speech to an end, having thoroughly proven his point, and leaves the audience ready to cast their ballots against the decree.

Conclusions

Through breaking *Against Aristocrates* into its parts one can analyze how Demosthenes creates and structures his arguments to be as persuasive as possible. In many ways *Against Aristocrates* conforms to the guidelines of rhetorical theory; Demosthenes' speech contains the necessary components to create a traditional structure, and he largely crafts each of his sections in accordance with theory. The peroration is the most deviant section, because it contains no emotional appeal to the audience, but this can be easily explained by the emotionality of the section that precedes it. *Against Aristocrates* is a particularly excellent example of ancient theory in practice because it contains elements of all three speech categories. One of the most convincing aspects of *Against Aristocrates* is the fullness with which he treats

[72] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 220. p.367

his subject matter; in combining the three types of oratory he makes his point not only that much stronger but far more interesting rhetorically.

This comprehensiveness in argument can also be seen within each of the proofs sections. In the judicial section Demosthenes proves not only that the decree violates Athenian laws that delineate the procedure for homicide, but that it circumvents respected Athenian legal institutions and that the very act of proposing an decree that violates Athenian laws is illegal. In the deliberative proofs Demosthenes makes a very strong argument for the disadvantageous nature of the decree by proposing a number of ways in which, should it be passed, it will hurt Athens in the future. He then goes further and argues that, even solely outside of this argument, the decree would still not serve its stated purpose. He then argues that the decree is dishonorable, and from there transitions into the biting epideictic section, where he tears Charidemus' character to shreds. Finally he refutes possible counterarguments, and in the end portion of the epideictic proofs extols Athens' glorious past and deplores the present for even considering the passage of a decree that would so debase the city's traditions. Demosthenes, in essence, presents every argument he can to keep his audience from passing the decree. He also orders his argument in the most effective way; he builds from the technicality of the judicial proofs to the very emotional and vehement epideictic section. Demosthenes is considered the prime example of Greek rhetoric, and *Against Aristocrates* illustrates excellently many rhetorical techniques in practice; he creates and orders an extremely persuasive argument, and, as will be discussed in the next chapter, renders his arguments more persuasive with well-chosen rhetorical figures.

Chapter 2: Style: Language, Tone and Figures in *Against Aristocrates*

Introduction

It is the stylistic element of speech-writing that creates great speeches. However logical an argument may be, it needs to be presented eloquently to persuade. The vast majority of speeches have something that they seek to prove, and since these theses are almost always controversial, a counterargument can always be made. For this reason, the manner in which an argument is delivered often makes or breaks the success of an oration. The sections on style that can be found in ancient rhetorical treatises are essentially analyses of all of the different devices one might utilize to create a persuasive speech. These devices, described by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as useful for conferring "distinction," can be broken down into three large categories: figures of diction, tropes, and figures of thought. Figures of diction occur "if the adornment is comprised in the fine polish of the language itself,"[73] while figures of thought "derive a certain distinction from the idea, not from the words."[74] According to Quintilian tropes[75]differ from both figures of diction and thought in that "by a trope is meant the artistic alteration of a word or phrase from its proper meaning to another."[76] It is through the use of these devices that speeches achieve their persuasive effects.

It is my goal in this chapter to examine the frequent or significant use Demosthenes makes of certain figures and tropes in *Against Aristocrates.* Although

---

[73] *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.12.18. p.275
[74] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.12.18. p.275
[75] The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* does not distinguish tropes as such, but includes them as a different kind of figure of diction. It was only later that they became canonized as tropes, as they are in Quintilian.
[76] Quintilian. 8.6.1. p.301.

some of Demosthenes' specific arguments appear open and shut, for instance, when he presents law statutes that Aristocrates' decree clearly violate, to achieve the ultimate goal of his speech he must deploy all of his persuasive power. He needs to convince his Athenian jury not to pass Aristocrates' decree, and in order to do this, he must successfully convince his audience that the passage of the decree would be illegal and dangerous. The persuasive power of *Against Aristocrates* in terms of style derives primarily from two sources: first from the representation of the character of the speaker[77] (ethos) and secondly from an adept use of various tropes and figures. I will first examine the use of ethos in the speech and secondly the specific figures and tropes that lend rhetorical power to the speech. Lastly I will examine an especially distinctive passage of Greek that demonstrates Demosthenes' stylistic mastery.

I. Ethos and Tone

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* terms the overall tone of a speech its "style" and then distinguishes three varieties of good "style:" the Grand, the Middle and the Simple.[78] The Grand style, as one might expect, is characterized by its ornate language, while a discourse will belong to the Middle style if it "has somewhat relaxed [its] style, and yet has not descended to the most ordinary prose."[79] The Simple style is described as using "the most ordinary speech of everyday."[80] Quintilian also describes three different levels of language; his definitions, however, are slightly different. He defines the simple style as "sufficient within itself," the middle as "richer in metaphors and rendered more pleasing by figures," and states

[77] The speaker, as previously mentioned, is Euthycles, but for the sake of clarity I will continue referring to Demosthenes as if he had actually orated the speech himself.
[78] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.7.11-14. pp.253-265.
[79] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.9.13. p.259.
[80] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.9.14. p.261.

that the orator using the grand style "will almost bring the gods down from heaven to meet and talk with him"[81] his speech is so elaborate. Demosthenes generally uses a straightforward style that would be characterized as the Middle by the standards of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and as Simple by Quintilian. This style best suits his purposes for a number of reasons: the Middle style allows him to present a very clear, no-frills argument in a manner that commands more respect than colloquial speech would. The language and tone of *Against Aristocrates* are sparer than the majority of later political oratory, however: Quintilian writes that "in deliberative oratory the senate demands a certain loftiness and the people a certain impetuosity of eloquence, [while] the public cases of the courts and those exacting capital punishment demand a more exact style."[82] The sparse and direct nature of *Against Aristocrates* can be largely attributed to Demosthenes' desire to communicate ethos.

The ideas of ethos and pathos are central to the Greek understanding of persuasive rhetoric, and are treated at length by Aristotle.[83] Concerns about ethos seem to have figured less in Roman oratory, as ethos is never discussed in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and treated only briefly in Quintilian.[84] Aristotle describes ethos as the character presented by the speaker in the context of a speech:

> [There is persuasion] through 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

[81] Quintilian. 12.10.60-62. p.315
[82] Quintilian. 8.3.14. p.219.
[83] Pathos, while not treated in this essay, is certainly key to Aristotle's understanding of persuasive rhetoric. Pathos is defined as the audience's emotional reactions to what they hear in a speech; Aristotle, in 2.1-2.11 of the *Rhetoric*, describes in detail the different emotional reactions that can be elicited from an audience.
[84] The Aristotelian concept of ethos does coincide quite closely with later Roman theorists' instructions on captatio benevolentiae, or encouraging goodwill in the audience, an instruction given primarily for the prooimion.

> a greater extent and more quickly [than we do others].... And this should result from the speech, not from a previous opinion that a speaker is a certain kind of person; for it is not the case... that fair-mindedness on the part of the speaker makes no contribution to persuasiveness; rather, character is almost, so to speak, the controlling factor in persuasion.[85]

This awareness of how the speaker presents himself is very evident throughout *Against Aristocrates*. One of the ways Demosthenes presents the ethos of the speaker is through his tone: the straightforward, clear nature of his rhetoric suggests a speaker not using sophistic methods to be persuasive, but instead one who has grounded his speech in honesty and good intentions.

Demosthenes makes a concerted effort to contrast himself with other "politicians" and "orators," whom he identifies as his opponents and describes in a derogatory way that suggests ulterior motives and sophistry on their part. At the very outset of the speech Demosthenes tells his audience, "you will be well-advised, men of Athens, to grant me your attention and give a favorable hearing to what I have to say. I am not one of the orators who worry you."[86] He then goes on to refer to himself as a "plain citizen;" Demosthenes describes himself as no different from his audience. This is a clear ploy to elicit good-will, and also creates a very clear distinction between the earnest, well intentioned speaker and his audience on one side, and scheming orators, among whom it is implied is Aristocrates. Demosthenes' expression of ethos is most clear in a passage at the end of the epideictic section where he actually speaks about himself. After spending a considerable amount of

[85] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 1.4. p.38.
[86] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 4. p.217

time proving the unworthy and wicked[87] character of Charidemus, Demosthenes imagines that someone might ask why he had not previously condemned Charidemus, especially when he was being put forward for other honors, such as the citizenship of Athens.[88] Demosthenes responds to these hypothetical questions by stating that he believes that "a great many men glibly telling lies about him would overpower one man, namely myself, telling the truth alone."[89] He then explains that his intervention in the present case is the "act of an honest man and patriotic citizen."[90] Demosthenes creates ethos by contrasting the speaker with "other orators" and by the use of straightforward language.

II. Tropes and Figures

Having discussed Demosthenes' rhetoric in terms of overall tone, it is now important to analyze the functions of some tropes and figures utilized prominently in *Against Aristocrates*. Although there are many figures that Demosthenes uses that I will not discuss here, I hope to provide an overview of those that are the most frequently used and the most important, and through this analysis to come to a greater understanding of how Demosthenes makes his arguments persuasive. The figures of diction presented here are Apostrophe, Reasoning by Question and Answer, Maxim, and Hypophora. The only trope discussed is Antonomasia, and the figures of thought are Frankness of Speech and Paradigm.

II. 1. Antonomasia

---

[87] The story that Demosthenes relates in sections 169-70, in which Charidemus purposefully gives a man and his son to men who will brutally execute them, leaves little doubt as to the wickedness of his character.
[88] This is an example of the figure of thought hypophora, and will be discussed later in this chapter.
[89] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 188, p.345.
[90] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 190. p.347.

One of the key rhetorical moves that Demosthenes makes is to create the illusion that Charidemus rather than Aristocrates had instigated the decree, because he desired that Athens grant him inviolability. While the lack of direct evidence presented in the speech suggests that Demosthenes could only speculate as to the origins of the decree prior to its proposal by Aristocrates, Demosthenes does everything in his power to suggest that the purpose of the decree was not as Aristocrates had presented it. It was not an award honoring a great Athenian benefactor, but instead a contrivance designed to benefit Charidemus politically. One of the methods by which Demosthenes sheds doubt and suspicion on Aristocrates' motives is through the subtle use of antonomasia, a trope.

Antonomasia is described in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as the process of designating "by an advantageous epithet a thing[91] that cannot be called by its proper name."[92] This technique allows one to refer to someone by some defining characteristic, instead of his name, thus equating a particular fact or characteristic all the more strongly with that specific person. Antonomasia usually involves substituting a particular epithet for a name, like using 'the son of Peleus' in place of Achilles. Demosthenes' use is different in that he does not use an epithet that refers to an explicit person, but instead uses the device to purposefully obscure about whom he is speaking. Instead of referring to Aristocrates by name, Demosthenes instead chooses to refer to him as "the defendant," "the author," and the "the mover." In a few places he even chooses to describe the proponents of the decree as "certain

[91] Although the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* says "thing," antonomasia is almost always used to refer to a person.
[92] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.31.42. p.335

persons,"[93] ambiguous phrasing clearly designed to imply Charidemus' involvement in the proposal of the decree. One very clear instance of this takes place in the statement of facts, in section 8. Demosthenes proclaims that "certain persons, who wanted... to get rid of the other kings, and to put Cersobleptes in possession of an undivided monarchy, contrived to equip themselves with this provisional resolution."[94] Although he is referring specifically to the person who created the decree, he refuses to name Aristocrates in favor of the very suggestive "certain persons." His use of tinej allows him to lump Aristocrates, who actually proposed the decree, and Cersobleptes and Charidemus, the decree's beneficiaries, into a single category. Thus, although his use of antonomasia is a little unorthodox, Demosthenes uses this trope to conflate Charidemus and Cersobleptes with Aristocrates through the studied vagueness of phrases like "certain persons."

