

The Rhetorical Analysis of Oriana Fallaci's *Interview with History*

Kaja Rostkowska-Biszczanik

University of Zielona Góra

k.rostkowska@ifp.uz.zgora.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-7997-4649

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with rhetoric of journalism in a political interview. **Scientific objective:** To indicate rhetorical devices used by Oriana Fallaci in *Interview with History*. **Research method:** The paper is an attempt at rhetorical analysis, and it discusses rhetorical elements appearing in the preface, in the biographical notes of the interviewees, and in the main text. Fallaci's interviews are arranged on the pillars of complementary modes of persuading — *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*. The material is structured according to this key, which allows for discussion of selected rhetorical ways of referring to reason, will, and emotion. **Results and conclusions:** In relation to the preface, the paper identifies the topos of introduction (novelty, brevity, modesty, and humor), references to the recipient, the author herself, and the topic as a common matter. The biographical notes and main text of interviews demonstrate the function of instruction assigned to rational argumentation and proving. Among the journalist's techniques belonging to the ethos sphere, axiological argumentation and the use of thought figures (antithesis, discrediting) were pointed out. The pathos sphere was characterized, among others, by discussing the imagery. **Cognitive value:** The paper fills a gap in research on the Oriana Fallaci's method — no rhetorical analysis of her conversations has been undertaken so far. The techniques described are not only theoretical but also practical, they can be adapted and developed in media practice.

KEYWORDS

rhetorical figures, leadership, rhetoric, mode of persuasion, interview



Oriana Fallaci interviewed the most important politicians of the international arena. Although the media world has changed dramatically since *Interview with History*, a book published in Italy in 1974, the output of the Italian icon of journalism has remained a highly valued example of political talk. It is a valuable research material in the context of rhetoric of leadership, but also rhetoric of journalism, especially in the era of personalizing the political scene, i.e. when leaders, not the party, are in the foreground (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2012, p. 177).

The paper is an attempt at rhetorical analysis of interviews collected in *Interview with History*. The volume contains an extensive introduction and twenty-eight conversations conducted in the '70s with political leaders of the United States, Vietnam, Cambodia, Iraq, Israel, and Ethiopia. Fallaci preceded each of the conversations with a subjectively outlined biographical note. The analysis is based on the Polish edition of the 2012 work (Warsaw, Sfera Publishing House), translated from Italian by Agnieszka Czepnik, Anna Osmólska-Mętrak, and Joanna Ugniewska. The purpose of the paper is to indicate the rhetorical devices used by the journalist. The rhetorical elements appearing in the preface to the book, in the main text, and in the biographical notes are discussed. Three areas of rhetoric have been distinguished, related to the sphere of reason, will, and emotion, with the awareness that the proposed key does not exhaust all interpretative possibilities of the research material.

Preliminary Assumptions

Rhetoric is understood here classically as *ars bene dicendi*, but the media context related to shaping journalistic messages is important. Walery Pisarek, who analyzed the means used by journalists, defines rhetoric as the art of effective public communication. In the '70s, he emphasized its eloquent dimension (1975). Thirty years later, he noticed that people who speak in public can still complain:

“No one notices us, and among those few who have noticed us, no one listens and reads us, and among those few who have heard or read us, no one understands us, and among those few who have understood us, no one wants to agree, and among those few who have agreed, no one remembers us” (Pisarek, 2002, p. 9).

Therefore, in public communication, apart from elocution, a number of other factors are of great importance. Barbara Bogolebska and Monika Worsowicz (2016) mention numerous references, for example inventive, in addition to the ingenuity and novelty of the subject and approach, it is important to include appeal to topos and rhetorical axioms, the presence of persuasive discourse and argumentation. They also point to the availability (exordial and final topos contribute to the acquisition of readers), rhetoric of journalism and journalistic genres manifested in the elements of surprise, dialogue, interactivity, subjectivity, polemic, and persuasiveness (p. 149).

