

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**Donald Trump vs Joe Biden:
communication strategies within presidential election 2020**

Bachelor's thesis
written by the 4th year student
2nd English group
of Bachelor's programme
“English Studies and Translation
and Two Western European Languages”
Field of science – 03 “Humanities”
Specialty – 035 “Philology”
Yaroslava Dobrenka

Supervisor:
O.O. Honcharova, PhD.

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 12 від 27.05.2021

Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV – 2021

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
I. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE	6
1.1. Political discourse as a subject of linguistic analysis	6
1.2. Communication strategies and tactics as a means of influence in political discourse	13
Conclusion	20
II. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN THE NATIONAL CONVENTION	
ACCEPTANCE SPEECH	21
2.1 Communication strategies in Donald Trump’s National Convention Acceptance Speech	22
2.2. Communication strategies in Joe Biden’s National Convention Acceptance Speech	39
Conclusion	52
SUMMARY	54
ABSTRACT	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
Appendix 1	67
Appendix 2	72
Appendix 3	92

INTRODUCTION

Language is an integral constituent of the world of politics. The interconnection of language, politics, ideology, and manipulation results in the emergence of a new type of discourse that is called political discourse. There are a lot of numerous typologies of political discourse, and a political speech is one of its genres which is currently popular among linguists due to its wide usage of various communication and speech techniques. The speech of a politician is immediate communication with the public, aimed at achieving certain political objectives. Therefore, political thought and actions are inseparable from political speech. To succeed in implementing certain communicative intentions and goals, a politician has to use specific means and techniques during the process of addressing the audience. Those techniques are defined as “communicative strategies” and “communicative tactics”, and they are of great importance in the research of the issue of speech impact on the political arena.

Communication strategies and tactics assist politicians with maintaining power, imposing ideas and brainwashing. With the steady development of a political speech as a means of exerting power on the general public, a plethora of strategies and tactics are witnessed to appear. Hence, it is critical to define which communication strategies and tactics influence the people’s perception of a politician. Electoral campaigns are the ultimate environment for the strategic-tactic manifestation by a politician.

The theoretical core of this research includes the publications of foreign and domestic scholars: Arutiunova N. D., Buzinova L. M., Dijk van T., Issers O.S., Jamieson K., Levinson S., Malysheva O.P., Mikhaleva O.L., Parshina O.M., Rixon P., Strauss D., Tarde G., Sheigal E. I.

Since the process of American elections has become a life-changing world event, a lot of attention is paid to the political candidates who decide to run for the office of President in the USA. The 2020 electoral campaign in the USA is marked by a number of unexpected events and actions, for which two political candidates – Donald Trump and Joe Biden – are accountable. Both political actors were challenging one another in the

fierce race for presidency. Since one of the most powerful ways to confront an opponent and therefore to gain recognition is always language, it is highly important to analyse the communication strategies and tactics of the US political candidates in order to identify the possible causes for one's victory or one's defeat.

This paper analyses the implementation of communication strategies and tactics of Donald Trump and Joe Biden in the National Convention Acceptance Speech as it marks the starting point of the race between candidates in front of the general public and sets the mood for the whole campaign. The research presents the study of the strategy of self-representation, of opponent discredit and the strategy of theatricality. The aforementioned elements create an image of a candidate which is being perceived by the potential voters who are accountable for the final outcome of the elections. Thus, the research discovers the possible influences of strategic-tactic employment on the voters' perception and furthermore discusses characteristics of linguistic personalities, the research of which will contribute to understanding the idiostyles of American political figures.

The **relevance** of the topic is determined by its relevance to the linguistic studies of communication strategies and tactics within the sphere of American politics and its influence on the voters' decision-making process.

The **aim** of this paper is to investigate the communication strategies and tactics of Donald Trump and Joe Biden. In order to achieve the aim, it is necessary to fulfil the following **tasks**:

- to determine the concept of political discourse;
- to explore the features and typology of political discourse;
- to identify the concepts of a communication strategy and a communication tactic;
- to outline the main communication strategies and its tactics within the oral political discourse;
- to describe peculiarities of the communication strategies and its tactics;
- to analyse the implementation of communication strategies and tactics in the National Convention Acceptance delivered by Donald Trump;

- to analyse the implementation of communication strategies and tactics in Joe Biden's National Convention Acceptance.

The **object** of the diploma paper is the communication strategies and tactics of Donald Trump and Joe Biden based on the National Convention Acceptance Speech.

The **subject** of the diploma paper is the language of Donald Trump and Joe Biden.

The **research material** consists of the National Convention Acceptance Speech of Donald Trump delivered in Washington, on August 27, 2020 and the National Convention Acceptance Speech of Joseph Biden delivered on August 20, 2020 in Wilmington, Delaware.

According to the purpose and objectives of the study, the **methods** of descriptive, contextual, interpretative and discourse analysis as well as the method of direct observation followed by the generalization of the results were used as the main methods of the analysis.

The **novelty** of the paper is that the analysis of the National Convention Acceptance speeches of two presidential candidates was for the first time carried out from the perspective of communication strategies and tactics.

The **practical value** of the research is marked by the importance of the obtained research results for further analysis of linguistic personalities or idiostyles of the American politicians.