While the use of antonomasia described above functions to create suspicion in the minds of the audience by suggesting that the decree was instigated by its beneficiary, Demosthenes also uses antonomasia to create doubt in the audience's mind about who actually is on trial. There is much in the speech that makes it seem that Charidemus is the person on trial; the lack of specific references to Aristocrates serves to distract the juror's attention. The epideictic section of the proofs in particular conveys the illusion that Charidemus is actually the defendant, as it is his character that is condemned. Demosthenes goes to great effort to paint a picture of Charidemus as a deeply untrustworthy and immoral man, in a manner that resembles the way a prosecutor might have tried to indict the character of a defendant. Thus

---

[93] tinej

[94] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 8, p.219.

Demosthenes' use of antonomasia lends persuasive force to the speech in two ways: by continually suggesting that Charidemus and even Cersobleptes were the original proponents of the decree, and also by allowing the actual defendant on trial to become muddled with the beneficiary of the decree. This trope is subtly and effectively employed throughout the speech and is very successful in condemning Aristocrates' motives. Because goodwill can be created on the part of the audience through contrasting the moral character of an orator with that of his opponents, antonomasia also helps to create goodwill on the part of the audience.

II. 2. Reasoning by Question and Answer [Aitiologia, Exetasmos]

In the judicial section of the proofs, Demosthenes makes the point that the decree proposed by Aristocrates is unconstitutional and breaks the law. His method for proving that the decree breaks the law is by systematically presenting different Athenian legal statutes, interpreting them, and then demonstrating how Aristocrates' decree breaks them. The key aspect here is Demosthenes' interpretation of the law. Although in some of the statutes it is immediately obvious that the decree circumvents the law, in a significant number of cases Demosthenes needs to give his own reading of the law in order to present the decree as unlawful. In section 37 Demosthenes presents this statute:

> If any man shall kill a murderer, or shall cause him to be killed, so long as the murderer absents himself from the frontier-market, the games, and the Amphictyonic sacrifices, he shall be liable to the same penalty as if he killed an Athenian citizen: and the Criminal Court shall adjudicate.[95]

[95] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 37. p.237.

Demosthenes must establish how Aristocrates' decree and this statute are related, which he does by using the rhetorical figure Reasoning by Question and Answer to make his points.

Reasoning by Question and Answer is essentially posing and then answering a series of questions. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines the Question and Answer strategy as "[asking] the reason for each successive statement we make, and seek[ing] the meaning of each successive affirmation."[96] This technique is valuable in that it has a conversational tone, which suits Demosthenes' simple and largely unembellished rhetorical style, and in that "its stylistic grace and the anticipation of the reasons, holds the hearer's attention."[97] In the case of the statute mentioned above, Demosthenes poses a question and then answers it. This technique allows Demosthenes to present his own interpretation of the statute in an unassuming way, which seems neither sophistic nor contrived. Demosthenes uses this figure primarily in the judicial section of the proofs, and uses it in his discussion of many different statutes. A closer examination of the example cited above will show how he specifically applies this figure of diction to his arguments.

After rereading the key section of the statute quoted above, Demosthenes asks, "What does this mean?"[98] He then immediately answers his own question, explaining that "it was just that, if a man who had gone into exile, when convicted on a charge of murder, should make good his flight and escape, he should be excluded from the country of the murdered man; but that it is not righteous to put him to death

[96] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.16.23. pp.285-287
[97] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.16.24. p.289
[98] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 38. p.237.

anywhere and everywhere."[99] This interpretation of the decree is central to the point that Demosthenes is trying to make with regard to this statute. His point is that the law provides an avenue to security for anyone who kills a murderer, and protects them as an Athenian citizen if they are properly in exile, while Aristocrates' decree does not incorporate any such protections in its stipulation that the murderer of Charidemus be subject to immediate seizure, without trial. Demosthenes seems to imply here that a murderer of Charidemus would qualify as a person who has killed a murderer, which suggests that Charidemus himself is already a murderer. Demosthenes organizes the entirety of his discussion of this statute (sections 37-43) by posing and then answering questions. He ends his examination of the statute by asking, "Gentleman, is it a trifling or a casual reason that you have for annulling this decree?"[100] That Demosthenes ends this section with a rhetorical question[101] lends both cohesiveness and elegance to his discussion of this statute.

II. 3. Frankness of Speech [Parresia]

One of the most interesting elements of Demosthenes' style here, and one that is perhaps the most discordant with later rhetorical theory, is his willingness to chastise his audience. In the later rhetorical tradition, the orator seeks to create goodwill on the part of his audience by taking an almost flattering tone in addressing them.[102] Although Demosthenes' tone varies over the course of his speech, there are a few passages that are surprising in their vocal critique of his Athenian audience. These passages most closely resemble the figure of thought Frankness of Speech, and

[99] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 38. p.237.
[100] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 43. p.241.
[101] A rhetorical question is a question with an implied answer. Cite?
[102] Although neither Greek nor Roman writers recommend flattery, Roman writers more greatly emphasize the importance of treating one's audience in a complementary manner.

it is worth comparing this figure with one or two of the more vehement passages in *Against Aristocrates*.

Frankness of Speech is described by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as instances "when, talking before those to whom we owe reverence or fear, we yet exercise our right to speak out, because we seem justified in reprehending them."[103] The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* later goes on to qualify that this may be followed by passages that temper such outspokenness with phrases like "I know how the audience may take this."[104] Demosthenes' uses of Frankness of Speech are not frequently qualified by such appeals to the jury, and are occasionally surprisingly critical in tone: while he sometimes directly criticizes his audience, he also has several passages in which he speaks poorly of contemporary Athenians as a whole. We may take one of the passages from the political section of the proofs for further examination. This frames one of Demosthenes' arguments: he has first made the point that should the decree pass and the other Thracian kings have less strength in comparison to Cersobleptes, the Athenians will not be able to call upon them should Cersobleptes turn his new-found strength against Athens. He then begins to chastise his audience for not understanding the obvious disadvantage of passing such a decree, and does so by comparing his Athenian audience unfavorably with the Olynthians, a people in Northern Greece. He claims that the Olynthians were prudent enough to recognize the threat posed by their neighbor, Philip of Macedon, and made a treaty with Athens to defend against him, while Athens is planning to offer inviolability to one of its own rivals.

---

[103] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. 4.36.48. p.349.
[104] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. 4.37.49. p.353.

Demosthenes frames his comparison with the Olynthians with two particularly vehement passages. His introduction to this comparison begins: "Again, it cannot possibly be alleged that it was natural that you should be hoodwinked and misled. For even though you had no other basis of calculation, even though you were unable of yourselves to grasp the state of affairs, you had before your eyes the example of those people at Olynthus."[105] The Athenian fault is two-fold: they did not initially perceive for themselves the danger posed by Cersobleptes, nor did they benefit from the example of the Olynthians, allegedly less intelligent than they. Similarly, at the end of this comparison, where one might have expected to find some statements made to reduce the impact of the insults made to the jury, one finds instead this passage: "When mere Olynthians know how to provide for the morrow, will not you, who are Athenians, do likewise? It is discreditable that you, who have a reputation for superior ability in political deliberation, should be convicted of a duller perception of your own advantage than Olynthians."[106] This passage is more vehement in its critique of the Athenian audience, although its criticism is tempered by acknowledging Athenian reputation for political wisdom.

The most reasonable explanation for this passage is to understand it as an extension of ethos. As previously discussed, it is advantageous for the orator to appear to have a very upstanding and uncompromising character, and this passage makes Demosthenes seem interested exclusively in protecting and serving the Athenian state. These passages can perhaps also be explained by the deep Greek

---

[105] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 107. p.289.

[106] This passage is also an example of argumentation 'a minore,' or from the lesser to the greater. Because Olynthians have a lesser reputation than the Athenians, the Athenians should exceed them in terms of ability, and therefore honor. Quintilian discusses this in 5.10.87. Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 109. p.291.

mistrust of anything resembling sophistry. Such considerations help explain why it would not only acceptable but perhaps advantageous for Demosthenes to employ Frankness of Speech in this manner.

II. 4. Hypophora

One of the more frequently used figures of diction at work in *Against Aristocrates* is the hypophora. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines the hypophora as occurring "when we enquire of our adversaries, or ask ourselves, what the adversaries can say in their favor, or what can be said against us."[107] While all of the examples that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* gives to illustrate this figure involve the orator posing and answering actual questions, Demosthenes chooses to state what he thinks Aristocrates will say, and then responds.[108] Demosthenes postulates the arguments that may be made against him, and then responds to them; this technique has the effect of both bolstering his own arguments, and making Aristocrates appear weak. Hypophora also is an attention-maintaining mechanism, as it introduces variation in the pace of the speech. Perhaps for this reason Demosthenes most frequently uses hypophora when he transitions between sections.

The most significant place in which Demosthenes uses hypophora is at the end of the judicial proofs and the beginning of the political proofs. In these instances, he uses hypophora to make a smooth transition into a new stage in the argument. He very cleverly links the judicial and political proofs through his use of hypophora in section 100: "I say that I do not believe Aristocrates will be able to deny that he has moved a decree in open violation of all the laws; but before now... I have seen a man

[107] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.23.33. p.311
[108] It is possible that this clear-cut strategy of presenting questions became more frequently used in Roman rhetoric.

contesting an indictment for illegal measures... who made an attempt to argue that his proposal had been to the public advantage."[109] After making the point that if a decree is unlawful it will ipso facto be contrary to the interests of the state, Demosthenes then moves into the arguments of the political proofs by proclaiming: "entirely opposed as his decree is to the laws, it is not less pernicious[110] than illegal."[111] Demosthenes then begins the deliberative proofs, which center on the ways the decree will be disadvantageous for Athens. The use of hypophora here allows Demosthenes to transition smoothly and elegantly into his new section of proofs, while driving the unlawfulness of the decree home one more time.

II. 5. Apostrophe

Demosthenes uses apostrophe, a figure of diction, at various intervals throughout the speech. Apostrophe is defined in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as a "figure which expresses grief or indignation by means of address to some man or city or place or object."[112] Apart from the common address to the jury, Demosthenes' apostrophes are always addressed to Aristocrates, and all have the same function. The apostrophe allows Demosthenes the opportunity to vary the tone of direct statement, which helps to keep the speech interesting, and to engage the jury more immediately in the give and take. The apostrophe in sections 47-48 is a very good example of this. This apostrophe occurs in one of his judicial arguments: he has presented a statute that addresses the question of boundaries and jurisdiction in murder cases, and here Demosthenes wishes to make the point that allowing for

---

[109] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 100. p.285.
[110] "Not less pernicious" refers to his upcoming deliberative arguments, where Demosthenes will argue that the decree is disadvantageous.
[111] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. 101. p.285.
[112] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. 4.15.22. p.283

immediate seizure of Charidemus' potential killer would break the law if it took place in certain jurisdictions.

