»Do not rush like geese into fog!«. Critical analysis of the discourse of a political leader's speech on the example of Stjepan Radić's speech from 24/25 November 1918 in the National Council

Veronika Novoselac*
veronika.novoselac@unicath.hr
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7063-7195

Vlatko Smiljanić**
vsmiljanic@hrstud.hr
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9835-0591

https://doi.org/10.31192/np.21.2.6
UDK / UDC: 808.51:32
32Radić, S.
Prethodno priopćenje /
Preliminary communication
Primljeno / Received:
3. studenog 2022. / Nov 3, 2022
Prihvaćeno / Accepted:
13. ožujka 2023. / March 13, 2023

Political discourse is a set of all speech acts that are determined and articulated in the form of verbal formations, whereby their content, subject and addressee fall under the purview of politics. Using Van Dijk's model of critical discourse analysis, the paper demonstrates one of the possibilities of an integrated approach to qualitative research in historiography using Radić's most famous speech as an example, which has not yet attracted the attention of communication studies and historiography to be adequately analyzed, interdisciplinarily evaluated, and syncretistically interpreted.

Key words: *critical discourse analysis, political discourse, political speech, Stjepan Radić.*

* Veronika Novoselac, Master in Communication Sciences and History, Catholic University of Croatia, Department of History; Ilica 242, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia.
** Vlatko Smiljanić, PhD, Master in Education of History, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Croatian Studies, Research Institute; Borongajska cesta 83d, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia.

Introduction

Political discourse is an important tool of political communication since it encompasses all speech acts that are determined and articulated in the form of verbal formations, with their content, subject, and address lying within the realm of politics.Political communication is defined as an interactive process of exchanging political content between different political participants to achieve certain effects.[1] The word chosen almost always affects people's perception of themselves and others. Therefore, language is used not only to express people's attitudes, thoughts, and beliefs,[2] but also to shape and establish identity, ideologies, power, and social (in)equality. Political leaders in all types of political systems often rely on the spoken word to influence and mobilize their followers and to convince others of the benefits that can result from their leadership.[3] Political speeches are used to convey certain messages and goals to the audience. Therefore, public speakers tend to use language that suits their goals and reflects their viewpoints. A critical examination of political speeches increases an individual's understanding of the role of proper language use in communicating with an audience.[4] Therefore, a political statement differs from other discussions in that it presents the speaker's point of view, clarifies his point of view, and announces his proposal, with the essential aspect of achieving political goals. Although in contemporary Croatian political communication and everyday language he is best known for the phrase »Do not rush like geese into fog!«, when interpreting Radić's deeds, for example in relation to Ante Starčević, his political oratory as a specific form of political activity is usually not taken as a starting point, even though his »historical greatness« was perhaps manifested to the highest degree in his speech at the night session of the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs on November 24, 1918. On that occasion Radić resolutely opposed the implementation of unitarian-centralist unification, even though his »blinded or beheaded supporters threatened him with murder in the parliament and lynching by the incited crowd on the street«.[5] Using Van Dijk's model of critical discourse analysis, the paper demonstrates one of the possibilities of an integrated approach to qualitative research in historiography

[1] Kuralay Kenzhekankyzy KENZHEKANOVA, Linguistic features of political discourse, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (2015) 6, 192-199, 193.

[2] Fatih BAYRAM, Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech, *Annual review of education, communication & language sciences*, 7 (2010) 1, 23-40, 29.

[3] Jonatham Charteris-Black, *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 1.

[4] Ruth WODAK, Critical discourse analysis, discourse-historical approach. *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction*, (2015) 1-14.

[5] Franjo TUĐMAN, Stjepan Radić u hrvatskoj povijesti [Stjepan Radić in Croatian History], in: *Stjepan Radić – politički spisi, govori, dokumenti* [Stjepan Radić – political writings, specches, documents], Zagreb, Školska knjiga, 1994, 9-37, 21.

using Radić's most famous speech as an example, which has not yet attracted the attention of communication studies and historiography to be adequately analyzed, interdisciplinarily evaluated, and syncretistically interpreted.