The diploma paper consists of 102 pages and two parts. The first part includes the theoretical background of political discourse and its typology, the concepts of a communication strategy and a communication tactic, its classifications and characteristic features. In the second part the analysis of the communication strategies and tactics in the National Convention speeches of two candidates are provided in order to analyse the employment of specific communication strategies and tactics in political discourse. In summary, the results of the scientific investigations are presented.

I. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1. Political discourse as a subject of linguistic analysis

At the current stage of the development of scientific thought, the discourse is at the center of a big range of humanitarian sciences, such as linguistics, philosophy, psychology, literary studies, political science, ethnography, theory of communication, etc.

The concept of "discourse" refers to the basic and most commonly used concepts in modern linguistics, but due to the multidimensional nature of its content and forms there is no united opinion concerning its interpretation even among linguists. For the first time the term "discourse" was introduced into scientific community by Y. Habermas to indicate the type of speech communication which involves rational critical consideration of values, norms and rules of social life [59, pp. 17-26].

E. Benvenist understands discourse as every expression that stipulates the presence of communicants: an addressee, an addresser and the intentions of the addresser to influence their interlocutor somehow [34, p. 64]. He adheres to the idea that discourse has processional character, and utterance is the individual transformation of language into discourse [34, p.135].

From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, definition of discourse was proposed by Teun A. van Dijk as the result of his concept of the communicative nature of a text. He highlights that discourse is a complex unity of language form, meaning and action which can be characterized with a help of terms "communicative action" or "communicative act". The person who speaks and the person who listens, their personalities and social characters, other aspects of social situation belong to this event [37, pp.121-122].

In functional pragmatics, linguists view discourse as a communicative-pragmatic sample of language behaviour in a specific social sphere, and it has a number of variables: social norms, relationships, roles, conventions, indicators of interactivity [58, p. 36]. The

main quality of discourse is the regularity of presence of a person who speaks and a person who listens at the same time.

The classic definition suggested by N. D. Arutiunova defines the discourse as a speech which is a motivated action, as a constituent of people interaction and the mechanisms of their consciousness; it is a speech with the deep roots in people's life [29, pp. 136-137]. The term "discourse" is primarily concerned with the language use in social context, particularly with the dialectical relationship between language, the main semiotic modality, society as well as with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication as social practice.

All definitions of 'discourse' have some common features. Having analysed all abovementioned interpretations of the term, it can be concluded that the "discourse" is the result of communication process that is seen as a social act or an interaction in a certain situation in which communicants are involved. It has distinctive lingual features which can be formed with a situation, environment or a way of transmitting information in that environment. It means that the discourse is the result of communication in a certain situation with all its constituents.

Nowadays many linguists study the issues of relations of language, politics, ideology and manipulation. It is stipulated by the fact that politics possesses a discursive character in its essence, and political actions and interactions are usually manifested with a help of language. Language is a crucial element for the expression of political ideas and political action implementation. It is thought that political activity can be limited as such by linguistic activity [4, p.47]. M. Edelman claims that political language is actually a political reality. Therefore, language is more than just an instrument for description of political events, it is an integral constituent of those. Its role is exerting an influence on the meaning of political events and forming political roles [5, p.8].

Political discourse can be analysed from four points of view: of political science, linguistics, sociopsycholinguistics and from the point of view of individual hermeneutics

[42, p. 34]. Therefore, political discourse analysis entails content, task and form analysis of discourse which appears in specific situations of a political life.

The linguistic interpretations of the term are relatively recent, though numerous. The role and place of political discourse is highly debatable in the present days. There is a conditional division of linguists who study the concept of political discourse into three groups in the modern linguistics: those who use the term “political discourse”, those who reject the linguistic meaning of the term, and the third group which uses the term “political discourse” as synonymous to the such concepts as “language of politics”, “political language”, “political communication”. For instance, A. Baranov and E. Kazakevich support the third view and synonymize “political discourse” to “political language” establishing the idea that political language is a special sign system devised particularly for political communication [31, p. 139]. O. Sheigal suggests that concepts “language of politics”, “political communication” and “political discourse” are usually interrelated. That’s why she equals terms “political discourse” and “political communication”, and considers “language of politics” to be a structured collection of signs which create semiotic area for political discourse [63, p.99]. K. Serazhym presents a generalised definition of the term where political discourse is the text created by the situation of political communication [57, p.240]. In our research we view “political discourse” as a text with a particular theme where interests of political entities (actors) in the process of their activities and the struggle for political power are expressed with the use of specific language signs (political language) in a situation of appropriate communication.

Despite the fact that a plethora of interpretations and approaches of the term “political discourse” can be found in the present days, some key elements are possible to outline. In particular, P. Charaudeau highlights the interactive characteristic of the discourse that confirms the importance of an addressee. This means that only addresser’s intention together with addressee’s interpretation can help in understanding the content of an act [1]. T. van Dijk follows the same direction outlining that political discourse can be realized only if there is an organized interaction of external factors. The defining elements

are considered to be the type of communicative activity (a press-conference, debates), status and the role of participants, their communicative goal [28, pp.12-15].