Demosthenes moves into this apostrophe by means of hypophora: first he supposes that if one asked Aristocrates whether or not he knows if Charidemus will be killed by another person or die in some other way, he would be forced to admit he does not. Demosthenes then employs apostrophe: "Next question: will the man who is to do it be a voluntary or involuntary agent, an alien or a citizen—do you know, Aristocrates?"[113] This question is undoubtedly attention-gathering, and the indignant tone helps keep the speech from sounding monotonous. The combination of hypophora and apostrophe emphasizes greatly Demosthenes' point, which is that Aristocrates is ignorant of any knowledge of the circumstances surrounding Charidemus' future death.

II. 6. Maxim

The maxim, another figure of diction, is used infrequently in *Against Aristocrates* but plays an important role. The maxim deserves special attention in part because it was identified and treated at length by Aristotle, and so one might expect it to be used more frequently in early Greek speeches like this one. Aristotle describes the maxim as "an assertion- not however, one about particulars... but of a general sort, and not about everything, but about actions and things that are to be chosen or avoided in regard to action."[114] Perhaps a little more clearly, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines the maxim as "a saying drawn from life, which shows concisely either what happens or what ought to happen" such as "Every beginning is

[113] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 47. p.243.
[114] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans: Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. 2.21.2. p.182

difficult."[115] Demosthenes' use of the maxim helps to explain the behavior of men in general terms, and for this reason creates a connection between the audience and Demosthenes: by appealing to commonly accepted beliefs he encourages confidence in the truth of what he says.

There are two examples of maxim that particularly characterize Demosthenes' use of this figure. The first occurs when Demosthenes tries to explain why the jury should consider it likely that Cersobleptes will act in a fashion that would be against his best interests by attacking Athens. Demosthenes uses a maxim to make sweeping statements about human nature, and from this assertion predicts the behavior of Cersobleptes and Charidemus. He states that "the truth is, men of Athens, that there are two things that are excellent for everybody: good luck, the chiefest and greatest of goods, and good counsel—inferior to good luck, but greater than any other; but men do not get both these things at once, and no successful man sets any limit or end to his desire to get more."[116] From this premise, Demosthenes explains that Charidemus and Cersobleptes are in fact likely to act in ways detrimental to themselves, although this might seem a counter-intuitive notion at first: in their desire for more, they will endanger what they already have. The other very notable maxim occurs in the epideictic section, when Demosthenes addresses the idea that by criticizing Charidemus' character he is somehow behaving in a vengeful way. Because he cannot say "I am not vindictive," he instead chooses to use a maxim, to frame his own behavior in a larger context: "the vindictive man is the man who hunts up grievances in order to inflict injury; the man who bears them in mind in order to be on his guard

[115] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.17.24. p.289
[116] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 113. p.293.

and not suffer injury, is a reasonable man."[117] Both maxims are a way of rallying common opinions held by Demosthenes and the audience to support the plausibility of his argument. The use of maxim also strengthens the ethos Demosthenes attempts to communicate, as it establishes common beliefs or ways of thinking between the orator and audience.

II. 7. Paradigm

One of the rhetorical figures that Demosthenes relies most heavily upon to build the success of his argument is the paradigm. This figure of thought was identified early on in rhetorical theory, and was written about at length by Aristotle, as well as the later rhetoricians who reflect subsequent Hellenistic and Roman theory. The paradigm is a kind of historic example that provides a precedent and a point of comparison for later events. As Aristotle puts it, "examples from history are more useful in deliberation; for generally, future events will be like those of the past."[118] Aristotle identifies two different varieties of paradigms: the first is "to speak of things that have happened before" and the other is "to make up [an illustration]."[119] Demosthenes relies very heavily on the historical form of paradigm, and does so in a very specific way. He presents recent historical examples, with which his audience would presumably have been familiar, and then directly relates them to the likely consequences of the decree at hand. By presenting an example from recent history, Demosthenes is substantially more convincing in his presentations of future scenarios.

---

[117] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 193. p.349.
[118] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 2.2.8. p.181
[119] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 2.20.2. p.179

Demosthenes organizes the vast majority of his paradigms in the same manner: he first relates a historical situation, then compares his historical characters to either Charidemus or Cersobleptes, and then presents the way in which Athens would be damaged if Charidemus or Cersobleptes behaved in the manner of their historical counterparts. Demosthenes' use of this figure is best illustrated with an actual case study. In the political section of the proofs, Demosthenes gives the example of two foreign men, Ariobarzanes and Philiscus, who were granted Athenian citizenship, and he compares them to the two men who stand to benefit from Aristocrates' decree: "Once upon a time, on a certain occasion, you gave your citizenship to Ariobarzanes, and also, on his account, to Philiscus-- just as you have recently given it to Charidemus for the sake of Cersobleptes."[120] This statement is significant for two reasons: first, Demosthenes presents Charidemus and Cersobleptes as intimately connected, and implies that the citizenship that has been extended to Charidemus in some sense also applies to Cersobleptes; second, Demosthenes sets up an immediate parallel between Ariobarzanes and Philiscus on the one hand, and Cersobleptes and Charidemus on the other, although there are no concrete reasons to suggest that Cersobleptes and Charidemus will behave in the same manner as Ariobarzanes and Philiscus.

Demosthenes goes on to present the history of Ariobarzanes and Philiscus; he writes that Philiscus, the historical counterpoint to Charidemus and also a general, occupied Hellenic cities, and having done so, "committed many outrages, mutilating free-born boys, insulting women, and behaving in general as you would expect a man,

[120] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 141. p.311

who had been brought up where there were no laws... to behave if he attained power."[121] Demosthenes strongly implies that Charidemus, should he attain a yet more powerful status, will behave in the same fashion. It is worth noting that Demosthenes has described Charidemus as a foreigner and northern barbarian of sorts in earlier passages, making the connection he draws between Charidemus and Philiscus that much more strong.[122] Demosthenes then relates that Philiscus was rightly killed by two worthy gentlemen, and having thus set up the historical parallel he wished to present, moves into a discussion of the likely outcome of the decree before the court. He postulates that should this decree be passed, and should Charidemus behave in the same manner as Philiscus (as it now appears he is very likely to do), Athens would be in an extremely unfortunate situation: they would either have to contravene their own decree or dishonorably punish the very people that they should be thanking, those who put Charidemus to death.

Demosthenes concludes this argument in a way that makes his use of paradigm more than clear: "I am glad to say that, in the case of Philiscus, it was not your fate to be ensnared and to incur that great dishonor; but in the present case, if you will heed my warning, you will be very careful... it is quite possible that the outcome will be such as I have described."[123] This example of Demosthenes' use of paradigm is typical; the deliberative section of the proofs is full of paradigms. This is because Demosthenes' political arguments rest entirely on speculations about the future, and the best way to make these projections plausible is to link them to definite past events.

---

[121] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 141. p.311.
[122] Ariobarzanes and Philiscus are from Asia Minor.
[123] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 143. p.313.

Demosthenes uses two other kinds of historical examples in *Against Aristocrates*, in the epideictic sections of the speech. The first is not a paradigm because it is not a comparison of one person's behavior to another, but is instead an account of Charidemus' own history. Demosthenes relates this history to depict Charidemus in an unflattering light, to make the point that he is deeply unworthy of the decree. Charidemus' past actions suggest that he will continue to behave in the same immoral manner, and thus these kinds of historical example have a very similar function to that of the paradigms in the deliberative proofs. The second kind of paradigm used in *Against Aristocrates* is in the section at the very end of the epideictic proofs, when Demosthenes describes the past glory of Athens and impugns the current Athenians for having fallen so far from their great past. Demosthenes gives examples of great historical figures from the fifth century, which was already regarded as something of a golden age, such as Themistocles, and tells his audience: "if you find their practice better than yours, you will do well to follow their example."[124] This function of paradigm is different from that used in the deliberative proofs, where Demosthenes is predicting future behavior based on the past. The emphasis here is on the glory of the past, whereas in the deliberative proofs Demosthenes uses examples from more recent Athenian history to predict the behavior of contemporary actors. Paradigm in the epideictic proofs contrasts the behaviors of the present and the past, while in the deliberative proofs the behaviors of the past predict those of the future; in both cases, however, the points Demosthenes makes rely heavily on the persuasive force of the paradigm.

[124] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 196. p.351.

III. Selection from *Against Aristocrates*

After examining Demosthenes' use of different rhetorical figures and tropes, it will be valuable now to take an actual sample from the speech and analyze what makes it persuasive. The passage I have selected is one of the most expressly emotional passages in the speech, and uses language that is considerably more vehement and accusatory than the language in the majority of the speech. The passage comes from the end of the epideictic section of the proofs, after Demosthenes not only has condemned Charidemus' character but has gone on to thoroughly criticize contemporary Athenian culture for its dishonorable nature. He has already compared the honors handed out by modern Athens with its behavior towards benefactors in what was recognized as the Athenian golden age, the fifth century. In section 200 Demosthenes states that "the truth is, in those days, to be made a citizen of Athens was an honor so precious in the eyes of the world that, to earn that favor alone, men were ready to render to you those memorable services. Today it is so worthless that not a few men who have already received it have wrought worse mischief to you than your declared enemies."[125] Demosthenes then moves from a discussion of Athens as a whole to an invective against contemporary Athenian politicians in section 201:

> ou monon d" auth thj polewj h dwrea propephlakistai kai faulh gegonen, alla kai pasai dia thn twn kataratwn kai qeoij exqrwn rhtorwn, twn ta toiauta grafontwn etoimwj, ponhrian, oi tosauthn uperbolhn pepoihntai thj autwn aisxrokerdeiaj wste

[125] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 200. p.353.

> taj timaj kai komid$ faul" apokhruttontej, outw pwlousin epeuwnizontej kai polloij apo twn autwn lhmmatwn grafontej pan o ti an boulwntai.

The passage above immediately follows: "Not only has this [honor] and other gifts of the state been dragged through the mud and been made mean, but [this was done] all through those abominable rhetors, hated by God, who readily write such wicked things;[126] men who, through base covetousness, make such ridiculous things of our honors and [civic] gifts, just like vendors hawking small and inconsequential merchandise: they cheaply barter to the masses at a fixed price any decree that they desire."[127]

The language here is fascinating: Demosthenes makes an important distinction here between the speaker and other orators, which reinforces strongly the ethos that Demosthenes has sought to portray throughout the speech. This invective is also certain to be particularly appealing to the audience, as Demosthenes presents a diatribe against the kind of dishonorable decree that Aristocrates has proposed, and then further strongly implies that Aristocrates was paid to propose the decree. Demosthenes goes so far as to call these other orators abominable [kataratwn] and hated by God [qeoij exqrwn,] surprisingly damning language, the likes of which he has not used previously in the speech. Demosthenes makes a distinction between the speaker and the audience on the one hand, and those abominable rhetors on the other. Demosthenes never states explicitly that Aristocrates was paid to propose the decree,

[126] A clear reference to Aristocrates' decree.
[127] This is my own translation.

presumably because he could not actually prove this, and so instead chooses to lump Aristocrates in with those contemptible politicians.