1. Political discourse

Discourse is a broad term with different definitions, which »integrate a whole range of meanings«.[6] Several different notions of discourse recorded in the literature have been summarized by Theun van Dijk. In general, it implies the verbal dimension of a spoken or written communicative act of a communicative event (what is usually called speech or text) that has become socially available for interpretation. It represents a specific form of language use and social interaction.[7] It is both socially constructed and socially conditioned. It can be used to assert dominance and knowledge, but also to resist and criticize. The term can also refer to a socially established set of genres associated with a social domain or field, such as political discourse, which would thus refer to all genres of discourse used in politics or discourses that make use of them. Political discourse is determined by political settings as well as political discourse structures. It can refer to a type of discourse that is a political production - a speech, a debate, a political interview, a political document, and so on, or we could refer to any conversation or textual production that is either about a political issue or is politically motivated.[8] The analysis of (political) discourse implies different theoretical and methodological approaches.[9] It can also be used to describe, interpret, analyze, and criticize social life as reflected in (political) speech.[10] A review of literature revealed various alternative theoretical lenses and models used to analyze political discourse, especially the political speeches of national party leaders. The language someone uses can indicate a person's intentions by portraying their beliefs, stance, and attitudes. Political speeches show how speakers persuade their listeners to support and accept their points of view. Politicians often use metaphors that are difficult for certain people to understand or whose intended message is difficult to decipher. Therefore,

[6] Stefan TITSCHER, Bryan JENNER, *Methods of text and discourse analysis: In search of meaning*, London, Sage publications, 2000, 144.

[7] Teun A. VAN DIJK, *Ideologija. Multidisciplinarni pristup* [Ideolology: A multidisciplinary approach], Zagreb, Golden Marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2006, 263-268.

[8] John Wilson, Political discourse, in: Deborah Tannen et al. (ed.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, John Wiley & Sons, 2001, 775-795, 775.

[9] Massoud SHARIFIFAE, Elahe RAHIMI, Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN, *Theory and Practice in Language studies*, 5 (2015) 2, 343-349, 343.

[10] Norman FAIRCLOUGH, *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*, London, Longman, 1995, 132.

looking at the analysis of political speeches can help identify the political goal of the speaker.

2. Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary approach that focuses on language as a kind of social practice. It emphasizes the importance of the mutual influence of linguistic and social practices and the development and maintenance of social power relations through language.[11] Its subject of research is often (public) speech, such as political speeches. CDA lacks a coherent theoretical framework because it is not based on a single line of research. There are several variants of CDA that can be conceptually and analytically very different. Teun A. van Dijk's model, which represents the sociocognitive paradigm is the most popular and widely used CDA model.[12] According to van Dijk, CDA is the study and analysis of written and spoken texts to uncover the discursive roots of power, dominance, inequality, and bias. It investigates how these discursive materials are preserved and reproduced in various social, political, and historical contexts.[13] Van Dijk's CDA model consists of three components: macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure. The macrostructure entails identifying the discourse's thematic determinants, followed by its basic ideas and other substantive features. It is about the overall meaning of the entire speech that encapsulates the declared opinion of an individual. The superstructure stresses the three major schematic determinants of the discourse, whereas the microstructure is associated with word choice and other standards that build the basic message of the discourse itself.[14]

Furthermore, Van Dijk also identifies different linguistic tactics utilized by politicians in public appearances that indicate a type of ideological political manipulation.[15] Van Dijk's socio-cognitive framework is made up of two basic discursive strategies: »positive self-representation« and »negative other representation«. In fact, the fundamental feature of all ideological and political debate is the polarization of in-group members, who are always shown favorably, while out-group members are always portrayed negatively. In other words, the speaker seeks to judge himself and the community to which he belongs

[11] Ruth WODAK, Christopher LUDWIG, *Challenges in a Changing World. Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis*, Vienna, Passagen Verlag, 1999, 12-13.