Fallaci's book consists of materials previously published in the press. Hence, the definition of press interview was adopted as a journalist's conversation with a public figure intended for publication (Wojtak, 2004, p. 238). The basic objectives of the interview are information about facts, creating a portrait of a specific person, acquiring readers, and shaping their opinions and even attitudes (Wojtak, 2004, p. 240). These aspects are consistent with rhetorical strategies of persuasion, which can be put in three terms: teaching (*docere*), moving (*movere*), and delight (*delectare*) (Bogolebska & Worsowicz, 2016, p. 191).

A journalist's meeting with an interviewee, a political leader, is a special communication situation in which there are two rhetorical entities. According to the definition of Krzysztof Grzegorzewski (2013), the rhetorical entity is a speaker endowed with all the features that may affect his or her ability to speak, and thus persuade (p. 11). Each of the rhetorical entities represents

individual features (linguistic, psychological, etc.). In the case of conversations posted in *Interview with History*, the entities are antagonistic. The journalist enters the role of an adversary, undertaking polemics, criticizing politicians, opposing their own narrative arguments.

It seems, however, that the imperative of Oriana Fallaci organizing the entirety of the book was to understand the phenomenon of leadership, to show the value system of interviewees, to portray them so as to evoke emotions (Fallaci, 2012, p. 18). The Italian journalist sought to achieve these goals using a wide range of rhetorical devices and mechanisms. The nomenclature of the paper was adapted from the studies of Mirosław Korolka (1990) and Beata Witkowska-Maksimczuk (2014).

It should be noted that the rhetoric of political leaders (also in the communication situation of an interview) has been widely described in the literature (including Ozóg, 2004; Dobek-Ostrowska, 2012; Kuś, 2018). There are also numerous analyzes regarding the strategies used by journalists (e.g. Pisarek, 2002; Worsowicz, 2013, 2016; Modrzejewska, 2012). The work of Oriana Fallaci was studied primarily in socio-cultural contexts (Sienko, 2010; Chechłowska-Lipińska, 2013; Tichoniuk-Wawrowicz, 2014). Conversations between the Italian icon of journalism and leaders have not yet been the subject of rhetorical analysis.

Rhetorical Analysis of *Interview with History*

Structural order is used in this analysis: first, the introduction to *Interview with History* is analyzed, then the actual interviews, and finally the profiles of the interviewees. The essayist introduction that opens the work not only presents the goals and basic thought accompanying the collection of interviews, but also seeks the answer to the question of what leadership is and where it comes from. The multidisciplinary nature of this concept is noted in science (Hartliński, 2012, p. 54), and Fallaci's interviews concern political leadership. Most definitions display a relational dimension — they are defined as the relationship between a political leader and a social group (Antoszewski & Herbut, 2002). In the media context, views related to exerting influence are important — in this way one can define leadership as the ability to arouse belief in the correctness of achieved goals (Scruton, 1996).

Regardless of the existing definitions, the journalist presents her understanding of leadership and a leader. She believes that “those who determine our destiny are not really better than ourselves; they are neither more intelligent nor stronger nor more enlightened than ourselves. If anything, they are more enterprising, more ambitious” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 18). In the preface, questions are asked about whether history is created by everyone, or only by few, and the journalist puts her fear of finding answers in metaphorical frames, wonders if she has “enough eyes and enough ears and enough brains to look and listen and understand like a worm hidden in the wood of history” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 17). She puts forward an important thesis: the most tragic aspect of the human condition is the need for power, i.e. the need for a leader (Fallaci, 2012, p. 18). Power deprives freedom and, according to Fallaci, is even a proof that absolute freedom does not exist, although it should be sought at all costs.

Topoi, or ancient “common places” appear in the introduction, understood as judgments, statements, and visual images that are used for argumentative purposes (Kukiela, 2010, p. 77). The preliminary topoi most frequently used by Fallaci are:

- topos of news, e.g. “To the subjects here lined up, in short, I went this spirit: each time seeking, together with information, an answer to the question of how they are different from ourselves” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 17);
- brevity and modesty, for example, “This book does not claim to be anything but what it is [...]. It does not want to promise anything more than it claims, I mean a document straddling journalism and history” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 15);

- humor, although it is a kind of joke referring to reflection, e.g. “We have no evidence to show that Vercingetorix was a scoundrel” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 16).