Although there are no clear-cut examples of the figures described above at work in the speech here, this passage does contain rhetorical strategies that serve a similar purpose to the previously discussed figures. The implied conflation of Aristocrates with the other politicians functions in a way that is similar how antonomasia functions, as described earlier in this chapter. This passage also resembles in some ways Frankness of Speech; while he does not directly disparage the audience in this passage, the statements he makes that precede this passage are very critical to Athens. Although the extent to which a jury would have taken as a reflection on themselves Demosthenes' statements about the polis as a whole is unclear, this passage does seem to avoid any direct criticism. Although he follows this passage by saying that "for the progress along this road to dishonor, men of Athens, if I am to tell the truth in all candor, nobody is more to blame than yourselves,"[128] the passage quoted in Greek above seems to mitigate the fault placed on the general public, and blame unscrupulous rhetors. This passage helps to temper the more directly critical tone of the following passages and in this sense has some of the same functions as Frankness of Speech.

This passage is particularly interesting because it combines both an expression of ethos and the figure Frankness of Speech, and because it is one of the most emotional passages in the entire speech. The language and tone here are more angry and vehement than any passage that precedes it, and for this reason alone is certain to

[128] Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates.* 204. p.355.

have caught audience attention, and communicated to them some of the speaker's anger with Aristocrates. Its vehement language also helps to explain the speech's low-key conclusion: although traditionally conclusions contain emotional language, instead the emotional language is confined to this and surrounding passages and the conclusion is more matter of fact in comparison.

Conclusion

The rhetorical devices that Demosthenes employs throughout undoubtedly embellish the speech and make it much more persuasive. But more than simply making the speech more elegant, Demosthenes' use of rhetorical figures is often inseparable from how he makes his arguments. The deliberative and epideictic proofs, for example, both rely heavily on paradigm to make their arguments convincing to the audience. The judicial proofs, despite their heavy reliance on external arguments, or technical proofs, also depend on the use of rhetorical figures for their persuasive force. The use of hypophora and apostrophe in the judicial proofs allows Demosthenes to support his arguments in a way that is more convincing than if he had just stated them outright. Similarly, the communication of ethos is necessary for Demosthenes to make some of his central points persuasive: his invective against both Aristocrates' and Charidemus' characters relies on the audience's belief that the speaker is honest, because both of these points rest entirely on non-technical, constructed arguments. Demosthenes' display of ethos is displayed primarily through rhetorical figures. Although the speaker refers to himself at points, he reinforces the sense of ethos throughout the speech through the use of figures like antonomasia, maxim and frankness of speech. Demosthenes' use of figures thus not only enriches

the speech stylistically but functions in tandem with his construction of arguments to lend the greatest degree of persuasive force to his speech.

Chapter 3: Say What?! The Rhetoric of George W. Bush

Introduction

While some might think that a comparison between ancient rhetorical theory and modern speechwriting may prove fruitless, I believe that a comparison of an ancient speech and a modern speech will be productive and will highlight the similarities and differences between the two in terms of Invention, Arrangement and Style. Although the ancient world produced a very rigorous theoretical structure for speechmaking, and in the modern world the speeches appears to be left solely in the hands of a speechwriter, who might lack any technical training, there are a surprising number of similarities between ancient and modern speeches. The purpose of this chapter will be to compare a speech given on March 17, 2003 by George W. Bush with ancient rhetorical theory; through the use of ancient categories I hope to ascertain what makes this modern speech persuasive. While there are places where modern political rhetoric and ancient theory do not coincide, even these differences can help shed light on the how political rhetoric is made persuasive in the modern world. Thus I will examine the March 17th speech for both its similarities to and differences from ancient rhetorical theory, in terms of argumentation, structure and rhetorical figures.

In the March 17th speech George W. Bush gave an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein, requiring that he and his sons leave Iraq in the next forty-eight hours. The speech is particularly interesting because of its single focus; unlike a State of the Union address, this speech does not discuss a large number of topics, but instead focuses entirely on the necessity for the impending conflict with Iraq. Because the

speech has one primary aim, to announce the commencement of war with Iraq in a way palatable to the American public, it resembles ancient speeches, which typically advocate a specific course of action. The March 17th speech is also similar to ancient deliberative oratory because it involves two main points on which many ancient political speeches rested: security and honor. The speech does deviate in several ways from ancient rhetorical theory, and this chapter will speculate as to what might cause some of these differences. This speech serves a fundamentally different purpose than ancient speeches: it is not a speech designed to persuade an audience to choose a particular course of action in an assembly, but is instead an announcement of and a justification for a course of action that has already been decided upon. Bush instead caters to public opinion, rather than to a more narrowly defined group listeners. The style of the speech has also clearly been affected by modernity: my hypothesis here is that the way media functions in the United States today has had a profound effect on speechmaking. Although there are many elements in the March 17th speech that directly correlate to ancient rhetorical theory, the speech's brevity and lack of a clear, external organizational structure can be attributed to the adaption of contemporary oratorical practice to modern media.

I. Structure

There is no well signposted structure to the March 17th speech. While making the larger argument for war with Iraq, Bush moves from one area of focus to another without clear transitions. Because the structure is never clearly laid out, and there are no precise demarcations separating different sections of the speech, I have separated the speech according to what I see as the major arguments. The text of the speech,

with my superimposed divisions, can be found in Appendix B. Classical oratory typically had a very fixed structure, and a speaker would outline clearly the different parts of a speech and the ways in which they fit together. This speech does not fall easily into sections corresponding to the ancient structure of prooimion, statement of facts, partition, proofs and conclusion. It was necessary for ancient speeches to have a very clear organization because of their length, and while the brevity of this speech reduces the need for a clear external structure, it does not eliminate it altogether. Certain arguments made in the March 17th speech do correspond to arguments and sections identified in ancient rhetorical theory. The introduction, although no more than a sentence long serves the same purpose as an ancient prooimion: "My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision." Despite its length, the introduction helps to create goodwill on the part of the audience, by addressing them as "my fellow citizens," and prepares them to hear the speech. I will now present the major arguments made in the March 17th speech, and compare the ways they correspond to or differ from ancient rhetorical theory.

I. 1. History of (Failed) Disarmament

The first section of the speech, save the one-line prooimion, chronicles a brief history of the United States' and "other nation's" attempts to disarm the Iraqi regime. This section closely resembles the statement of facts section described by ancient theorists. The central aim of this section is to establish for the audience the fact that world has already tried to peacefully disarm Iraq. For this reason, Bush almost immediately puts forward Iraq's promise to disarm after the end of the Gulf war: "that regime pledged to reveal and destroy all of its weapons of mass destruction as a

condition for ending the Persian Gulf War in 1991."[129] By dismissing the possibility of a peaceful resolution to the crisis posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction as an action already tried and failed, Bush answers one of the most salient points of criticism that may have been raised against the disarmament of Iraq by force. This section also sets up a diametric opposition between Iraq on the one hand and the United States and those unnamed other nations seeking to disarm Iraq on the other. This is an example of antithesis[130] that will be continued through the rest of the speech, and one that has definite moral undertones. Bush states that "peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime have failed again and again because we are not dealing with peaceful men."(I) Bush highlights this contrast by repeating the same word, "peaceful," to describe polar opposites. As is typical for a statement of facts, this section establishes key information for the audience: that peaceful disarmament of Iraq is not an option, and that the United States and those other nations in agreement are the moral actors, and that the Iraqi regime is their opposite.

I. 2. The Current Danger

After describing efforts to disarm Iraq, Bush then transitions into the dangers of an armed Iraq: he asserts that Iraq harbors terrorists, and then presents a terrifying image of the future. He first claims that "Using chemical, biological or one day nuclear weapons obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our

---

[129] Bush, George W. "President Says Saddam Hussein Must Leave Iraq Within 48 Hours." The Cross Hall. 17 March 2003.

[130] Antithesis is a rhetorical figure that used throughout the speech and will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter.

country or any other." He uses very clear images that because of 9/11 prey upon fears already raging in the American public to create a grim image of what may come if the United States does not intervene while it still has the chance. He also uses a tricolon crescendo which creates a forceful rhetorical effect: the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* describes the use of three cola as "the neatest and most complete"[131] arrangement. By providing, in explicit terms, the realities that America may face, Bush leaves a haunting image that gives impetus and gravity to the rest of the speech. His specification of different kinds of weapons and the numbers of people that could be killed stands in stark contrast to the vague phrasing of the rest of the speech: even when later he refers to "the day of horror," the apocalyptic tone is not matched by detailed enumeration of the horrors in question.

This section in some senses is plays the role of the proofs in ancient rhetoric: by providing these explicit images and evoking the memories of 9/11, Bush provides an argument for going to war with Iraq. His proof rests on the conviction that going to war with Iraq is necessary to ensure the safety of the country. Bush states that "intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised."(II) This statement seems to be Bush's attempt to prove the necessity of going to war with Iraq; from the standpoint of ancient rhetorical theory, however, this claim is insufficient. Instead of crafting an argument that would convince his audience of the undeniable reality of Iraq's weapons, Bush simply states their existence, and the fact that they had been used on the Iraqi people and Iraq's

[131] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.19.26. p.295

neighbors, and moves on. The audience is left without specifics of the danger posed by Iraq: one might be better convinced by details containing information on where, what and how many weapons Iraq possesses, but these are excluded. Instead of convincing his audience that Iraq poses enough of a threat to necessitate pre-emptive action Bush instead simply tells them that this is the case.

I. 3. Iteration of Recent Events

In this section, Bush chronicles in detail the recent history of the United States' interactions with the United Nations, as if to justify the almost unilateral approach the United States took in the Iraq war. Bush wants to make the point that the entire world recognizes the great security threat posed by Iraq, but that not all countries are willing to act responsibly by actually declaring war. Bush states that "the United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours."(III) He cites several United Nations resolutions pertaining to Iraq; these are exactly what one would expect to find in a statement of facts. This section is a second statement of facts, iterating a slightly different, but relevant, series of events for the public. Bush here concentrates on relating the history of the United Nations', and more specifically the recent Security Council's activity surrounding Iraq's disarmament.

Another interesting aspect of this section is the way Bush justifies his resort to the military. He seems interested in proving the legitimacy of his actions, and does so by continually referencing the United Nations and his own authority. The introduction of this section reassures the American public that the United States has the authority to declare war on its own: "The United States has the sovereign

authority to use force in assuring its own national security. That duty falls to me as Commander of Chief by the oath I have sworn, by the oath I will keep."[132](III) He establishes the United States' authority to declare war at will, and also establishes that it has already received permission from the security council. He thus addresses criticisms that were already surfacing at that time: that war with Iraq was not supported by the United States' allies, or by the rest of the world. He states that "this is not a question of authority, it is a question of will,"(III) and thereby accuses those nations that would veto his proposal of simply not having the willpower to resolve the universally accepted security threat posed by Iraq. Bush goes on to say, "these governments share our assessment of the danger, but not our resolve to meet it."(III) The question of the validity of war with Iraq recalls the judicial proofs in *Against Aristocrates*, although the situations are reversed; Demosthenes needs to prove the illegality of Aristocrates' decree, while Bush here tries to reassure the public that his actions are entirely legitimate even without U.N. support. One may also compare Bush's citing of different United Nations resolutions with Demosthenes' presentations of different Athenian law statutes. Both are non-technical proofs which allow Demosthenes and George Bush to ground their arguments in references to external pieces of legislation, which helps both of them to prove their cases.