[12] Muhammad Faishol Nurul HUDA, Didin Nuruddin HIDAYAT, An Investigation of Macrostructure, Superstructure, and Microstructure on Online News Text, *NOBEL: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 11 (2020) 2, 149-161, 152.

[13] Teun A. VAN DIJK, Critical discourse analysis, *The handbook of discourse analysis*, (2015) 466-485, 466.

[14] Huda, Hidayat, *An Investigation of Macrostructure…*, 152-153.

[15] Teun A. VAN DIJK, Discourse and manipulation, *Discourse & society*, 17 (2006) 3, 359-383, 373.

favorably while negatively characterizing others consistently. Notably, discursive strategies disclose how political figures manifest their future commitment and maneuver citizens to build a better future. The discursive strategies are involved in the notion of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation based on the construction of Us and Them. It is a language approach founded on the substantive opposition of language units as well as the usually claimed ideological opposition of extra-linguistic referents.[16] Implications and presuppositions are powerful semantic features of language that attempt to subtly proclaim »facts« that may or may not be real. Metaphors and analogies are also of great importance. The CDA analysis can shed light on the greater social and political context of the time, as well as providing insight into how language is used to form public opinion and impact political discourse. Nevertheless, discourse research based only on text analysis is not enough because the text is only the result of the production practice that must also be observed.[17]

3. The speech of Stjepan Radić in the National Council from 24/25 November 1918

At the night session of the Central Committee of the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs in Zagreb on 24/25 November 1918, a decision was made to immediately send a delegation to Belgrade, which would sign an act with the representatives of the Kingdom of Serbia on the unconditional unification of the South Slavic peoples and the creation of the Yugoslav state, which was accomplished in a few days. Only Stjepan Radić, the president of the Croatian People's Peasant Party, strongly opposed such a solution, proposing the creation of a federal state in which Croatian statehood would be preserved. Pointing out that Croats are in favor of the establishment of a federal republic, he warned the members of the Central Committee not to rush into the arms of Serbia before agreeing on the future position of Croatia. He believed that »the Croatian people have the right to establish their own Croatian state in Yugoslav unity«. Shying away from the unitarism of »a single state without any internal borders«, Radić insists that the internationally recognized Yugoslav territory has a single state border on the outside, but he also demands that Croatia retain its state border in the common state. He claimed that »the Croatian peasant – which is nine tenths of the Croatian nation - became a complete man during the war, which means that he will no longer serve anyone, be a slave to nobody, neither a foreigner nor his own brother, neither to someone

[16] Daniela MATIĆ, Ideološka polarizacija u govornim činovima unutar političkih govora, *Folia Linguistica er Litteraria*, 6 (2012) 59-77.

[17] Teun A. VAN DIJK, *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008.

else's nor to his own country, rather he wants, in this great age, the state to be organized on a free republican and righteous humane foundation«.[18] His famous speech was not pre-written or stenographic. It was written down from memory, and Radić published it in 1920 in »Dom« (No. 3-4) and as a brochure »Gentlemen's politics without the people and against the people« and more fully in 1923 in the booklet »Peasant consciousness and people's will – the path to a peasant republic«. The speech was reprinted several times, and in 1971 it was interpreted on the vinyl record »Stjepan Radić 1871–1971«.[19] It is precisely its multiple publications that testify to the importance of the speech for Croatian political history.

4. Critical analysis of the discourse of Radić's most famous speech

A CDA study of Radić's speech focuses on how Radić frames his arguments and the issues he discusses using language. The research considers Radić's positioning regarding other speakers and his audience, as well as how he employs language to convince and influence his audience. The study seeks to answer the following research questions: What is the discourse of Radić's speech and what discursive strategies were applied? Van Dijk's CDA approach is employed because Van Dijk provides more detailed information about the discourse's structure, components, and constituents. The elements observed in the text media are thematic, schematic, semantic, syntactic, stylistic, and rhetorical. Discourse analysis was aided by qualitative research tools, like MAXQODA.