The preface to the book has the same functions as the introduction of rhetorical speech according to the classical rules of rhetoric: in addition to affecting reason, it is to attract the attention of the recipients (Witkowska-Maksymczuk, 2014, p. 61). Fallaci also acquires the recipient's favor by introducing techniques characteristic of the initial parts of rhetorical speeches. First of all, she refers to:

- the recipient, e.g. “And discouraged, you conclude that those who make one turn instead of another are few, those who make us take one road instead of another” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 16);
- herself, e.g. “I leave shreds of my heart and soul” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 15);
- the subject as a common matter, e.g. “Our existence is decided by a few people, by their dreams and caprices, their initiative and will” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 16).

Among the eye-catching elements are numerous questions: “What do we become? Impotent herd in the hands of now a noble shepherd, now an infamous one?” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 16). Moreover, Fallaci formulates unexpected, controversial statements: “We do not even know whether Jesus Christ was tall or short [...], whether he really said the things that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John assert. Ah, if only someone had interviewed him [...].” (Fallaci, 2012, pp. 16–17). The efficient use of rhetorical tricks and numerous references testify to the rhetorical creativity of Oriana Fallaci. “Vivid language” is not an aim itself, but rather a preview of strongly persuasive conversations referring to the sphere of reason, will, and emotions.

The tricks described in the introduction create the illusion of dialogicality — the text having a monological character acquires the features of a dialogical expression. Although the roles of the author and recipient are unchangeable and the text is formally monologous, numerous questions are formulated, and the sentences that follow are various variants of the answers that can be given. The microdialogues used can be treated both as a presentation of the journalist's internal voice and as an invitation to the reader's dialogue. The introduction is therefore marked by conversation, and this treatment exposes Fallaci's dialogical thinking, strongly rooted and visible in her works.

Moving on to the main parts of interviews contained in *Interview with History*, it should be noted that they are mostly structured according to the classical pattern. To name the most important features: the title of the interview is the name of an interviewee, and the statements of the journalist and interlocutors are characterized by asymmetry — the questions are much shorter than the answers of the interviewees. It is worth noting that Fallaci subordinates her descriptions to the conversations, which is reflected in the punctuation and lexical linguistic layer (numerous exclamation marks, emotional vocabulary). Interviews, ranging from a dozen to several dozen pages, are intended to provide answers to questions about the motivations of leaders or their most important national and international plans. Therefore, current political and social events are important, but not only — trying to inquire into the essence of Fallaci's leadership, she introduces sequences based on questions about the private life of politicians, their path to power or ideological matters.

According to Fallaci, one of the most important attributes of a leader is intellect. In the dimension of logos, language, as a basic communication tool, is used to “learn (reason) and describe (arguments) real content, as well as expressing thoughts and emotions (figures, style)” (Bogołębska & Worsowicz, 2016, p. 51). The logos is connected with rational argumentation (*ad rem*, judgment, reasoning, proving). Fallaci asks leaders to explain their decisions, pushing for explanations regarding political actions. She demands clear, understandable, credibly presented answers, tries to organize the statements of leaders, also introducing numerous modules based

on argumentation. She tracks cause-and-effect relationships to highlight the consequences of decisions made by politicians. She cares for maintaining leaders' narrative in the limits of logic and coherence, but is also willing to make a brilliant exchange of views — the following sequence of conversation with the Shah of Iran, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi is an example:

- [...] So today that in Iran there's no democracy...
- *Is there, Majesty?*
- I assure you, there is [...].
- *Maybe I explained myself badly, Majesty. I meant democracy as we understand it in the West, namely, a regime that permits anyone to think as he likes and is based on a parliament where even minorities are represented [...].*
- [...] And here I'm receiving you in the palace, and you're here sitting next to me...
- *Which is very kind of you, Majesty.*
- Hmm... It certainly shows we have democracy and freedom here...
- *It certainly does. But I'd like to ask you something, Majesty. I'd like to ask you: if I were an Iranian instead of an Italian, and lived here and thought as I do and wrote as I do, I mean if I were to criticize you, would you throw me in jail?*
- Probably. If what you thought and wrote went counter to our laws, you'd be put on trial.
- *Really? And sentenced too?*
- I think so [...] (Fallaci, 2012, pp. 441–442).