I. 4. The Next Steps

After setting forth his own authority, Bush goes ahead and declares war. He states that "the decades of deceit and cruelty have now reached an end. Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within forty eight hours. Their refusal to do so

[132] Misspeaking is one of the hallmarks of Bush's presidency: note here how he says "Commander of Chief" instead of "Commander in Chief."

will result in a military conflict commenced at a time of our choosing."(IV) A large portion of this section is an apostrophe, as Bush directly addresses Iraqi citizens. After this apostrophe, Bush discusses war in general terms by stating a few maxims, such as "Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past." His purpose here seems to be to reassure the both the American and Iraqi publics that America will see out the war. This section does not correspond to those discussed in ancient rhetorical theory; this is because, unlike in ancient speeches, Bush is describing an action that has already been decided upon and will happen. For a domestic audience the passage conveys a reassuring message of the inevitability of American success.

Although it does not correspond with ancient section divisions, this passage is plainly designed to have a specific effect on its audience. Although he states that his message will broadcast in Iraq, the information included in the address is clearly meant for a domestic audience as well. In fact, many of the statements in the apostrophe seem as though they were designed for the American public; a lot of what Bush says describes in antithetical terms the evil actions of Hussein's regime, and America as a liberating force. Bush tells the Iraqis that "in free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms."(IV) Although statements like these make it transparent that Bush's aims include convincing the American public of the just nature of the war they are about to enter into, it is also possible that Bush's aims here are to convince the Iraqi public of America's commitment to the war. After addressing the citizens of Iraq, Bush transitions into

the next section of the speech, which relates to the impending wartime situation in the United States.

I. 5. The Home Front

The next section of the speech focuses on the Bush administration's preparations for war on the home front. Like the previous section, and for the same reasons, this section does not correspond to ancient rhetorical theory. While in section IV Bush describes the steps that the United States will take in Iraq, in this section he describes what will happen at home. This passage seems designed solely to inspire confidence in the Bush administration's actions. Bush lists a number of ways that the American government is preparing to keep the homeland secure against potential threats. Bush here tries to present the security measures he will take as comprehensive, covering both external and internal threats. To cover external threats Bush describes "additional security at our airports and increased Coast Guard patrols of major seaports."(V) To reassure the public about security threats coming from within the country Bush mentions that "in recent days, American authorities have expelled from the country certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services." In this way Bush tries to convey to the public that they will protected on all fronts, from those who might try to enter the country, or those who are already in the United States.

Despite reassuring his audience as to their safety, Bush also uses this passage to reinforce for them the great danger posed by Iraq. To do this, he implies a connection between Saddam Hussein and the terrorists of 9/11. Although he never explicitly states that Hussein was behind the terrorist attacks, he does state that "in

desperation, he and terrorist groups might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people."(V) This statement is clearly meant to evoke the memory of and emotional reaction to 9/11, and suggests that Saddam Hussein might enlist the help of terrorist groups to create the next 9/11. While this section might evoke fear from the audience simply because it refers obliquely to the events of 9/11, the connection between Saddam Hussein's government and terrorists is not entirely convincing. Bush states that they are connected, but does not provide any kind of argument, either rhetorically constructed or based in external evidence, that supports this assertion. This section, although it explicitly reassures its audience about their safety, also reinforces the American public's already existent fears about terrorism, and thus, if one buys the connection between Saddam Hussein's government and terrorist organizations, helps to convince the audience of the need to confront the great security threat posed by Iraq.

I. 6. Justification

The next section of the speech does correspond to an ancient speech section, the proofs. This section deals with justifying the war in Iraq; first, it tries to prove that the war in Iraq is necessary from the standpoint of security, and second, it presents the war as morally justified. These two forms of justification closely correspond with the two major sources of argument upon which deliberative oratory, in the classical tradition, is built. While deliberative oratory is primarily concerned with what is advantageous for the state, the larger category of advantage is broken down by Roman rhetorical theorists into two categories: Security and Honor.

The first section of this justification for the war with Iraq directly pertains to security concerns. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states that "to consider Security is to provide some plan or other for the avoidance of a present or imminent danger."[133] This is exactly how Bush presents the justification for his actions throughout the entirety of the speech. He repeatedly references the terrorist link to Iraq and the danger of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. This section makes even more explicit Bush' commitment to security concerns, and, further iterates the need for pre-emptive action. This section clearly outlines the logic behind Bush's pre-emptive attack; he tries to persuade the American public that it is only a matter of time before Iraq's potential for harm is realized. Bush states that "we choose to meet that threat now where it arises, before it can appear suddenly in our skies and cities."(VI) This section is meant to justify Bush's invasion of Iraq to those critics of his pre-emptive plan. His statement that "responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self-defense" but "suicide" clearly depicts the gravity of the threat to security that Bush uses to justify going to war with Iraq.

Similarly, the second half of this section of the proofs also agrees with the goals of political oratory delineated by ancient rhetoricians. The other main goal of political rhetoric is to convince the public that the proposed action is honorable. Although this argument may not seem to be made explicitly in the March 17th speech, I would claim that in the final section, in his discussion of liberty and peace, Bush purposefully evokes patriotic and honorable sentiments. He establishes the relevance of honor early on in the speech, when he claims that "the United States and other

[133] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 3.2.3. p.161.

nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the regime."(I) He then reiterates this language of honor in the final portion of the proofs. By proclaiming that "the United States will work with other countries to advance liberty and peace in that region," Bush tells the American people that this is a just war, undertaken for secular, moral reasons, which he believes will appeal to a wide American audience. I would argue that appealing to ideals like liberty and the traditions of the American people is a modern equivalent to the ancient appeal to honor. Demosthenes also relies on the proud traditions of the Athenians in his discussions of honor; this is clear in the judicial proofs when he relates the history of the Athenian courts, in the deliberative proofs when he refers back to honors given in the 5th century, and in the epideictic proofs when he presents glorious figures of Athens' past to compare to Charidemus. Thus Bush's argument here relies on the same emotional reaction to tradition and honor that Demosthenes' speech relied on when it was delivered millennia earlier.

This section, because of its references to peace and liberty, also has some elements of a peroration. According to ancient theory the peroration is traditionally an emotional conclusion that is meant to arouse the audience as much as possible; to go out with a bang, if you will. Although I would qualify this section as a portion of the proofs, as it seems that Bush's purpose is still to justify the war in Iraq, his language here, especially in the post 9/11 context, evokes feelings of patriotism and pride in his audience. Bush then ends the speech the same way he began it, with a one line peroration: simply, "Good night, and may God continue to bless America."(VI)

II. Style

While George W. Bush is not famous for his rhetorical prowess, and is in fact known for his tendency to poor grammar and to inarticulate public addresses in a variety of settings, I would argue that his "poor" speech is very much on purpose. I will propose that his manner of speaking, every bit as much as what he actually says, is meant to persuade, and reflects directly Bush' constituency and the people he most wants to find his speech persuasive. In both the 2000 and 2004 elections, Bush was elected by a strong Republican base and it is these people to whom he tries specifically to appeal. While Republicans come in many shapes and sizes, Bush was also heavily backed by the Christian right wing, many of whom come from the South and Midwest. Bush's Texas twang and slow manner of speaking must be in some part affected; he was educated first at Phillips Andover, then at Yale, and he received an MBA from Harvard, all institutions in the Northeast.[134] His manner of plain speaking, by which I mean both his word choice and style of delivery, are purposefully chosen to create a persuasive demeanor that Bush believes will appeal to the majority of his audience.

The next few sections will examine ethos and pathos, and also the figures of thought and diction that lend persuasive power to the speech. Ethos and pathos play a very significant role in what makes this speech persuasive. Bush often excludes specific details about the claims he makes; for example, Bush says that "intelligence gathered...leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised," but he does not specify what these weapons

[134] *The White House*. Biography of President George W. Bush. 2008. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/president/biography.html>

are, where the weapons are, or any details about potential terrorist attacks. Because Bush presents the threat posed by Iraq in general terms, it is all the more necessary that the audience perceives Bush as truthful. Similarly, the course of pre-emptive action that Bush proposes here relies on the audience's belief that going to war is a necessary step. Bush creates the illusion of necessity by evoking a strong emotional reaction from the audience; this corresponds with ancient conceptions of pathos. After presenting ethos and pathos, I will then examine the figures of thought and diction that function to make the speech effective. These include the figures of diction Epanophora, Synonymy, Antithesis, and Maxim, and Paradigm, a figure of thought. In combination, these devices function to make the speech forceful and contribute greatly to its persuasiveness.

II. 1. Ethos

Bush displays his ethos through his speech, in a manner very similar to Demosthenes' practice in *Against Aristocrates*. Demosthenes displays his ethos by speaking in a straightforward but eloquent manner, and also by contrasting his own intentions with those of other corrupt rhetors. Bush approaches the creation of his ethos similarly; he speaks in a simple, straightforward manner, and makes a point of contrasting the resolve and responsibility of his administration with the attitudes of other nations that refused to support him in the Iraq war. Bush speaks primarily in simple sentences, and uses terminology that the vast majority of Americans are able to understand. The speech is primarily composed of independent clauses; subordination is rarely used. His speech very much corresponds with the "simple" style detailed in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and other ancient rhetorical treatises.

Bush's manner of speaking helps to create his ethos by portraying him as an honest man doing the right thing by acting to protect America and the rest of the world.

Bush sets up something of a moral scale by which to judge the actions of all the countries and international bodies he refers to: there are the United States and its allies, who are the most righteous; the United Nations and those weak countries that "share our assessment of the danger but not our resolve to meet it;"(III) and Saddam Hussein's regime and their terrorist friends. Bush accomplishes several things by describing all countries and international bodies as fitting into this scale. He presents himself as willing to undertake a difficult but necessary task, and also dismisses the idea that a country might legitimately oppose his judgment of the threat posed by Iraq by qualifying those countries that did not support him as lacking resolve. He makes statements like "the United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours,"(III) to highlight the United States' responsibility as the world's dominant power to keep the world free and safe. This kind of rhetoric makes Bush appear a strong leader who has the willpower to do the right thing.

Bush also uses this moral scale to juxtapose himself with Saddam Hussein. He describes Saddam Hussein as "the tyrant" and the Iraqi people as oppressed, and describes in vivid detail the evil acts of Saddam Hussein: he references "poison factories," "executions of dissidents," and "torture chambers and rape rooms." Explicit references like this are meant to characterize Saddam Hussein as an evil man, and by virtue of the contrast Bush establishes between the two of them, makes himself look just. The best known example of this polarization dates to Bush's first

State of the Union address, on January 29, 2002, when Bush, after naming North Korea, Iran and Iraq, declared that "states like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil."[135] Although not as explicitly stated in the March 17th speech, Bush continues to use language that suggests his administration is in the moral right; he presents himself as possessing both the willpower that lesser leaders do not have, and the moral high ground.