4.1 Macrostructure

Accusing the other councilors of trying to pull down and push Croatia out of the overall geopolitical picture, instead of, taught by the experience of the First World War, standing up for it and the needs of their people, Radić, in the introductory part of his speech, refers the audience to his topic, emphasizing the obligation of his statement in order to influence the conscience and consciousness of the members of the Central Committee:

> »I will not speak for the sake of external effect (success), as one might otherwise think (...) I am speaking, therefore, to fulfill my duty and to use my right, and

[18] Nada SOKOLIĆ JAMAN, Komunistička štampa u Hrvatskoj o djelatnosti Stjepana Radića (1918. – 1925.) [Communist press in Croatia about the activities of Stjepan Radić (1918-1925)], *Radovi zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, 6 (1974) 1, 273-313, 273.

[19] Suzana LEČEK, *Stjepan Radić. Hrvatski biografski leksikon* [*Croatian biographical lexicon*], https://hbl.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=11947 (05.10.2022).

> also to knock on your conscience so that you have no excuse later that no one has showed the abyss into which you want to plunge all our people, and especially the Croatian people«.[20]

The main thematic determinant of Radić's speech is the argumentative opposition to the urgent and thoughtless unification of Croatian lands with the Kingdom of Serbia, i.e., advocacy for clearly defined guarantees according to which no nation in the new state will be dominant over the other. Opposing the conclusions of the National Council, Radić presents the perspective of the republican organization of the future common state, speaking on his own behalf and on behalf of most of the population of the Croatian lands at the time, i.e., the peasantry as a new force of political life, which makes up the largest part of the population. Using mostly assertive, directive, and declarative speech acts, he presents his own position in an argumentative manner with the aim of starting a further discussion that would reconsider the decisions made. He claims that parliamentarians are more concerned with constructing a centralized state than with the wishes and desires of the people. He claims that linguistic unity does not imply political unity, and that a centralized state will not satisfy all Slavic peoples. He claims that the struggle has increased Croatian peasants' awareness of injustice and that they will not accept any type of oppression, including centralism and militarism. According to him, the National Council does not operate democratically and instead forces its will on the people. He also believes that the Council violates the Constitution by bypassing the Croatian state parliament. Throughout Stjepan Radić's speech, the importance of justice, freedom, and prosperity for the country and homeland is underlined.

4.2. Superstructure

Radić's goal is to convince of the harmfulness of the imposition of foreign rule and the neglect and failure to recognize the sovereign will of the people. A well-designed and organized speech is built around this main thought, which aims to influence the consciousness and conscience of the listener. Radić's speech is separated into various portions, each with its own topic and purpose, in which he shows the accusation he makes in the introduction in numerous different thematic subcategories in the core part of the speech. The first part of the speech deals with the historical context of Croatia. Radić describes the centuries of oppression and subjugation that the Croatian people endured under Austro-Hungarian rule and emphasizes the need for self-determination and independence. The second part of the speech deals with the current political situation in Croatia and the role of the National Council. Radić criticizes the Serbian-dominated Yugoslav government for its lack of concern for the needs

[20] Radić, *Politički spisi, govori, dokumenti…*, 79.

and interests of the Croatian people and calls for greater autonomy and decentralization of power. Trying to argue the undemocratic nature of the procedure with facts, the central part of the speech begins by criticizing the views on the unification of Croats, Serbs and Slovenes into one centralist state, and at the end of the speech he once again refers to national unity and the fact that unification requires the recognition of the right to self-determination, not »national speech«, that is, that the idea of Yugoslavism should be based on the distinction between all constituent nations within the state. Radić promotes his political views, ideas, and goals mostly in the second part of the speech, which touches on anti-centralism and republicanism as the two fundamental concepts of Radić's ideology. He fights against political elitism and corruption and condemns the undemocratic work of the National Council. As one of the consequences, he warns that the people will leave and abandon the politicians they elected because they have betrayed their trust with the described and decided act. The third part of the speech deals with the future vision of Croatia and its place in Europe. Radić argues that Croatia has a unique cultural and historical identity that must be preserved and celebrated. He also emphasizes the importance of economic development and social justice, calling for a more equitable distribution of wealth and resources.