Hence, we can come to the conclusion that political discourse has extralingual nature (goal, circumstances, way and time of formation); in addition, there is usually an addresser and an addressee. The interaction between participants and external factors are necessary elements for its formation. Therefore, the importance of extralingual factors implies the institutionality of political discourse as long as it is a communication within the framework of status-role relations. A. Baranov and E. Kazakevich suggest that political discourse has to be limited by institutional forms of communication [31]. Consequently, one may say that political discourse is viewed as a communicative event or a social dialogue which exist with the help of social (political) institutions between individuals, groups and institutions itself which participate in this dialogue. That is why every institution of modern society has its type of discourse. According to this, V. Karasik outlines scientific, religious, business, political, mass-media, law, pedagogical and other types of discourse. The specifics of institutional discourse are revealed in its type, i.e. in the type of public institution which is identified by a special name in the collective consciousness of the language and is generalized in the key concepts of this institution, in particular, functioning of political discourse as a power [45]. The contrary view is presented by O. Sheigal who understands political discourse as a broader concept than simply institutional and as that which includes any speech forms, a subject, an addressee or content relating to politics [63, p.23].

In our research we comply with this point of view as we think that the presence of a political institution is not a key element in political discourse formation which can also take place outside specific institutions, especially when we take into consideration electoral campaigns.

Therefore, the key features of political discourse singled out by O. Sheigal include: the predominance of mass addressee, theatricality, emotionality, semantic ambiguity and connected to it phantomsation fideism, remoteness, authoritarianism and dynamism

[63, p.131]. N. Kondratenko goes into specifics of political discourse and suggests also mythology, rituality, theatricality and agony, sacralization, rhetoric, the manipulation of recipients' consciousness as predominant characteristics of this type of discourse [48, p.15].

We tend to single out the following features of political discourse that we consider to be the important for our research:

- 1) extralingual nature;
- 2) interactivity (addresser – addressee);
- 3) thematisation connected to the realities of political sphere;
- 4) the assertion of interests of political actors;
- 5) emotionality;
- 6) theatricality.

The typology of political discourse is analysed with a help of different approaches by Ukrainian and foreign linguists. For N. Kondratenko is important to consider form (oral or written), the function of an addresser (addresser direct and mediated), goal (informative, incentive, image, motivational, expressive), the factor (function) of an addressee (personally addressed or mass/publicly addressed), the sphere of functioning (TV, political, newspaper and magazine, radio-political, advertising or PR) as main features for typology of the discourse [48, pp. 12-13]. As for the sphere of functioning, it is essential to add the Internet (Internet political discourse). Furthermore, a characteristic feature of political discourse is its tendency to overlap with other types of discourse such as law, scientific, mass media, pedagogical, etc. Our research will adhere to this classification as we consider it to be the most multifaceted what is crucial for an accurate analysis.

Our attention will be directed towards oral political discourse as this type includes political speeches, appeals to public and official statements, and those have the form of a monologue. an interview, a press-conference and debates belong to dialogue types of oral political discourse.

Although there is a number of factors and approaches for genre classification of oral and written texts in political discourse, it is still one of the most important issue for our research. Political language genres are in the state of constant development and modification nowadays. As a result, new genre varieties appear. The reason for such a tendency is the need to impose a powerful influence on potential recipients during political campaigns. Except for this fact, a goal or a motive of political language vary as well as its function. All those factors predetermine the problem of language genre division and description of their characteristic features in political discourse.

Ukrainian and foreign researchers attempted to work out the typology of genres: for example, N. Arutiunova [30], F. Batsevych [32], N. Fairclough [7], N. Kondratenko [47], O. Sheigal [63]. The majority of linguists tend to take into consideration the nature of information distribution while working on the classification. Therefore, phatic and informative types are singled out. N. Kondratenko divides language genres in political discourse into the following groups: presentation and image, informative, ritual, agitation, agonally-argued. The goal of informative genre is to present topical new information. These include language genres such as messages, statements and interviews. The language genres of image presentation form an important set of texts required for addresser's participation in political activities and is presented by slogans, programmes and biography. These texts have the biggest value for political discourse. They represent a political subject, i.e. a politician or a political party, and function in both official and mass communication or political advertisements. Those texts are directed towards the creation of political image and its support, that's why their task is to position a subject in a positive or a negative way. Ritual language genres are associated with the increased phatic features of political discourse and accompany political rituals that contain verbal components such as speeches or public appearances. Inauguration speeches, greetings, obituary, gratitude are the most widespread ritual language genres. Agitation language genres are mostly used during election campaigns. The main goal of those is to encourage voters to vote and support a political entity. This type of language genres of political discourse is usually

interconnected with the abovementioned ones and are expressed in a form of a slogan, political speech and leaflets [47, pp. 19-21]. Having analysed the goal and functioning of the agitation language genre, we conclude that the National Convention Acceptance Speech that is characteristic of American political discourse belongs to this type.

The genres of political discourse are often hybrid in nature, which is associated with the process of social change, in which both politics and other spheres of life are involved. In addition, they are heterogenic and suggest a broad understanding of politics as a partially institutionalized sphere of social life. This also explains the difficulties in identifying the genres of political discourse. The classification by N. Fairclough according to the field of activity and function is one of the examples of the interrelation of politics with various life spheres. This division includes genres connected with the system of politics (debates, political programmes, parliamentary or party speeches by politicians at conferences), mediatized political genres (political news, political interviews, political advertising in newspapers or on billboards) and genres connected with the public sphere (public meetings, campaign materials, political forums, focus groups) [7, p.32].