II. 2. Pathos

The role of pathos is also important in understanding what makes this speech persuasive and effective. Aristotle describes judgment as not an entirely rational act, and so swaying an audience's emotions can be very beneficial to the orator. Aristotle writes 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."[136] The emotional tenor of the United States at the time that this speech was delivered is crucial to the understanding of pathos. One may characterize the United States as a whole at this time as still highly sensitive to suggestions of domestic terrorism, and after months of hype, on edge about the possibility of war with Iraq.[137] Bush's language is meant here to evoke different emotions by turns, but primarily anger, fear and patriotic sentiments.

---

[135] Bush, George W. "State of the Union." United States Capitol Building. 29 January 2002.
[136] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 1.2.5. p.39
[137] Although this is partly surmised through personal experience, many newspaper articles dating to the days after Bush declared war describe a nation afraid of war, but also "relieved" to finally be at war after months of discussion and escalating emotions.
Halbfinger, David M. with Steinberg, Jacques. "Threats and Responses: Reaction; Wait Over, Americans Voice a Mix of Relief and Anxiety." *New York Times*. 18 March 2003. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9F0CE5D61431F93BA25750C0A9659C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=2>

In his treatment of pathos, Aristotle deals with a wide range of emotions, and discusses how eliciting those emotions can be to an orator's advantage, and also how each emotion functions. In his discussion of anger [*orge*] Aristotle writes that "a kind of pleasure follows all experiences of anger from the hope of getting retaliation."[138] Assuming Aristotle's analysis of anger to be true, one can easily see how valuable eliciting anger from his audience would be for Bush; his primary objective, in this speech, is to sell the Iraq war to the American public. Aristotle also notes that anger must be directed against "at some particular individual."[139] Bush creates anger explicitly at Saddam Hussein by representing him both as an ally of terrorists and as destructive and cruel to the Iraqi people. He also frequently, though not explicitly, compares him to Hitler, a comparison certain to elicit an emotional response from the audience.[140]

Bush is also heavily reliant on his audience's fears. His primary reason for invading Iraq is to keep America safe. This notion relies on promoting a belief on the part of the American populace that they will be unsafe with Saddam Hussein still in power. Aristotle writes "let fear [*phobos*] be defined as a sort of pain or agitation derived from the imagination of a future destructive or painful evil."[141] This conception of fear clearly corresponds to the kind of fear that Bush tries, throughout this speech, to elicit. Bush helps to create this fear by linking Saddam Hussein to terrorist and terrorist actions, thus dredging up the memory of 9/11, although he makes no attempt to give any concrete evidence linking the two. Bush explicitly

---

[138] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 2.2.1. p.125.
[139] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 2.2.1. p.124.
[140] See my discussion of the Dictator Paradigm for more information on how this comparison functions.
[141] Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. 2.5.1. p.139.

states that “it [the Iraqi regime] has a deep hatred of America and it has aided, trained and harbored terrorists, including operatives of al Queda,”(II) and describes the “chemical, biological and one day nuclear weapons”(II) that Iraq could use. In his discussion of fear, Aristotle also says: “that which causes fear seems near at hand.” In order to be persuasive, it is necessary for Bush to create the illusion that Iraq or their terrorist allies would, in all likelihood, strike the United States in the near future. By evoking fear in his audience, Bush all the more persuasively makes his case for war with Iraq.

The other main sentiment that Bush tries to evoke from his audience is feelings of patriotism. Acquiring support for a war can be a difficult task: Bush needs to convince his audience that it is both necessary and worthwhile for America to pay the costs of war. This means everything from bearing an economic burden to the loss of an unknown number of American soldiers’ lives. While persuading an audience to support such a difficult thing relies on the use of anger and fear, patriotic sentiment also accomplishes this goal. Bush makes two kinds of statements that evoke patriotic feelings; the first are references to America “taking responsibility,” and the second are references to the liberty for which America stands. In section VI the speech contains emotional language that refers to the ideals which every American is taught are the foundation of the country. Bush specifically states at the beginning of this section of justification that “as we enforce the just demands of the world, we will also honor the deepest commitments of our country. Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty.”(VI) These statements

undoubtedly create the sense of patriotism and pride on which any country relies when it enters into a war.

II. 3. Epanaphora

One of the most frequently used figures of diction in the March 17th speech is epanaphora. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines epanaphora as occuring "when one and the same word forms successive beginnings for phrases expressing like and different ideas" and again notes that "this figure has not only much charm, but also impressiveness and vigor in the highest degree."[142] The March 17th speech uses epanaphora frequently and throughout the speech; in most cases, Bush will begin two successive clauses or sentences with the same word or phrase. In the first section of the speech (I), he states that "we have passed..." and then begins his next sentence with "we have sent..." He also uses epanaphora at the end of the second section (II) when he says "before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act." In both of these examples the repetition of the phrase creates additional emphasis on what Bush is saying by encouraging the hearer to think of these actions as in some way identical or sequential. Again, in section III Bush states that "that duty falls to me as commander of chief by the oath I have sworn, by the oath I will keep."(III) The repetition of "by the oath" emphasizes this as particularly important in the minds of the audience, and also dramatizes the consequences of the oath by implying that swearing the oath and keeping it necessitates invading Iraq.

The best example of epanaphora, however, comes during his address to the Iraqi people. Bush first describes what the United States will do in Iraq by saying:

[142] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.13.19. pp.275-277.

"we will deliver the food and medicine.... we will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free."(IV) The repetition here makes Bush appear extremely resolved and determined to accomplish these goals. It also paints a mini-picture of what Iraq will look like when it is free; each of the three cola here complement and build off each other. He then follows this epanaphora with another example of epanaphora, when he states what will not longer exist in Iraq after the United States invasion: "there will be no more wars of aggression... no more poison factories, no more torture chambers and rape rooms." Both "we will" and "no more" are repeated three times each, which creates an elegant rhythm and parallel structure of the kind recommended by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.[143] The contrast between what will be and what will not be stand in stark contrast to each other, and are an example of antithesis that will be discussed in the next section. The use of epanaphora here lends great rhetorical force to what Bush says; he both appears more determined through his use of repetition of "we will" but also impresses more strongly what he says into the minds of his listeners.

II. 4. Antithesis

The use of antithesis in the March 17th speech is particularly interesting because of the role it plays in establishing Bush's moral scale. Antithesis is notably both a figure of diction and a figure of thought, depending on how it is viewed. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines antithesis the figure of diction as occurring "when the style is built upon contraries, as follows: 'Flattery has pleasant beginnings, but

[143] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.13.19. pp.275-277.

also brings on bitterest endings'."[144] The author distinguishes the two by stating: "the first [the figure of diction] consists in a rapid opposition of words; in the other [the figure of thought] opposing thoughts ought to meet in comparison."[145] In point of fact, the use of antithesis as a figure of diction implies antithesis in thought, and so the two really function together. Antithesis can be seen clearly in phrasings like "this is not a question of authority, it is a question of will."(III) This use of antithesis manifests itself in both the wording and the meaning of the statement. Another clear example of antithesis is the opposition set up between Bush's resolve and that of the nations not willing to go to war with Iraq. This example is worked in at different point throughout the speech: for instance, Bush states that "the United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours."(III) Bush's use of antithesis here enforces the moral scale discussed previously: Bush dismisses the unstated idea that any country might not recognize Iraq as a threat, but instead presents the United States and the United Nations as contrasting solely in terms of will. These uses of antithesis create a powerfully persuasive effect.

II. 5. Synonymy

Another rhetorical figure used throughout the March 17th speech is synonymy. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines synonymy as "the figure which does not duplicate the same word by repeating it, but replaces the word that has been used by another of the same meaning." Bush utilizes this figure throughout the speech to add emphasis and greater gravity to what he says. He does not always restate the same word, but will often describe a situation using one phrase, and then another, although

[144] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.15.21. p.283.
[145] *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* 4.45.58. p.377.

they often mean the exact same thing. For example, Bush states that "many nations… do have the resolve and fortitude to act against this threat."(III) It would have been sufficient to use either 'resolve' or 'fortitude' to make his point, but the use of both words is more rhetorically forceful. The use of "resolve and fortitude" adds weight to his words by forcing the audience to pay more attention to what he is saying: the same effect can be seen when Bush uses a synonymous phrase instead of a word: in the last section of the speech, he states that "should enemies strike our country, they would be attempting to shift our attention with panic and weaken our morale with fear."(VI) Again, the meanings of "shift our attention with panic" and "weaken our morale with fear" are very much the same, but the use of both phrases draws far greater attention to the point than one would alone. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states that "the hearer cannot but be impressed when the force of the first expression is renewed by the explanatory synonym." In addition to creating rhetorical emphasis, the sentence construction created by this figure also adds rhetorically to the speech by creating a pleasing rhythm.

This rhythm is created by the use of long sentences, many of which contain multiple clauses. Bush frequently uses parallel words and phrases joined in the same way: "food and medicine;" "military and intelligence services;" "public and private messages;" "journalists and inspectors." These construction create a pleasing internal rhythm. This paragraph is an excellent example

> As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison

> factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. (IV)

All three sentences that precede "the tyrant will soon be gone" have many clauses and parallel construction. The penultimate sentence demonstrates a tricolon crescendo and insistent epanaphora that emphasizes even more strongly the rhetorical punch packed into the final short sentence. Bush punctuates his use of longer sentences with short, one clause sentences to greatly emphasize those passages, and add a staccato effect to the speech.

II. 6. Maxim

One of the most prolifically used figures in this speech is the maxim. The maxim is used here to convey general truths, which give the impression that Bush is calling on established wisdom and the shared beliefs of his listeners. Examples of his use of maxim notably include two that follow one after the other: "Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty except the certainty of sacrifice."(IV) These are both very general statements, and statements that are likely to be accepted by a wide audience. By making generally accepted statements he better relates to a large range of his addressees. His use of maxims, although occasionally ineffective, helps to foster a sense of understanding between Bush and his audience; by making general statements that sound true to the majority of those listening, they are more likely to trust the other statements he presents to them. Maxims are also useful to him for their brevity. They are traditionally short, pithy statements; the maxims throughout the March 17th speech are brief but powerful statements. For these reasons, they make good 'sound

bytes,' which in modern televised oratory are a necessity. The effects of television and the modern media will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter.

II. 7. The Hitler Paradigm

Paradigm can be a very persuasive oratorical tool, and Bush utilizes it in the March 17th speech very effectively. At various points throughout the speech, Bush makes reference to World War II and to "murderous dictators;" while this is not an explicit reference, it certainly calls to mind the likes of Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini. Bush implicitly compares Saddam Hussein to these dictators, and thus creates a paradigm that suggests that the devastation of the holocaust and WWII will somehow be mimicked by Saddam Hussein if he is left unchecked. Bush makes this comparison at several points: after describing the way that America has tried to work with the United Nations on the issue of Iraq, Bush states that "the U.N. was founded after the Second World War... to confront aggressive dictators actively and early."(III) This clearly equates Saddam with the likes of such despised men as Stalin and Hitler. He alludes to World War II again when he states that "war crimes will be prosecuted, war criminals will be punished and it will be no defense to say, 'I was just following orders'."(IV) Although not unique to them, this was the excuse of a great many Nazi soldiers, who passed off the responsibility for their actions under the third Reich as "following orders." By making statements like these, Bush draws a clear comparison between Saddam Hussein and any of several infamous dictators of the twentieth century, and implies that if left unchecked Saddam Hussein will behave in a similar manner.