4.3 Microstructure

Considering that it was subsequently reconstructed and written down, it is not surprising that Radić's most famous speech has 4771 words and 196 sentences, which means that he spoke for about 24 minutes in total. Given that his average number of words in a sentence is twenty-four, his sentences are quite complex and multidimensional, and he connects them most often with constituent or disjunctive conjunctions. Although it is outside the structure of the sentence, the vocative of the second person plural of the personal pronoun »you« is used more than a hundred times in the speech, and it is immediately followed by the pronoun »we«. It can be read from the above that, despite the monologue, Radić wants to encourage two-way interpersonal communication, but the strategies he uses do not allow him to do so. Using an accusatory approach, characterizing opponents as incompetent, crazy, naive, and stupid, his provocations did not ensure their intended back reaction, i.e., giving up on the undemocratically adopted proposal. The Cirrus vizualuzation of Radić's speech reflect the key themes of the speech, which include concerns about the centralization of power, the need for greater representation and inclusivity, and the importance of recognizing the distinct identity and interests of Croatia. In speech, the most common noun is »narod«, followed by »Croats« together with all its noun derivatives such as the adjective Croatian. It is important to point out that in several places Radić explains the phrase »national unity«,

while warning about its wrong connotations: »We are three brothers, a Croat, a Slovene, a Serb, and we are not one. Each brother should be asked.« Also, the concept that he especially breaks down and dissects is the concept of democracy, referring to its original meaning, which at the same time derives from his diverse education: »And that's all because to you democracy is an empty word; because it never even occurs to you in your dreams that you act according to the meaning of that word, which means that the people must be asked first in every important matter, that all state affairs must be conducted according to the will and needs of the people, that is, that in our country it is necessary to rule according to the will and needs of the peasant majority, and by no means according to the arbitrariness of the insignificant gentlemanly minority.« Radić is continuously speaking to his audience. He speaks straight to them, repeating the phrase »Gentlemen!« with which he begins his speech, as well as every following sentence of his, up to eighteen times. It is concerned with the repeating of a single unit in the text, which achieves a form of parallelism to allow for an exaggerated syntactic regularity. The balance of sentence elements that line up in the ideas of the discourse itself is achieved by repeating a given phrase in exactly equivalent situations.

Word Count	4771
Character Length	23527
Sentences	196
Lexical Density	88%
Lexical Diversity	35%
Readability Index	9.282
Average Words Per Sentence	30.8
Duration	24 min

Table 1: General features of Radić's speech.

Picture 1: The Cirrus vizualuzation of Radić's speech[21]

Radić's speech is a clear example of political polarization. As a leader, speaking about his actions, values, and attitudes he represents, he explains them as the only correct, rational and adequate ones. He explains the actions of his political opponents as failed, absurd and arbitrary. For example, when describing the whole situation, Radić uses the noun »stupidity«, precisely characterizing his political dissenters as unjust, careless, and unintelligent. He accuses

[21] A cirrus visualization is a type of word cloud that shows the most frequently used words in a text, with the size of the words indicating their frequency of use. The visualization can give a quick and simple overview of the main topics and themes addressed in the speech. The larger and bolder a term, the more frequently it appears in a text and the more relevant it is.

and calls the actions of the leading Slovenian, Serbian, Dalmatian, Vojvodina and Bosnian political opponents inconsistent, warning of the importance of historical experience.