Our research is predominantly concerned with the genre related to the public sphere of communication since presidential candidates directly appeal to the public to vote for them in the National Convention Acceptance Speech (a characteristic of agitation genre). Agitation language genre and its varieties are in the center of our research. Speech as a genre variety belongs to oral genres of political discourse and is aimed at immediate communication with addressees during which a politician calls for the support of his candidacy or the relevant political party. Speeches are usually prepared beforehand yet they can possess some features of improvisation. However, unlike printed texts, oral speeches mostly do not contain outright appeals, represented by motivational sentences, instead the specific characteristic of agitation speeches is their explicit dialogicity, because the speaker creates the effect of a conversation addressing recipients with questions, appeals and responding to them.

1.2. Communication strategies and tactics as a means of influence in political discourse

In modern linguistics communication is viewed as a speech implementation of the intentions of its participants: intentions of self-presentation, attracting attention, situation analysis, etc. Verbally expressed intentions are realized through certain strategies and tactics of discourse. Political thought and actions are closely connected with the political speech: words, actions, and events cooperate, i.e. words decipher or explain events or actions as well as state political facts, while actions help words gain their political efficacy in various ways. Communicative interaction in political discourse involves the singling out the specific ways of the communicative intention realisation, intention through particular models of behavior of participants in political communication.

Communicative strategies and tactics are considered to be the subject of linguistic research in political discourse. The theoretical core for this research includes the publications of foreign and domestic scholars: L. Buzinova [36], O. Issers [44], K. Jamieson [13], S. Levinson [15], A. Olianich [54], P. Rixon [19], D. Strauss [24], G. Tarde [26]. The two interrelated concepts “communicative strategy” and “communicative tactic” are of great importance in the study of the problem of speech impact. Despite the active development of discourse analysis in linguistics, a generally accepted understanding of the terms “communicative strategy” and “communicative tactic” and unanimous methods of their implementation have not been developed. A number of approaches regarding the definitions of those terms exists, that is why we will discuss the most related ones in our research.

Generally speaking, a communicative strategy is defined as the process of directed speech influence, or as a prepared scheme for exerting a speech impact on participants in communicative interaction [63]. The similar interpretation of a strategy is proposed by F. Batsevych. The linguist suggests that a communicative strategy reflects the general pragmalinguistic principles that determine the optimal implementation of illocutionary

intentions, the communicative intentions of a speaker to achieve the specific goal of communication [33, p.119].

T. van Dijk characterizes communicative strategy as “the property of cognitive plans” [37, p. 272]. The cognitive plans represent “the general organization of some sequence of actions and include the purpose or purposes of interaction” [37, p. 274].

O.S. Issers proposes that a communicative strategy represents a plan of communication based on the people’s knowledge which provides solutions for speaker’s communicative tasks in case there is the scarcity of information regarding the partner’s actions [44, p. 100]. According to the Russian linguist, a communicative tactic is one or more actions to facilitate implementation of the strategy.

D. Tannen has another point of view and states that the property of automaticity is characteristic of a communicative strategy, and it is not realized by communicators, but can be decoded by them later [25, p. 47]. Therefore, in agreement with the interpretations mentioned above, we deal with a communicative strategy as the cognitive process of speaker’s correlation of a communicative purpose with the set of theoretical courses of action directed at its achievement.

In addition, A.V. Holodnov points out that communicative strategy is a combination of verbal and non-verbal techniques and methods for problem-solving of communicative interaction [41, pp. 114-115].

Thus, we can conclude that a communicative strategy within the sphere of politics and political discourse is a certain plan and combination of speech acts which are aimed at the specific goal of political activity. This plan is a scheme to achieve the speaker’s communicative intention. It entails the usage of various language means to obtain the desired result or to exercise an influence on the listeners. Apparently, the strategy is a prerogative of both, an addresser, who initiates the communication, and an addressee, who is responsible for giving or avoiding a response or providing an emotional reaction. Consequently, we consider this definition of a communication strategy the most appropriate for our research.

The implementation of speech strategies can be fulfilled only with a help of certain communicative or speech tactics, i.e. to implement a specific plan and to obtain the set goal of communication an addresser has to opt for proper tactics. It is the next level of communicative interaction.

According to O.S. Issers, tactics is a group of definite actions of communication which correspond to the plan of communicative process. When communicative strategies are considered to be more general and abstract, manifested on the global level of communication process, tactics are local rhetoric means or techniques and lines of speech behaviour [50, p. 139]. They do not correspond with the communicative purpose but with the set of separate communicative intentions.

As for the interrelation of communicative strategies and tactics, a speaker puts forward a communicative purpose and, while following certain communicative intentions, employs or creates a communicative strategy which will be transformed into appropriate communicative tactics [46, p. 20].

Thus, a speech tactic is the certain stage of communicative strategy fulfillment. Altogether they undertake and accomplish the specific speech task and purpose of a particular stage of communicative process.