Among the rhetorical mechanisms used by Fallaci, *topoi* in the argumentative function are noteworthy, especially the argument of similarity, opposition, and authority. And although these are actions designed to evoke emotions, they are also an impulse for a substantive conversation that broadens the knowledge of the recipient. Writing about *Interview with History*, Federico Rampini (2012) noticed that today, in the era of journalism being a “massive product”, Fallaci's style may be useful to “select information, organize it, and give it meaning, bring it to the right size, demythologize and, if necessary, reject” (p. 10). All these tasks enumerated by the Italian writer and journalist in relation to Oriana Fallaci's interviews are to emphasize their not only historical but also social value.

The area of values is another pillar of talks with leaders. In the phenomenon of political leadership itself, the journalist sees contrasting values, which is reflected in the rhetoric of interviews. Persuasive influence in the area of ethos focuses on axiology and moral attitude, and is to affect the will of the recipient (Bogołębska & Worsowicz, 2016, p. 114). Through the talks, Fallaci gives politicians the opportunity to explain their behavior and allows them to explain themselves by taking controversial political steps. At the same time, she openly stigmatizes those that lead to war, death, and suffering. The sphere of ethos is primarily characterized by axiological argumentation (*ad hominem*). The following quotes from the bodies of various interviews contained in the volume illustrate it:

Mr. President, we've been talking a lot about democracy and elections [...]. What do you have to say to those who call you the dictator of South Vietnam? (Fallaci, 2012, p. 69).

Dr. Habash, [...] you were a doctor and your profession was to save people, not to kill them (Fallaci, 2012, p. 182).

It seems to me the moment has come to take up your personality, Mr. President. Let's talk a little bit about this man who is very rich and yet is a socialist, lives like a Westerner, but has two wives (Fallaci, 2012, p. 243).

Fallaci emphasizes the contradictions inherent in the attitudes and value systems of the interviewees. Antithesis-based denials are an important group of rhetorical figures used by the journalist. During the talks, the journalist's interest in the personality of the interlocutors is emphasized. Fallaci's well-known interview with Henry Kissinger was made famous by the following conversation based on the contrast:

– I'm looking for one through this interview. And I don't find it. I suppose that at the root of everything there's your success. I mean, like a chess player, you've made two or three good movies. China, first of all. People like chess players who checkmate the king.

– Yes, China has been a very important element in the mechanics of my success. And yet that's not the main point [...]. The main point arises from the fact that I've always acted alone. Americans like that immensely. Americans like the cowboy who leads the wagon train by riding ahead alone on his horse, the cowboy who rides all alone into the town, the village, with his horse and nothing else [...].

– I see. You see yourself as a kind of Henry Fonda, unarmed and ready to fight with his fists for honest ideals. Alone, courageous...

– Not necessarily courageous. In fact, this cowboy doesn't have to be courageous. All he needs is to be alone, to show others that he rides into the town and does everything by himself (Fallaci, 2012, p. 42).

The concept of a lone cowboy became so suggestive that the punch line contained in the last part of the interview, when Kissinger cuts off the conversation saying: "I won't tell you what I am. I'll never tell anyone" (Fallaci, 2012, p. 45), loses his power of expression.

The journalist believed that the portrait of leaders was born "from the chaos of thoughts, colors, evasive answers, balanced sentences, irritating silence" (Fallaci, 2012, p. 28). Maria Wojtak (2004) wrote about creating a portrait in an interview reminding that the task of this genre is to influence readers, satisfy their curiosity, and build the image of a given person or the environment they represent — recording and modifying various components of this portrait (p. 247). Using the means of persuasion referring to the ethos, Fallaci most often reached for three types of rhetorical figures. In the collected material, the most common figure is discrediting (*extenuatio*), often supported by mockery (*illusio*):

That you're Nixon's mental wet nurse (Fallaci, 2012, p. 39).