Bush makes an explicit comparison between the situation in Iraq and that with Nazi Germany when he mentions appeasement, the policy used by Britain during the 1930s to try to create peace with Hitler, in lieu of armed resistance. Appeasement has been described as the byword for "blundering incompetence and lack of resolution," and there still remains "a strong perception in the Anglo-Saxon world that appeasement was and is dishonorable and craven."[146] By using the word appeasement, Bush specifically evokes the memory of World War II and because of the connotations of his word choice strongly criticizes the behavior of states that will not support his war. Bush states here that "in the 20th century, some chose to appease murderous dictators whose threats were allowed to grow into genocide and global war." He then describes the dangers of appeasement as being much more heightened in the 21st century: "in this century... a policy of appeasement could bring a kind of destruction never before seen on this earth." By making these statements, Bush specifically equates those nations unwilling to declare war on Iraq with those who acquiesced to the desires of Nazi Germany, and thus grants them a strong moral denunciation.

III. The Effects of Modern Media

Ancient and modern speeches can be compared in many regards, but in making that comparison it is necessary to take into account the effects of modern media on oratory both in terms of function and rhetoric. Bush's speech, as discussed in the introduction to this chapter, serves a different function than that of ancient deliberative oratory in that the speech announces a course of action that has already

[146] Neville, Peter. *Hitler and Appeasement.* Hambledon Continuum: New York, 2006. xi.

been authorized. The rhetoric of this modern speech is markedly different from ancient speeches in a number of ways: the speech is far briefer than ancient speeches were and displays rhetorical features that have been tailored to suit modern media and a mainly television audience.

The primary effect of modern forms of communication on the rhetoric of the speech is the emphasis on 'sound bytes,' short phrases designed to be picked up and reproduced by broadcast and print media; in essence, they are condensed and easily accessible phrases that can be used to convey the main points of the speech. Bush uses phrases throughout the speech that seem chosen especially with the media's need for sound bytes in mind: these include phrases like the opening of the speech, "the final days of decision are upon us" and the antithetical statement, "we are a peaceful people, yet we are not a fragile people." Such sound bytes are dispersed throughout the speech. One way to examine the effect that these short phrases have on the speech's audience is by examining some initial responses to the speech. An article in the New York Times the day after the speech titled "THREATS AND RESPONSES: AN OVERVIEW,"[147] which gave a brief summation of the previous night's ultimatum, quoted the Bush speech on three separate occasions: the "final days of decision," "the tyrant will soon be gone" and "a dying regime" were all phrases picked up by the media. Because it was likely that many Americans would access the speech only through hearing or reading about it after the fact, Bush delivered a speech full of such readily quotable phrases. These sound bytes resemble maxims in their

[147] Depalma, Anthony. "Threats and Responses: An Overview." *New York Times.* 18 March 2003. http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C01EFD71431F93BA25750C0A9659C8B63&scp=3&sq=bush+war+in+iraq&st=nyt

brevity, but are different in terms of content. Such brief phrases are not characteristic of ancient oratory.

Another huge effect of modern media is the reduced need for proof; although Bush claims Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction, nowhere in the speech does he effectively prove those weapons exist, either through use of external proof or rhetorically constructed arguments. Because it is just as likely for a regular American to access this speech through reading about it afterward as through watching, and because he will be exposed to media reporting of the speech, he is more likely to take away from the speech those elements that the media focuses on. Because detailed, complicated or otherwise unwieldy "concrete" information, like the location and nature of the weapons of mass destruction are, was unlikely to be conveyed by the media when it presented summations of the speech, it was less necessary for Bush to include this kind of information. Similarly, rhetorically complex arguments that might have better supported his claim that Iraq is a great danger would not translate well into the catch phrases that the media looks for. The proofs section in this speech, which might better be described as a justification for war, lacks of any factual evidence that supports the statements that Bush makes. He paints grim scenarios without actually demonstrating their probability. The main reason that Bush could deliver this speech successfully as it was, without concrete proof, is because of the way modern media would report the speech after it had been given. In the ancient world, it would be necessary for an orator to convince effectively an audience in person, while in today's world, the media and media interpretations of oratory often play a major role in disseminating the central

messages of a speech. In terms of style this results in an abundance of catchy phrases, used later as sound bytes, and affects content by greatly lessening the burden of providing real evidence.

Conclusion

While in many respects the March 17th speech is persuasive, it does suffer from some major failings in terms of argument. The argument that Bush makes for war with Iraq relies heavily upon his assertion that it is an absolute necessity in order to ensure the safety of the United States. He does incorporate honor into the speech, but this is more to chastise those countries not following him into war than to convince his audience that he is undertaking a necessary action. The argument that Bush makes for security is largely effective because of his successful evocation of the audience's emotions. He brings up several extremely emotional subjects: his references to 9/11 and the Holocaust are very clear. In terms of rational argument, however, the March 17th speech suffers. Bush's security argument rests on the audience's belief in several key points, namely that Iraq does possess weapons of mass destruction that could harm the United States and is likely to use them, and that Iraq has definite ties to terrorist organizations that either have struck or intend to strike the United States. While Bush states these things to be the case, he does not effectively prove this to be true. He offers no factual evidence to support either statement, and also does not employ rhetorical arguments to convince his audience of the validity of his points. The office of the Presidency does help to legitimate Bush's claims: especially when this speech was orated, it is likely that many Americans would have believed his statements simply because he is the President. The status of

the orator, however, does not lend enough credibility to any speech to remove the burden of proof. Without sufficient proof Bush's argument is only convincing through his manipulation of audience emotion, and while in this respect he is very effective, the success of his argument does depend on rational persuasion.

Conclusion: Then and Now

It is clear that although in the ancient world rhetoric more directly had an impact on civic affairs, the power of rhetoric is as significant today as ever. The race for the Democratic Party nomination between Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama leaves no doubt as to the crucial role that rhetoric plays. Clinton often criticizes Obama, who is frequently lauded for his ability to give a good speech, as full of empty words that will not translate into concrete actions. She recently declared that "It's time we moved from good words to good works, from sound bites to sound solutions."[148] Obama has previously responded to similar criticism by saying, "Don't be fooled by this talk about speeches versus solutions... It's true, I give a good speech. What do I do? Nothing wrong with that."[149] Not only is there nothing wrong with that, but it is certain that Obama's powerful oratory has been a crucial factor determining his success so far. Rhetoric is not only as powerful in the modern world as in antiquity, but also serves similar functions. In the case of this Presidential race, both speakers do their utmost to persuade audience members to cast their votes for them, much in the same way that ancient speeches are designed to move an audience who will then vote. Although the March 17th speech declares an action that has already been decided upon, it too functions in a way comparable to ancient speeches; it is designed to persuade the court of public opinion, in a way that is not dissimilar to Demosthenes' aims in *Against Aristocrates*.

---

[148] Zeleny, Jeff. "Obama, Drawing Criticism on Two Fronts, Fires Back." *New York Times*. 21 February 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/21/us/politics/21campaign.html?_r=1&scp=2&sq=clinton+comments+on+obama+rhetoric&st=nyt&oref=slogin>

[149] Zeleny, Jeff. "Obama Adding Detail to His Oratory." *New York Times*. 17 February 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/17/us/politics/17obama.html?_r=1&scp=4&sq=obama+speeches&st=nyt&oref=slogin>

Demosthenes is known as the preeminent ancient Athenian orator, and as such, it is unsurprising that *Against Aristocrates* is an incredibly persuasive speech. *Against Aristocrates* adheres in many respects to rhetorical theory, and is thus an excellent example of theory enacted. Demosthenes demonstrates well formulated and thorough arguments, arranges them in a way that carefully builds in emotional tenor, and employs stylistic figures that render his speech rhetorically forceful. There are places where he does deviate from rhetorical theory, most notably in the peroration. This difference can be explained in terms of rhetorical theory, however: the section that precedes the peroration actually provides the emotional appeal one would expect to find in the peroration. *Against Aristocrates* thus largely adheres to rhetorical theory, and is made persuasive through the potent combination of Invention, Arrangement and Style, each composed in an extremely effective way.

A comparison between the two speeches themselves will highlight even more effectively the similarities between ancient and modern rhetoric. One can easily compare the central sources of argument in both the ancient and modern speeches examined here. Although *Against Aristocrates* contains a strong judicial argument, both it and the March 17th speech present arguments that rest on the same primary, political concerns: security, and less significantly, honor. They also both utilize rhetorical figures and tropes first identified by ancient rhetorical theory in similar ways. Demosthenes makes his deliberative proofs persuasive in large part by his use of paradigm, and Bush constructs one of the most emotionally evocative elements of his speech with the same device. Similarly, the persuasiveness of both of these speeches rests on the speaker's ethos as it is communicated through the oration, and

each specifically tries to convey the image of an honest, moral speaker. Not only does the March 17th speech conform in many regards to the guidelines of ancient theory, but it even demonstrates some similar concerns and uses of style with *Against Aristocrates*, despite their different time periods and cultural contexts.

There are also, of course, some major differences between modern oratory and ancient theory. The March 17th speech relies on its ability to manipulate the audience's emotions for persuasive ends instead of presenting a fully constructed rational argument. Bush does not sufficiently provide proof of a link between Iraq and terrorist organizations; he also does not sufficiently prove that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction. He offers neither external, concrete evidence of the security threat posed by Iraq nor a well-constructed rhetorical argument designed to convince his audience of these facts. The speech does include two sections that correlate to ancient statements of facts; however, neither of these fulfills the purpose of the section by providing the factual information necessary for the audience to be persuaded by the speech. While the status, power and legitimacy of the Presidency does give, or perhaps gave, Bush a certain credibility he might otherwise lack, it does not mitigate the need for a fully developed and well-explained argument that proves the statements on which Bush bases the rest of his assertions about security. The March 17th speech also differs from rhetorical theory in its lack of explicit organizational structure, and in some of its stylistic decisions; these differences can largely be attributed to the effects of modern media.

Although the March 17th speech does demonstrate a few significant differences from ancient rhetorical theory, an analysis from this standpoint gives a

full understanding of the methodology by which the speech is made persuasive. Both the aspects of the March 17th speech that adhere to rhetorical theory and those that deviate from it prove the relevance of a comparison between the two. It also seems that some of the advice that the modern world has to offer on the rhetoric of speechmaking draws directly from those guidelines first delineated in the fourth century BCE. Jack Burden, the narrator in Robert Penn Warren's *All The Kings Men*, might offer the best piece of oratorical advice in modern literature: he tells Willie Talos, at the point when Talos is running for Governor and giving awful speeches, "'Yeah' I said, 'I heard the speech. But they don't give a damn about that. Hell, make 'em cry, or make 'em laugh, make 'em think you're their weak and erring pal, or make 'em think you're God-a-Mighty. Or make 'em mad. Even mad at you. Just stir 'em up."[150] This advice eerily echoes Aristotle's discussion of pathos, written millennia earlier. Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that ancient rhetorical theory is as relevant to modern oratory as it is to that of Greece or Rome.

[150] Warren, Robert Penn. *All the King's Men.* Restored Edition. San Diego: Harcourt, Inc, 2001. p.102.