Political communication is directly aimed at maintaining power. Therefore, while achieving this purpose, politicians tend to deploy a variety of communication strategies and tactics which assist them with imposing ideas or brainwashing. Political discourse is an environment for the implementation of certain speech strategies through specific verbal and non-verbal methods and techniques, i.e. speech tactics. The correlation of verbal and non-verbal means of communication is not homogenous, though. It is in political discourse where emblems, symbols, and venues of certain political events become important for the profound effect as well. The analysis of political discourse leads us to singling out various types of communicative strategies and tactics within this type of discourse. The approaches to the classification are numerous (Appendix 1), but we will consider the most relevant to our research.

One of the key strategies in political communication is **the strategy of self-representation**. A number of linguists considers the strategy as the one frequently implemented within political discourse: M. Zheltukhina [43], O. Issers [44], O. Parshina [55], T. van Dijk [38]. We will discuss the classification proposed by O. M. Parshina which we consider to be the most pertinent for our research. The strategy of self-representation is related to the concept of political image and the endeavour of politicians to demonstrate their advantageous features, although the created image does not usually correspond with a real personality. The tactics with a help of which this strategy is employed can be divided into three types:

- the tactic of identification or relating oneself to somebody;
- the tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something;
- the tactic of the positive image creation.

The tactic of relating oneself to somebody or something is of a great importance in political speech. It is not possible to create a full-fledged image of a politician without the strategy. The demonstration of the unintended symbolic belonging to a certain social status or a political group is the essence of the tactic. Politicians usually try to show that they are representatives of the audience. Accordingly, voters might see these political figures as persons from the same social class. The image of a political leader has to correspond to the expectations of the public, which are their potential voters [55, p. 26].

As for the tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something, it is aimed at drawing a line between a political speaker and their rival or policies, ideas, beliefs of their opponents, which are in contrast with those of a speaker. This distancing is often implemented in a speech with a help of contrastive parallel constructions, oppositions and antithesis. The tactic not only contributes to a positive image of a person talking, but also highlights the negative features of opposition.

The tactic of the positive image creation has a solely self-congratulatory character. However, there are different approaches to the implementation of the tactic: inherent or adherent descriptions. A great emphasis is put on a speaker by the frequent repetition of

personal pronouns. As a rule, the demonstration of one's strengths is supported by a range of lexemes with a positive connotation within the tactic.

The linguist highlights the existence of other strategies such as the strategy of discredit, attack, self-defense, the formation of the emotional mood of the addressee, information-interpretation, argumentative, agitation, and manipulative strategies. Despite the fact that some scientists single out the manipulative strategy, it is considered that all the communicative strategies of political discourse which possess an ideological character are to some extent manipulative. Therefore, manipulation is usually a given in political communication whereas the strategies and tactics are the means for its implementation [52]. As for the argumentative strategy, the aim of which is to persuade an addressee with a help of various pieces of evidence, not always rational, though, it has a selective approach. This selection process of argumentation is directly interrelated with the interpretation of information in favour of an addresser, the task that corresponds to the information-interpretation strategy. Additionally, argumentation is closely interconnected with agitation in political communication and discourse because of the frequent use of implicit and explicit slogans and appeals. So, the strategies of agitation, information-interpretation, emotional mood formation are constituents of the argumentative strategy. Thus, according to our research, there is no need for distinguishing the strategy of argumentation because of its versatile character, i.e. it can find its manifestation in both self-representation and opponent-discredit strategies.

The strategy of discredit that is also proposed in the classification by O. Parshina is essential for our political speech analysis. Except for O. Parshina, the discredit strategy is outlined in the works of O. S. Issers where the linguist points out that the main feature of the given strategy is the perlocutionary effect; an addressee is accused, probably even unfairly, and ultimately feels humiliated and ridiculed [44, p. 161]. O.L. Mikhaleva also distinguishes the discredit strategy but calls it the lowering strategy, the essence of which is the reduction of the significance of opponent's status [53 pp. 96 – 105]. While analysing

political discourse, T. van Dijk mentions the presence of negative opponent-presentation strategy as well [38, pp. 238-246].

Nevertheless, we will still adhere to the classification created by O. Parshina. The linguist emphasises that the constituent element of the strategy of discredit is the attacking of a political opponent. The strategy involves the use of various techniques and methods in order to discredit the opponent, upset their balance, force them to defend themselves and therefore deprive them of the opportunity to express their position. For its pursuing the following tactics are used: the tactic of accusation (exposing) and the tactic of offense (humiliation and ridicule of the opposition).

For defaming the credibility of the political rival the tactic of exposing can be of a great value. This exposure of a political opponent is manifested with a help of verbal aggression. As a result, it sparks aggressiveness in an opponent as the tactic involves using provocative questions, labeling, unspoken charges, threats, insults, accusations and ridicule [51].

The presented two tactics are the key ones which are employed by political representatives in order to disrepute their rivals. Nevertheless, the use of tactics varies in a particular situation and can be wider depending on the purpose of an addresser, however, we consider all the other tactics within the strategy of discredit and attacking as the components of the main aforementioned twos. To sum up, the manipulative nature of the tactics makes it possible to influence the feelings and emotive state of the target audience, i.e. voters. To implement the mentioned above tactic political candidates are prone to use emotionally evaluative vocabulary or neutral lexemes which gain the connotative meaning in a pre-election procedure, and which we will examine in our political speech analysis in detail [39].