What do you have to say to those who call you the dictator of South Vietnam? (Fallaci, 2012, p. 69).

What have you to say about the fact that you're called an „American puppet” or the „man of the Americans”? (Fallaci, 2012, p. 70).

– What do you have to say to those who accuse you of being [...] the most corrupt man in Vietnam?

– Mademoiselle, it's not even worth to trouble to answer [...].

– Well, then let's put it another way, Mr. President. Is it true that you were born very poor?

– Very true [...].

– *And is it true that today you're immensely rich, with bank accounts and houses in Switzerland, London, Paris, and Australia?*

– It's not true. I swear to you on the head of my daughter and of my son that I own nothing abroad [...]. (Fallaci, 2012, pp. 71–72).

In the examples cited, one more trick used by the author is noteworthy: very general phrases (“those who call you,” „those who accuse you”), which is a procedure used to objectify the statement. This is an example of building a certain relationship between the participants, i.e. entering the role. Within the interaction, the journalist has many roles to choose from, e.g. an intermediary, intermediary-helper, learning-partner, expert-partner or partner-representative of the public opinion (Bauer, 2000, p. 195; Wojtak, 2010, p. 143). In the course of conversations with politicians, Fallaci reaches for rhetoric device characteristic of the latter role, consisting in expressing not only her own opinion, but also a wider society. Objectivizing the utterance is done by using the non-personal verb forms (generalizations) and the first person plural — the pronoun “we”, which is to be a social voice.

Turning to the analysis of the interlocutors' profiles, it should be noted that an important element of rhetoric of the analyzed work is the sphere of pathos associated with shaping emotions. The journalist's activities are focused here on showing and arousing feelings, and stimulating the imagination. Emotional valuation finds expression in vivid language (Bogołębska & Worsowicz, 2016, p. 114). The ancient rhetorical style based on the scheme of four advantages of articulating (*quattuorvirtutes dicendi*) included the most important advantages of correctness, clarity, appropriateness, and decorativeness. The latter included the following attributes of the word: brilliance, strength, ingenuity, richness, wit, fluency, diligence, and grace (Kukiela, 2010, p. 86).

Ziomek (2004) notes that in antiquity rhetoric was an art in which “there was no collision between pragmatic and aesthetic functions. All the beauty of the rhetorical text as an author's text served to win favor” (p. 16). Stylistic rhetorical figures serve linguistic intensification, increase clarity, unambiguity, tension of expression, or “make it more pleasant to the listener” (Allhoff & Allhoff, 2008, p. 122). Witkowska-Maksimczuk (2014) emphasizes that the figure increases the persuasive value of statements (p. 115). The use of devices aimed at shaping emotions is based in *Interview with History* on word aesthetics (imagery, comparisons) and composition (arrangement of conversations, construction of interviewees, composition structure).

The best exemplification of shaping emotions in *Interview with History* are the biographical notes of the interlocutors. For each of the interviews, Fallaci added a separate surrounding text. This is a hybrid form of introduction to the interview, associated with a biographical note. These introductions to conversations saturated with subjectivity are above all a space for persuasion.

Fallaci shows leadership as intellect-based politics and its moral construction, but the characterological and physical feature of it are also important — it is to them that Fallaci devotes extensive parts of the biographical notes of politicians. When building portraits of interviewees, the journalist attaches particular importance to such image components as voice, face, and posture. She uses contrasting. She says of Henry Kissinger: “The fifty-year-old in horn-rimmed glasses”, who “nor leap from speeding automobiles like James Bond, but he advises on wars, ends wars” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 21). In almost every biographical note, Fallaci describes the face of the interlocutor, e.g.: “Have you ever seen a sadder face than the face of Hussein? His lips are strips of disheartenment” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 184). She also describes their voice: “Do you know that obsessive, hammering sound of rain falling on a roof? His voice is like that” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 28). She draws attention to their behavior, posture — often as the opposite, for example portraying George Habash — first Fallaci states that the Palestinian leader is guilty of most

attacks in Europe (Fallaci, 2012, p. 168), and then she admits that “every gesture emanated from great sadness and great dignity, and that is why when you looked at him, you felt overwhelming sympathy. I didn’t want to feel it. I was pushing it away. But it returned and I couldn’t help it” (Fallaci, 2012, pp. 169-170).