> »because of which the Croatian peasant, and that is nine tenths of the Croatian nation, became a complete man during the war, which means that he will no longer serve anyone, be a slave to nobody, neither a foreigner nor his own brother, neither to someone else's nor to his own country, rather he wants, in this great age, the state to be organized on a free republican and righteous, humane (social) foundation. And you, a handful of you gentlemen, are against it!«[22]

He emphasizes that he is speaking on behalf of the Croatian people

> »that will no longer serve anyone, be a slave to nobody, neither a foreigner nor his own brother, neither to someone else's nor to his own country, rather he wants, in this great age, the state to be organized on a free republican and righteous, humane (social) foundation.«[23]

Therefore, presenting himself as the political leader of most of the Croatian people, Radić assumes a clear authority and attitude, speaking extremely sharply and coherently, specifically:

> »And I, whom you throw away and exclude from your midst, whom, in fact, you are working about the head, I will, you see, be, God willing, like a fish in water not only among the Croatian peasantry, but also among the Slovenian and Serbian peasantry.«[24]

It is therefore impressive to notice how he illustrates the Croatian peasant, characterizing him as daring, brave, wise, but also smart enough to »know everywhere that the state and homeland is in justice and freedom, in prosperity and in education.« In this way, he actually constructs its essence and significance for Croatian politics in the future, pointing out that »all peasants are resolutely and enthusiastically for the republic, and the entire Croatian peasant world is against centralism as it is against militarism.« This discourse on the concept of the Croatian peasant mainly influenced and shaped the political and social scene of the 1920s. He uses many different stylistic devices, but the most common is comparison and metaphor. Metaphor is a stylistic device used to connect abstract ideas with concrete images. Radić uses metaphorical language in his speech in order not only to improve its effect, but to bring it closer and define its goal more clearly. Also, the speech abounds with epithets, especially »Croatian«, »folk« and »rural«. Then with anaphora, antimetabole, proleps and rhetorical questions. Several times Radić also exclusively uses an exclamation, all to strengthen his statement. The speech abounds with strong imagery with

[22] *Ibid.*, 83.
[23] *Ibid.*, 83.
[24] *Ibid.*, 84.

which, apart from emotionally, Radić also enhances his statement logically. For example,

> »it is a terrible guilt when the streams of martyr's, say heroic, blood of Serbs and Croats and Slovenes are of no value to you, because you say that this blood was shed for King Peter and for the new great kingdom. All the tears, prayers and sighs of all our mothers, wives, sisters and daughters are worth nothing to you.«[25]

His comparison, which warns the gentlemen present about an insufficiently thought-out decision, is summed up in a phrase used in political communication to this day »Do not rush like geese into fog«. In the English phraseological vocabulary, this phrase is equivalent to the saying »Do not get ahead of yourself«. It's the most quoted exclamation point from that speech, but for its context you need to read the entire speech, which doesn't end with that exclamation but ends with »Long live the Republic! Long live Croatia!« The vocabulary he uses reflects determination and a kind of attacking attitude. His concluding exclamation reflects his belief in the realization of the aspirations of the policy for which he advocates. Semiotically, it is important to point out Radić's accusation of infatuation with the SHS rebus, which says nothing »to the heart or the mind« about the coexistence of peoples. Namely, he is appalled at the attitude that a national name should be written with an abbreviation because it should never be shortened, just as one cannot shorten the last name of an individual person, asking in vain: »SHS meant first Slovenes, Croats and Serbs; now it means Serbs, Croats and Slovenes! What will it mean tomorrow?«[26]

In his speech to the National Council on 24/25 November 1918, Radić shared his ideas and beliefs using verbal language in several ways.

- Clear and direct language: Radić was known for his direct and straightforward communication style, which he used to great effect in this speech. He expressed his points clearly and concisely, using simple language that was easy for his audience to understand.
- Appeals to emotion: Radić also used emotional appeals to connect with his audience and reinforce his message. For example, he spoke passionately about the struggles of Croatian farmers and the need to protect their rights and interests. He also used strong, evocative language to describe the importance of the Croatian people and their cultural identity.
- Historical References: To create a sense of shared identity and history, Radić also used historical references in his speech. He referred to the Croatian peoples long struggle for independence and self-determination and emphasized the importance of preserving Croatian traditions and cultural practices.