Bibliography

1. Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. George Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

2. Bush, George W. "President Says Saddam Hussein Must Leave Iraq Within 48 Hours." The Cross Hall. 17 March 2003.

3. Bush, George W. "State of the Union." United States Capitol Building. 29 January 2002.

4. Demosthenes. *Against Aristocrates*. Trans: J.H.Vince. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

5. Depalma, Anthony. "Threats and Responses: An Overview." *New York Times*. 18 March 2003. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C01EFD71431F93BA25750C0A9659C8B63&scp=3&sq=bush+war+in+iraq&st=nyt>

6. Dodds, E.R. Introduction. *Gorgias*. By Plato. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

7. Halbfinger, David M. with Steinberg, Jacques. "Threats and Responses: Reaction; Wait Over, Americans Voice a Mix of Relief and Anxiety." *New York Times*. 18 March 2003. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9F0CE5D61431F93BA25750C0A9659C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=2>

8. Kennedy, George. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.

9. Neville, Peter. *Hitler and Appeasement*. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006.

10. Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

11. Quintilian. *Orator's Education*. Trans: Donald Russell. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

12. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Trans: Harry Caplan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

13. *The White House*. Biography of President George W. Bush. 2008. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/president/biography.html>

14. Warren, Robert Penn. *All the King's Men*. Restored Edition. San Diego: Harcourt, Inc, 2001

15. Worthington, Ian. *Demosthenes, Statesman and Orator*. London: Routledge, 2000.

16. Zeleny, Jeff. "Obama Adding Detail to His Oratory." *New York Times*. 17 February 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/17/us/politics/17obama.html?_r=1&scp=4&sq=obama+speeches&st=nyt&oref=slogin>

17. Zeleny, Jeff. "Obama, Drawing Criticism on Two Fronts, Fires Back." *New York Times*. 21 February 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/21/us/politics/21campaign.html?_r=1&scp=2&sq=clinton+comments+on+obama+rhetoric&st=nyt&oref=slogin>

Appendix A: The Political History of Athens Preceding *Against Aristocrates*

Although Athens in the fourth century did not hold the same dominant place in respect to other city-states that it held in the fifth century, it was still considered to be one of, if not the most powerful Greek state. Its position of power was not as definite as it had been, however, and Athens engaged in a number of small wars throughout the first half of the fourth century. These were with neighboring states for the most part, primarily Sparta and Thebes. In this period Athens actually engaged militarily more often with Thebes than with longstanding enemy state Sparta, because of Thebes' ambition to be recognized as the most powerful state in Boetia. The Peace of 362BCE eventually concluded the hostilities between Thebes and Athens, but military affairs continued in the North. They also engaged with the northern states Thrace and Macedonia at various intervals. Athens' main supply of grain came to them by ship from the Cimmerian Bosporous, and they sailed through the Hellespont, then controlled by Thrace. Athens was extremely reliant on this supply of corn, and thus was frequently brought into power struggles, and sometimes open conflict, with Thrace. Athens is described as having "commercial activity and prosperity [that] were unrivalled"[151] and a fleet more numerous than anyone else's in the Mediterranean. Athens was also "free from serious internal division, and her constitution stood in no danger of disturbance."[152] This, in general terms, was Athens' condition through the first half of the fourth century.

---

[151] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1914. p.69
[152] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*. p.69

Charidemus' relationship with Athens had begun in the decade previous to *Against Aristocrates*. He began by serving under Athenian General Iphicrates, but when Iphicrates was succeeded by Timotheus, Charidemus betrayed his duty to Athens by returning a group of Amphipolan hostages he had been entrusted to bring to Athens. Giving the hostages back to Amphipolis effectively annihilated Athens' main strategy to convince the Amphipolans to surrender their city. He then returned to Thrace, where he served under Cotys, the father of Cersobleptes. Charidemus then volunteered his services for Olynthus, another northern city, then under the control of Amphipolis, "but some Athenian ships captured him on his way thither; he joined the Athenian forces instead, and was rewarded with the citizenship of Athens and other compliments."[153] He then spent some time again serving under Cotys, and laid siege to Crithote and Elaueus in the Chersonese, both Athenian towns, and openly opposed Athenian general Cephisodotus for several months. Charidemus continued to engage in activities that strengthened his relationship with Thrace, and which hurt Athens.

Timotheus, an Athenian general, was sent to the Northern city of Amphipolis, which had originally been a colony of Athens, founded in 437, but "the Spartans had captured it in 424, and in spite of various attempts, Athens had never recovered it. It was now an important city and virtually independent both of the great Greek cities and of Macedonia; but the Athenians claimed a right to it."[154] Athens, led by the general Timotheus, again tried to conquer Amphipolis in 360-359, but was repelled. "In the same year, [Athenian General] Cephisodotus was sent to the Hellespont but he had more than his match in Charidemus, a captain of mercenaries, who was in the

[153] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom.* p.61
[154] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom.* p.53

service of Cotys [the Macedonian King]."[155] In 359BC he captured a Thracian prince who had risen in revolt against Cotys, and who was also friendly to the Athenians, and turned him over to the people of Cardia, who put him to death. Shortly after this affair, in 358 Cotys passed away, and Charidemus took control of Cotys' young son Cersobleptes, acting as his "guardian and first minister, as well as [his] general."[156] This murder of the Thracian prince at Charidemus' instigation created outrage through much of Thrace, and lead to the partition of Thrace into three separate kingdoms, one of which was left in control of Cotys' son Cersobleptes and Charidemus.

Charidemus again came into favor in Athens after this point when he was suggested as a general to Athens by Cersobleptes' representative Aristomachus. Aristomachus expressed to the Athenians both "the friendly sentiments of himself [Cersobleptes] and his General Charidemus" and that only Charidemus would be able to recover the city of Amphipolis for them, and that they should use him as their General.[157] Amphipolis at this time was controlled by Philip, who was steadily gaining power from his seat in Macedonia. It's possible that Cersobleptes made this gesture towards Athens in the hope of creating an alliance to defend against Philip, but it seems more likely that Cersobleptes was instead looking to extend his influence over the Thracian region. The decree proposed by Aristocrates, had it been passed, would have made it very difficult for the other Thracian kings, Amadocus, and the sons of Bersiades, to ever oppose Cersobleptes. While he was never made inviolable,

[155] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*. p.61
[156] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*. p.61
[157] Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*. p.161

Charidemus remained very popular in Athens after this point. He was made an Athenian general in 351 to contend against Philip on the Propontis.[158]

[158] Caplan, Harry. Introduction. *Against Aristocrates*. p.213

Appendix B: Transcript of the March 17th Speech[159]

I. My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision.

For more than a decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all of its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

Since then, the world has engaged in 12 years of diplomacy. We have passed more than a dozen resolutions in the United Nations Security Council. We have sent hundreds of weapons inspectors to oversee the disarmament of Iraq.

Our good faith has not been returned. The Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage. It has uniformly defied Security Council resolutions demanding full disarmament.

Over the years, U.N. weapons inspectors have been threatened by Iraqi officials, electronically bugged and systematically deceived. Peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraq regime have failed again and again because we are not dealing with peaceful men.

II. Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

The regime has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East. It has a deep hatred of America and our friends and it has aided, trained and harbored terrorists, including operatives of Al Qaeda. The danger is clear: Using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country or any other.

III. The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat, but we will do everything to defeat it. Instead of drifting along toward tragedy, we will set a course toward safety.

Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed.

---

[159] I have superimposed my speech divisions here. Bush, George W. "President Says Saddam Hussein Must Leave Iraq Within 48 Hours." The Cross Hall. 17 March 2003. http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/03/17/sprj.irq.bush.transcript/

The United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security. That duty falls to me as commander of chief by the oath I have sworn, by the oath I will keep. Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq.

America tried to work with the United Nations to address this threat because we wanted to resolve the issue peacefully. We believe in the mission of the United Nations.

One reason the U.N. was founded after the Second World War was to confront aggressive dictators actively and early, before they can attack the innocent and destroy the peace.

In the case of Iraq, the Security Council did act in the early 1990s. Under Resolutions 678 and 687, both still in effect, the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. This is not a question of authority, it is a question of will.

Last September, I went to the U.N. General Assembly and urged the nations of the world to unite and bring an end to this danger. On November 8th, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1441, finding Iraq in material breach of its obligations and vowing serious consequences if Iraq did not fully and immediately disarm.

Today, no nation can possibly claim that Iraq has disarmed. And it will not disarm so long as Saddam Hussein holds power.

For the last four and a half months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that council's longstanding demands. Yet some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced that they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq. These governments share our assessment of the danger, but not our resolve to meet it.

Many nations, however, do have the resolve and fortitude to act against this threat to peace, and a broad coalition is now gathering to enforce the just demands of the world.

The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours. In recent days, some governments in the Middle East have been doing their part. They have delivered public and private messages urging the dictator to leave Iraq so that disarmament can proceed peacefully.

He has thus far refused.

IV. All the decades of deceit and cruelty have now reached an end. Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours. Their refusal to do so will result in military conflict commenced at a time of our choosing.

For their own safety, all foreign nationals, including journalists and inspectors, should leave Iraq immediately.

Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

I urge every member of the Iraqi military and intelligence services: If war comes, do not fight for a dying regime that is not worth your own life.

And all Iraqi military and civilian personnel should listen carefully to this warning: In any conflict, your fate will depend on your actions. Do not destroy oil wells, a source of wealth that belongs to the Iraqi people. Do not obey any command to use weapons of mass destruction against anyone, including the Iraqi people. War crimes will be prosecuted, war criminals will be punished and it will be no defense to say, "I was just following orders." Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war and every measure will be taken to win it.

Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty except the certainty of sacrifice.

V. Yet the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military, and we are prepared to do so.

If Saddam Hussein attempts to cling to power, he will remain a deadly foe until the end.

In desperation, he and terrorist groups might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people and our friends. These attacks are not inevitable. They are, however, possible.

And this very fact underscores the reason we cannot live under the threat of blackmail. The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed. Our government is on heightened watch against these dangers. Just as we are preparing to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland.

In recent days, American authorities have expelled from the country certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services.

Among other measures, I have directed additional security at our airports and increased Coast Guard patrols of major seaports. The Department of Homeland Security is working closely with the nation's governors to increase armed security at critical facilities across America.

Should enemies strike our country, they would be attempting to shift our attention with panic and weaken our morale with fear. In this, they would fail.

No act of theirs can alter the course or shake the resolve of this country. We are a peaceful people, yet we are not a fragile people. And we will not be intimidated by thugs and killers.

If our enemies dare to strike us, they and all who have aided them will face fearful consequences.

VI. We are now acting because the risks of inaction would be far greater. In one year, or five years, the power of Iraq to inflict harm on all free nations would be multiplied many times over. With these capabilities, Saddam Hussein and his terrorist allies could choose the moment of deadly conflict when they are strongest. We choose to meet that threat now where it arises, before it can appear suddenly in our skies and cities.

The cause of peace requires all free nations to recognize new and undeniable realities. In the 20th century, some chose to appease murderous dictators whose threats were allowed to grow into genocide and global war.

In this century, when evil men plot chemical, biological and nuclear terror, a policy of appeasement could bring destruction of a kind never before seen on this earth. Terrorists and terrorist states do not reveal these threats with fair notice in formal declarations.

And responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self defense. It is suicide. The security of the world requires disarming Saddam Hussein now.

As we enforce the just demands of the world, we will also honor the deepest commitments of our country. Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Good night, and may God continue to bless America.