There are also other journalist’s observations regarding non-verbal communication elements showing the interviewees. They are expressed in the form of numerous metaphors. The journalist writes about the Vietnamese General that his name, Giap, was “short and dry as a slap in the face” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 75). Regarding kinematics, she interestingly describes Pakistani Prime Minister Ali Bhutto: “He looked like a banker who wants to get you to open an account in his bank [...]. A mysterious sadness was locked in his eyes” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 225). In her descriptions of proxemics, she boldly uses figurative expressions: “his deceptively ingenuous air of one who has discovered life’s pleasure” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 23).

Among the most important functions of non-verbal messages, i.e. content carried by appearance or manner of movement, we can notice the strengthening of verbal statements or their softening (Alhoff & Alhoff, 2008, p. 24). Oriana Fallaci notes what lies beyond the exchange of replicas between the journalist and interlocutor, and at the same time interprets, subjectively specifies the non-verbal sphere of their contact. Fallaci describes all these elements with sophisticated vocabulary — poetry of the language can be seen. According to Grzegorzewski (2013), this is a popular type of rhetorical figure used to leaven the expression and give it a persuasive character (p. 19). Imagery plays an important role here, as well as in less important replies: “No Machiavellianism, Dr. Kissinger” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 41), and in longer parts:

„And listen: for me the most beautiful monument to human dignity is still the one I saw on a hill in the Peloponnesus [...]. It was not a statue, it was not a flag, but three letters that in Greek signify No: *Oxi*. Men thirsting for freedom had written them among the trees during the Nazi-Fascist occupation, and for thirty years that No had remained there, unfaded by the sun or rain. Then the colonels had obliterated it with stroke of whitewash. But immediately, almost magically, the sun and rain had dissolved the whitewash. So that day by day the three letters reappeared on the surface, stubborn, desperate, indelible” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 19).

Imagery, in connection with anecdotes, performs similar functions here to those attributed to visual aids used by the rhetorician. In addition, the story told in the introduction returns in the book several times playing the role of the most important symbol. The metaphor completes the preface of Fallaci and, like a transition, takes the recipient to the next stage of the narrative:

Panagulis died, murdered by the same Authority that the book accuses, condemns, and hates. All the more so after his murder. But while reading it, you should keep in mind that No that reappears, stubborn, desperate, indelible, among the trees on a hill in the Peloponnesus (Fallaci, 2012, p. 20).

The Greek *oxi* also appears as a closing part — in a last interview with Panagulis, Fallaci compares him to the savior: “He had the face of a Jesus crucified ten times” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 660), “how to say hello to man who has just left the grave?” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 667). His character merges and summarizes the content of the book, and Fallaci sees his as a beloved leader, characterized by courage, sacrifice, wisdom.

As in the interviews, there are numerous antitheses in the biographical notes. Describing Nguyen van Thieu, the journalist states that:

(...) even hating him and having always hated everything he represents, stolen and undeserved power, ignorance, corruption, obedience to the strongest, abuse, in spite of yourself and with anger you ended by feeling a human sympathy for him (Fallaci, 2012, p. 48).

In the introduction to the interview with Sihanouk, she warns: “[...] the longer you listen to him, the more you follow him, the longer you analyze him, the less you understand him” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 90). Fallaci also draws attention to the internal conflicts of her interviewees. She writes about Saddam Hussein: “that lie depicts a man who is tragic, yes, but also treacherous. Tragic by destiny, treacherous by necessity” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 188). When describing Golda Meir, Fallaci stated that the personality of the Prime Minister of Israel “escaped any attempts to close it in a certain color, shape. It contained too many things and all of them contradictory” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 195). The use of opposition allows for higher expression.