[25] *Ibid.*, 83.
[26] *Ibid.*, 80.

- Logical arguments: Radić also used logical arguments and conclusions to support his claims and convince his audience. He clearly stated the importance of the Croatian Peasant Party and its mission and supported his claims with examples and evidence.

He uses several discursive strategies to persuade his audience, including:

- Emotional language: by expressing an unsatisfactory attitude, he simultaneously gives vent to his own feelings. His impressive affective language, which he uses to influence the audience and inspire change, demonstrates intellectual strength and resilience in convincing them of the correctness of his own views through rhetorical argumentation. By emphasizing dissatisfaction with the current situation and politically reckless actions, Radić seeks to influence the consciousness and emotions of the audience by appealing to their reason and logical thinking. Radić uses emotive language to evoke strong emotions in his audience and to emphasize the importance of his arguments. For example, he uses words such as »shameful,« »horror,« and »treason« to describe the governments actions and criticize its policies.
- Rhetorical questions: Radić uses rhetorical questions to make his audience think about the issues he raises and come to their own conclusions. For example, he asks, »Is not it time we finally realized the consequences of our actions?« This question causes his audience to reflect on the governments actions and consider the need for change.
- Repetition: Radić uses repetition to emphasize his key points and make his arguments more memorable. For example, he repeats the phrase »Croatia is not Serbia« several times during his speech to emphasize the importance of recognizing Croatia's own identity and interests.
- Metaphors: Radić uses metaphors to make his arguments more vivid and to help his audience understand complex ideas. For example, he compares the government's policies to "a burning torch setting the field on fire" to illustrate the destructive nature of their actions.
- Inclusive language: Radić uses inclusive language to appeal to a broader audience and to emphasize the importance of representing the interests of all citizens. For example, he uses phrases such as »we all suffer« and »we all demand« to emphasize that the problems he addresses affect all citizens of the Kingdom.

In summary, Radić's discourse in his speech to the National Council on November 24-25, 1918, is characterized by critical arguments, emotive language, rhetorical questions, repetition, metaphors, and integrative language. These discursive strategies help make his arguments more persuasive and memorable

and encourage his listeners to consider the need to change government' policy. In his speech, Radić explained his party's position on the new state and its government. He expressed concern about the centralization of power and the possibility that the interests of Croatia and other parts of the Kingdom might be disregarded. He argued that the new government should be more inclusive and representative, and that the interests of all citizens should be considered. One of the strengths of Radić's speech is the clarity with which he presents his arguments. He uses simple language and clear examples to present his arguments, which makes it easier for his audience to follow his reasoning. He also uses rhetorical devices such as repetition and alliteration to emphasize his key points, which contributes to the persuasiveness of his speech. A weakness of Radićs speech, however, is that he focuses heavily on the concerns and interests of his own party and region, rather than seeing the new state in a larger context. While it is understandable that he would want to work for the interests of his constituency, it is also important for political leaders to think of the common good and the needs of the entire country. Radić's narrow focus on Croatia and the Croatian Peasant Party may have limited the impact of his message on a broader audience. Another weakness of Radić's speech is that it is largely reactive rather than proactive. He spends the most of his speech condemning the administration and its policies rather than giving alternative answers or a vision for the future. While it is critical to keep governments accountable and voice concerns about their conduct, political leaders must also be proactive and constructive in their dialogue. Generally, the speech's rhetoric is distinguished by a strong sense of national identity and a devotion to democratic norms and principles. Radi uses historical connections and colorful language to excite and mobilize his audience by instilling a sense of urgency and a call to action. However, the discourse also reflects a degree of nationalism and populism, evident in Radić's emphasis on the superiority of Croatian culture and the need to protect it from outside influences. This style of discourse can be divisive and exclusive, fueling tensions and disputes among various ethnic and cultural groups. Furthermore, the discourse might be critiqued for a lack of actual recommendations and answers to the challenges that Croatia was experiencing at the time. Radi's speech, while passionate and encouraging, lacks a clear plan for achieving the goals he discusses.