The last strategy which is of a particular importance for our analysis is **the strategy of theatricality** outlined by O.L. Mikhaleva. In accordance with the strategy, a speaker has to take into consideration the audience, i.e. their potential voters. I. Sheigal adds that the essence of theatricality of political discourse is connected with the fact that the target

audience defines a political event as a kind of performance, played out specifically for them [64, pp. 92-96]. Thus, there is always a recipient of information, at whom politicians, in our case political candidates aim their speeches and performances. In addition, the target audience is always the general public. That's why it is crucial to analyse the tactics of the given strategy in pre-election political discourse. The following strategy includes a great number of tactics:

- the tactic of prompting (a call to action, accepting certain point of view);
- cooperation tactic (a way to communicate with an addressee by appealing to their ideas and values);
- delimitation tactic (pointing out the differences in positions and views);
- the tactic of informing (providing facts and data without speaker's appraisal);
- the tactic of promising (voluntary commitment to do something);
- prognostication tactic (statements about the further development of a situation based on the interpretation of different data);
- the tactic of warning (early notifications of possible events, actions, situations, etc.);
- the tactic of using irony (creating the contrast between the said and meant information);
- provocation tactic (incitement to actions that may lead to negative consequences).

To our mind, the strategy of theatricality and its tactics have an immediate or short-lasting effect on the general public, though. They are employed to make the performance efficient, the image of a politician is barely influenced.

We consider it logical to single out three main strategies in our analysis. As we already know, the concept of a communication strategy has relatively abstract meaning since they can be manifested in a real speech exclusively with a help of particular means, i.e. communicative tactics. Therefore, we will be analysing the following communicative

strategies of our political candidates: self-representation strategy, strategy of discredit and the strategy of theatricality. We consider this division the most generalized and appropriate for the tactic classifications within those strategies.

Conclusion

To sum up, a number of the scientific interpretations of the concept of political discourse has been presented, which helps us define this type of discourse as a multi-faceted phenomenon with a particular theme in a specific situation where political actors express their interests and intentions for political power using the certain language signs, which is called a political language. The extralingual context (aim, circumstances, method and time) and an addresser-addressee interaction are important constituents of political discourse. We have found out that the most widespread characteristics of political discourse are extralingual nature, interactivity, thematisation connected to the realities of political sphere, the assertion of interests of political actors, emotionality and theatricality. Having analysed the genres of political discourse, we came to the conclusion that they are often prone to overlap and are hybrid in their essence. Thus, we have delineated a political speech during an electoral campaign as an object of our research and defined a speech as a variety of agitation genre that belongs to oral political discourse.

A speech in political communication consists of a set of particular verbal communicative strategies and tactics. Under communicative strategies of politicians, we understand a certain scheme or plan of speech acts which is set out to achieve specific goals and intentions in a politician-audience monologue or a dialogue. Speech tactics are the means which facilitate this process in a particular situation, they vary depending on the different external factors. We have defined three main communicative strategies within the discourse of politics, which are important for our further research: self-representation, discredit and theatricality. The tactics which the aforementioned strategies entail have been outlined as well. With the correct interpretation of verbal signals of a politician we will be able to understand which strategies have a positive or a negative

impact on the general image of a politician, how audience react to one or another strategy, and to what extent the information told is genuine and true. Our theoretical generalisations concerning political discourse, its features, typology, genres, functions, communication strategies and tactics used within the given discourse will serve as the foundation for the practical part of our research.

II. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN THE NATIONAL CONVENTION ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Politics is a combination of activities which are aimed to exert an influence predominantly on society. For achieving the set objective, a politician involves a wide scope of actions, or strategies and tactics, to be more precise. Those employed methods can have different forms of implementations but the key one in the world of politics is always speech. Political speech is an important component at all stages of the career of a politician, however, they are most crucial during electoral campaigns. The success or failure of a candidate directly depends on the appropriately chosen strategies implemented in their speeches to the public. Therefore, a speech is widely used genre in political discourse as it is a tool for creating a desirable effect, i.e. to build a candidate-voter connection or to make people vote for a specific candidate. Overall, it is a rhetoric way for gaining power.

Thus, it is crucial to analyse the speeches of political candidates within electoral campaigns. In our research we will focus on the unique and world-famous event, namely on the American electoral campaign 2020 and its notorious and at the same time prominent actors Donald Trump and Joe Biden. The National Convention Acceptance Speech of both candidates is chosen for our analysis as it is the starting point of their race in front of the public as they announce their run for the office of President.

2.1 Communication strategies

in Donald Trump's National Convention Acceptance Speech

The National Convention Acceptance Speech delivered by Donald Trump as the 2020 Republican presidential nominee on the South Lawn of the White House in Washington, August 27, 2020 will undergo our strategic-tactic analysis in which we will outline the peculiarities of the following strategies and their constituents:

- 1) **the strategy of self-representation** (for emphasizing one's achievements and strengths);
- 2) **the strategy of opponent discredit** (for showing opponent's inability to manage life-important issues);
- 3) **the strategy of theatricality** (for presenting a performance in front of the public).

The language of Donald Trump has attracted a lot of attention since his debut on the US political arena. He is well-known for his simplicity in passing messages to the public when compared to all the previous US presidents. Although his charismatic figure is usually viewed controversially, Donald Trump managed to get enough support during the electoral campaign in 2016 and fought fiercely in the campaign of 2020.