Conclusions

The art of effective communication applies to all expressions of journalistic and political activity, and the meeting of a journalist with a political leader during the interview creates an important space for implementing rhetorical strategies. The purpose of the paper was to identify and describe the rhetorical devices used by Oriana Fallaci in her talks with political leaders gathered in the volume entitled *Interview with History*. Fallaci's interviews feature complementary strategies for persuading: logos, ethos, and pathos. According to this key, material was developed, which allowed to discuss selected rhetorical ways of appealing to reason, will, and emotions.

In relation to the preface, topoi of introduction (novelty, brevity, modesty, and humor), references to the recipient, themselves and the topic as a common matter have been distinguished. In the main parts of the interviews and in the description of interviewees the function of advising assigned to rational argumentation and proving was shown. Among the journalist's techniques belonging to the ethos sphere, axiological argumentation and the use of thought figures (antithesis, discrediting) were pointed out. The pathos sphere was characterized, among others, by discussing imagery.

Fallaci's deeply rooted thinking is revealed not only through interviews in the strict sense, which are the main part of the book. Its features can be seen in the introduction and in the profiles of the interlocutors. The journalist repeatedly refers to the recipient, and presents her theses not as ready thought constructs, but in the process of emerging questions and answers. Presenting the interviewees in two parts/two genres: the proper interview and the biographical note allows achieving specific goals. On the one hand, it allows to achieve documentary detail in terms of the presentation of people and information obtained, on the other, it shows the image of interlocutors through the prism of the journalist's personal view. However, it is difficult to talk about a biased portrayal of politicians, because Fallaci leaves readers space to form their own assessments. The use of antitheses, understatements, questions addressed to recipients opens the way to other interpretations, different points of view.

The perception of interviews as “information divided into voices” (Wojtak, 2004, p. 238) thus evokes the context outlined by Mikhail Bakhtin (1970) or Michał Głowiński (1998) about dialogicality and polyphonic nature of texts. The composed book contains parts having the structure of dialogue exchanges, as well as not having this structure, but bearing its features, creating a kind of macrodialogue conducted on many levels: both with the interviewees, with the author, and with the reader. Fallaci's work, from this perspective, turns out to be in its entirety both a response to political events explaining their genesis, course or effects, and a question asked to leaders, society, and the media.

Oriana Fallaci was aware of the rhetoric of her conversations. Sketching the figure of Yasir Arafat she wrote that he delivered allusive or evasive speeches, twisted sentences, “contained nothing beyond his rhetorical intransigence [...]. He did not show the slightest desire to include, even in dialectical play, another person's point of view” (Fallaci, 2012, p. 155). The Italian icon

of journalism created a space for rhetorical dispute, provoked it, but also served to strengthen the attractiveness of the interview. As Barbara Bogolebska (2006) wrote:

“A journalist is a rhetorical subject, emphasizing his/her authorship [...]. The authors indicate their critical attitude to other opinions or the described reality. *Homo rhetoricus* in journalism is a man of polemics and dialogue — sometimes internal” (p. 10).

Interviews tend to interpret the interlocutor's ideas, even if the journalist finds himself/herself in the role of an opponent. This is, among other things, the reason for the controversy caused by conversations of Oriana Fallaci or, in Poland, Teresa Torańska (1985) talking with communist dignitaries or Krzysztof Kąkolewski (1975) questioning former SS-men. Denis McQuil (2008) writes that:

“on the one hand, they [the media] usually find their *raison d'être* in their service to their audience, to whom they provide information and views according to judgements of interest and need [...] On the other hand, they also provide channels by which the state and powerful interests address the people, as well as platform for the views of political parties and other interest groups” (p. 511).

Interview with History, subjected in this paper to analysis of verbal and organizational tactics used by Oriana Fallaci, reveals only part of the rhetorical layer of the work. Although the analysis of Fallaci's work does not verify the well-known Mussolini's thesis that “interview was the best form of propaganda”, yet, it shows the capabilities of rhetoric of journalism in political interview, when the interlocutor bases his statements on two pillars: information and ideology.