Conclusion

Stjepan Radić's speech in the National Council on November 24 and 25, 1918, was a turning point in Croatian history and is a clear and convincing example of the political discourse of the early 20th century. Radić was a prominent Croatian politician and founder of the Croatian Peasant Party. His speech

was delivered at a time of great political change in the region, as the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was in the making. The speech summarizes Radić's original political ideology about statehood, Croatian sovereignty, and the idea of republicanism. In it, Radić does not oppose unification, but advocates that it must take place within the framework of a federative republic, not a centralist monarchy. Radić's speech is a political discourse that addresses the issue of the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Radić, as a prominent Croatian politician and founder of the Croatian Peasant Party, expresses his concerns about the centralization of power and the potential marginalization of the interests of Croatia and other constituent parts of the Kingdom. Radić's discourse can be characterized as critical, as he is challenging the government's policies and advocating for changes. The discourse of this speech' reflects the political context of the time, and its interpretation can provide valuable insights into the prevailing political ideas and attitudes of the time. By analyzing the speech using Van Djiks CDA theory, it was possible to determine Radić's political thinking, his attitude towards foreign policy and opposition, and his awareness of the strengthening of the peasantry as a new political people (natio politica) in Croatia after the First World War. His ideology, which he wove into his speech, is characterized by the ideas of democratic nationalism, constitutional freedoms, natural law, social responsibility, and a socially conscious republic. Although there are some weaknesses in his argument and approach, Radić effectively conveys his concerns about the new state and the need for greater representation and inclusiveness. Overall, Radić's speech was a powerful example of how verbal language can be used to share ideas and beliefs. He combined emotional appeals, historical references, logical arguments, and clear language to build a strong case for the importance of protecting the rights and interests of Croatian peasants and the Croatian people as a whole. Such a method of interdisciplinary research can serve as a new model for the qualitative analysis of historical sources, especially the speeches of political leaders, to reach multi-perspective and syncretic conclusions. This paper shows how the qualitative application of the methods of a human science (history) and a social science (communication studies) can lead to valid conclusions in qualitative interdisciplinary research. This type of interdisciplinary research can be used to develop a new paradigm for the qualitative analysis of historical data, especially speeches of political leaders, to obtain pluralistic and syncretic conclusions. Since this thesis analyzes only one of Radi's speeches and does not compare or analyze all speeches, the impetus for future research could be to use Ruth Wodak's historiographic-communicological approach of critical discourse analysis, which aims to identify hidden assumptions in different historical accounts by focusing on the language used in their processing.

Veronika Novoselac* – Vlatko Smiljanić**

»Ne srljajte kao guske u maglu!« Kritička analiza diskursa govora političkoga lidera na primjeru govora Stjepana Radića od 24./25. studenoga 1918. godine u Narodnom vijeću

Sažetak

Politički diskurs je skup svih govornih činova koji su determinirani i artikulirani u obliku verbalnih tvorbi, pri čemu njihov sadržaj, predmet i adresat ulaze u djelokrug politike. Koristeći Van Dijkov model kritičke analize diskursa, rad pokazuje jednu od mogućnosti integriranog pristupa kvalitativnom istraživanju u historiografiji na primjeru najpoznatijeg Radićeva govora koji do sada nije izazvao pažnju komunikologije i historiografije da bi bio validno analiziran, interdisciplinarno vrednovan i sinkretistički interpretiran.

Ključne riječi: kritička analiza diskursa, politički diskurs, politički govor, Stjepan Radić.

* Veronika Novoselac, mag. comm. et mag. hist., Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište, Odjel za povijest, Ilica 242, HR-10000 Zagreb; e-mail: veronika.novoselac@unicath.hr.

** Dr. sc. Vlatko Smiljanić, mag. educ. hist., Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Fakultet hrvatskih studija, Znanstveni zavod, Borongajska cesta 83d, HR-10000 Zagreb; e-mail: vsmiljanic@hrstud.hr.