Bibliography

- Allhoff, D.W., & Allhoff, W. (2008). *Sztuka przekonywania do własnych racji. Retoryka i komunikacja*. Przeł. P. Włodyga. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Antoszewski, A., & Herbut, R. (Red.). (2002). *Leksykon politologii*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Alta2.
- Bachtin, M. (1970). *Problemy poetyki Dostojewskiego*. Przeł. N. Modzelewska. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Bauer, Z., & Chudziński, E. (Red.). (2000). *Dziennikarstwo i świat mediów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Universitas.
- Bogolebska, B., & Worsowicz, M. (2016). *Retoryka i jej zastosowania*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Bogolebska, B. (2006). *Między literaturą i publicystyką*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Piktora.
- Chechłowska-Lipińska, M. (2013). Poprawność czy niepoprawność polityczna – rozważania na temat współczesnego dyskursu w ujęciu Oriany Fallaci. *Warmińsko-Mazurski Kwartalnik Naukowy: Nauki Społeczne*, 3, 9–20.
- Dobek-Ostrowska, B. (2012). *Komunikowanie polityczne i społeczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Fallaci, O. (2012). *Wywiad z historią*. Przeł. A. Czepnik, A. Osmólska-Mętrak, J. Ugniewska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sfery.
- Głowiński, M. (1998). *Dzieło wobec odbiorcy. Szkice z komunikacji literackiej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Grzegorzewski, K. (2013). Koncepcja podmiotu retorycznego jako narzędzie badania języka i retoryki władzy. *Oblicza Komunikacji*, 6, 9–21.
- Hartliński, M. (2012). *Przywództwo polityczne. Wprowadzenie*. Olsztyn: Instytut Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego w Olsztynie.
- Kąkolewski, K. (1975). *Co u Pana słyhać?* Warszawa: Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza „Czytelnik”.
- Korolko, M. (1990). *Sztuka retoryki. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wiedza Powszechna.

- Kukiela, E. (2010). Zabiegi retoryczne w dyskursie politycznym, czyli jak powiedzieć wszystko, co trzeba i tylko to, co trzeba? *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Linguistica*, 45, 77–93.
- Kuś, R. (2018). *Retoryka polityczna Richarda Nixona*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Księgarnia Akademicka.
- McQuail, D. (2008). *Teoria komunikowania masowego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Modrzejewska, E. (2012). Lógos, éthos, páthos w praktyce medialno-politycznej. Środki przekonywania w cytowanych wypowiedziach opozycji. *Forum Artis Rhetoricae*, 2, 55–78.
- Ożóg, K. (2004). *Język w służbie polityki*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Pisarek, W. (2002). *Nowa retoryka dziennikarska*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Universitas.
- Pisarek, W. (1975). *Retoryka dziennikarska*. Warszawa: Robotnicza Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza „Prasa-Książka-Ruch”.
- Rampini, F. (2012). *Przedmowa*. W O. Fallaci. *Wydanie z historią*. Przeł. A. Czepnik, A. Osmólska-Mętrak, J. Ugniewska (s. 5–11). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sfery.
- Scruton, R. (2002). *Słownik myśli politycznej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Sienko, M. (2010). Oriana Fallaci wobec problemów współczesnej Europy. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska: Historia*, 65(1), 117–139.
doi:10.2478/v10068-011-0006-9
- Tichoniuk-Wawrowicz, E. (2014). Problem poprawności politycznej w ostatnich publikacjach Oriany Fallaci. W E. Borkowska, B. Wojewoda (Red.). *Tożsamość Europejczyków* (s. 179–198). Gliwice: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Śląskiej.
- Torańska, T. (1985). *Oni*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Przedświt.
- Witkowska-Maksimczuk, B. (2014). *Elementy retoryki i erystyki w przykładach*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Aspra.
- Wojtak, M. (2004). *Gatunki prasowe*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Wojtak, M. (2010). *Analiza gatunków prasowych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Worsowicz, M. (2013). O „*duchu stosowności*”. *Teoria retoryczna a współczesna praktyka medialna*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Worsowicz, M. (2016). Triada retoryczna (logos, etos, patos) a perswazyjność sylwetki prasowej. *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Litteraria Polonica*, 1(31), 137–148.
- Ziomek, J. (2004). *Retoryka opisowa*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Ossolineum.