The Convention Acceptance Speech is an around 70-minute vouching for president's reelection including his remarks on the broad scope of topics such as his first term in office, trade deals, economy, coronavirus, the number of jobs and Biden's policies [12]. The speech has an agitation character that is a common feature for the addresses delivered within electoral campaigns. In addition, it is easy to notice that Trump's speech is a prepared writing as it substantially differs from the spontaneous language characteristic of Donald Trump.

When we proceed to our strategic-tactic analysis of Republican nominee's speech, **the self-representation strategy** is the one to start our description with. This strategy is usually viewed as the most widespread means employed by Donald Trump. In the analysed speech it is implemented by identifying oneself with the American society or

some prominent figures that made change in the history of the USA, by expressing solidarity with different social classes, presenting and celebrating one's merits and achievements. Hence, it can be highlighted that the tactic of relating oneself to somebody and the demonstration of one's strengths, i.e. the tactic of positive image creation, are the main communicative tactics used by Donald Trump within the given strategy. The tactic of distancing oneself from somebody is usually in the background.

The tactic of relating oneself to the famous personalities. The tactic is a powerful tool to awaken the feelings and memories of the American public connected to the historical past of their country. Naming some prominent personalities which are known almost by every American and by people far away from the US borders forces voters to create comparisons in their heads and therefore leads to attributing of all the positive features of famous people mentioned to the characteristics of a candidate standing in front of them.

At the beginning of the Acceptance speech, candidate Donald Trump identifies the Republican Party, the party member of which he is, with the party of Abraham Lincoln: *The Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, goes forward united, determined and ready to welcome millions of Democrats...* In such a way he compares yourself to the first president of the Republican party who is considered to be a national hero of the American society. Although the comparison is implicit, it is understandable that Donald Trump claims to be the successor of such a prominent personality.

Then, the former president refers to the “*beautiful and majestic*” White House, his home at that time, and recalls all the distinguished people who were previous inhabitants of this building: *This has been the home of larger-than-life figures like Teddy Roosevelt and Andrew Jackson, who rallied Americans to bold visions of a bigger and brighter future. Within these walls lived tenacious generals like President Grant and Eisenhower, who led our soldiers in the cause of freedom. From these grounds, Thomas Jefferson sent Lewis and Clark to chart our continent. In the depths of a bloody Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln looked out these very windows upon a half-completed Washington*

Monument and asked God and his Providence to save our nation. Two weeks after Pearl Harbor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt welcomed Winston Churchill, and just inside, they set our people on course to victory in the Second World War. These reminders of the famous politicians and their crucial deeds serve as an introduction that will be soon shifted to the Trump's accomplishment celebration. He emphasises the fact that he has also had this honor to reside in the White House. Thus, his stay there is also marked with a number of deeds to remember about which he will inform the general public some paragraphs later.

Donald Trump tends to identify himself relatively frequently with the first Republican president, that is why we can notice the following lines later in the address: *And I say very modestly that I have done more for the African-American community than any president since Abraham Lincoln, our first Republican president.* It is known that Abraham Lincoln was famous for its anti-racist policies, so Donald Trump is eager to take the advantage of its fact emphasizing on its connection to the first Republican president once again. However, it is not excluded that views of Lincoln on Afro-Americans and slavery were intermixed and had been changing from time to time. This information is not spread among the general American public, who makes the majority of electorate, though.

The tactic of identifying oneself with the American people. The purpose of this tactic is an unintentional identification of a political leader with certain social, class, political, ethnic and racial groups [56]. Every political candidate attempts to be suitable for one or another group and their interests. The tactic is responsible for not just gaining the support of voters, but also for a positive image creation. In addition, the identification is a means that serves for uniting of one certain group of people and opposing against another one. In such a way, the discussed tactic triggers the emergence of one more tactic of self-representation strategy – the tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something. In the acceptance speech delivered by Donald Trump the identification with the American society is manifested with the use of pronouns “*we*” and “*our*”. As a result, it generates the image of unity of one friendly American family where Trump and the ordinary American folk find themselves in the equal positions:

I stand before you tonight honored by your support, proud of the extraordinary progress we have made together over the last four incredible years and blooming with confidence in the bright future we will build for America over the next four years. The beginning of his speech is already marked by the use of tactic of identification. He does not distinguish himself from other American people, on the contrary, the candidate intensifies the unity with the American people by repeating the pronoun “we”. Moreover, Trump emphasises that they together have made the progress and will go hand in hand “to make America great again” in the future. The use of adjectives with positive connotation: *extraordinary progress, incredible years, bright future* makes this statement even more appealing for his potential voters as he does not mention the negative outcomes of his presidency.

Almost at the end of his speech he tends to simultaneously create even more vivid generalization and identification: *We are the nation that won a revolution, toppled tyranny and fascism, and delivered millions into freedom. We laid down the railroads, built the great ships, raised up the skyscrapers, revolutionized industry, and sparked a new age of scientific discovery. We set the trends in art and music, radio and film, sport and literature. And we did it with style and confidence and flair because that is who we are.* The accumulation of pronoun “we” creates the effect of melody and eloquence and consequently has an impact of people’s consciousness because of the use of repetition. In this excerpt of his speech, he tries to be heard by people from the different walks of life claiming that everyone has been involved in the process of bright-future-building of the USA. It is important to consider that Trump lists only the instances of success steering clear of any traces of negative experiences. The explanation is that the former president wants to finish the address on a high note as the conclusion will be undoubtedly the most memorable part of the 70-minute speech.

The tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something. As it was mentioned before, while frequently using pronouns “we” and “our”, the opposition “we-they” appears, the aim of which is to draw a clear line between Trump’s and Biden’s supporters

and the policies of the twos, in particular, for example: *And this election will decide whether we will defend the American way of life or allow a radical movement to completely dismantle and destroy it. <...> Joe Biden and his party repeatedly assailed America as a land of racial, economic and social injustice... How can the Democratic Party ask to lead our country when it spent so much time tearing down our country? A number of oppositions are presented by Donald Trump: *we, our country – radical movement, Joe Biden and his party, Democratic Party, it*. Although we would like to believe that the goal of Trump is to oppose himself to Joe Biden, he ends up dividing the American society in two groups – Republicans and Democrats, and therefore the hatred rules not just between two candidates, but between the two parts of the society. In addition, the tactic of distancing obviously interrelates with the tactics of discredit strategy because of its frequent use of negatively connotative words while describing the opponent: *dismantle, destroy, injustice, tear down*.*

When in the previous fragment Donald Trump repeatedly puts emphasis on the opposition “we – they”, then, in the following passage he changes it to “*I – they, he*”: *Four years ago, I ran for president because I cannot watch this betrayal of our country any longer. I could not sit by as career politicians let other countries take advantage of us on trade, borders, foreign policy and national defense*. He refers to his opponents as to a career politician during his speech and claims that he personally is strongly against such views over and over again. The collocation “*career politicians*” has some traces of irony meaning politicians who neglect people’s interest and care only about their own well-being.

It seems to us that the opposition “*I – he*” is based only on the lofty statements without providing any reliant figures and data why they differ: *And I have done more in three years for the Black community than Joe Biden has done in 47 years. And when I am re-elected, the best is yet to come*. It is characteristic of Donald Trump to make loud statements that are aimed at both distancing from the opponent and creating a positive

image of himself. The antithesis “*three – 47 years*” serves as a powerful tool to attract the voter’s attention as well.

The tactic of positive image creation. The tactic serves as a generalization and summary for the previously discussed communicative means, however, it has no clear subject and plan since it is simply aimed at celebrating the strength of a candidate, usually without any proofs of the information listed. The statements that elevate moral, intellectual and professional qualities and claims about one’s prolific social activity are frequently used within the strategy. This image creation does not imply sincerity and brings to the fore the technological aspect, namely the usage of expressive means [60, p.158]: *From the moment I left my former life behind — and it was a good life — I have done nothing but fight for you. I did what our political establishment never expected and could never forgive, breaking the cardinal rule of Washington politics. I kept my promise.* Firstly, Trump accentuates the voters’ attention on his sacrifice made for the American people, using an embedded clause. Then, we can trace the frequent use of pronoun “I” that is almost anaphoric [35]. In the second sentence of the excerpt, he not only takes pride in his actions, but also criticises his opponents in a bit discreet way, calling them “*political establishment*”. The repetition of adverb “*never*”, which has a negative contextual meaning, creates a dramatic effect. In the conclusion to the statement, Donald Trump just states the fact without detailed explanation again. Overall, the positive reference to himself is a common feature of Trump, and it provides an immediate effect; however, it still has no value [11, pp.8-16].

When we move further into the speech, it is noticeable that his self-celebration becomes supported with some facts and figures: *Unlike many presidents before me, I kept my promise, recognized Israel’s true capital and moved our Embassy to Jerusalem.* He continues contrasting himself to his predecessors using the adversative conjunction “*unlike*”. Additionally, the repetition of the phrase “*I kept my promise*” steadily recurs during the whole speech and makes it memorable for the listeners.

With the flow of the speech the former president adds more facts to his eloquent statements about himself and his office: *In perhaps no area did the Washington special interests try harder to stop us than on my policy of pro-American immigration. But I refused to back down, and today America's borders are more secure than ever before.* Here and in the subsequent parts he mentions some particular examples of his activity as a president. Undoubtedly, not losing the possibility to negatively refer to the opposition Trump uses the inversion in the first sentence to attract the attention of the public, however, it seems highly diplomatic of him to replace some negative descriptions of his opponents with euphemism “*the Washington special interests*”. Nevertheless, this contrast is created with the purpose to look better on the background as he finishes this part taking a positive turn regarding his policies. The use of adversative pronoun “*but*” accentuates the difference, and therefore the adjective “*secure*” with a positive connotation drags all the positive light to Trump.

To conclude, the strategy of self-representation and its tactics help to form the stable and recognizable image of the political candidate who has definitely to be a successful leader in the voters' consciousness. Our analysis makes it possible to distinguish the tactic of relating oneself to famous personalities and the American society as the most preferred by Donald Trump within this strategy. He skillfully implements it with the frequent use of pronoun “*we*” and “*our*” and the references to common American values: *freedom, progress, discovery, confidence, development*. Consequently, the constant repetition of the mentioned pronouns draws the lines between Trump's supporters (we) and his opposition (they), and this contrast becomes more vivid in the tactic of distancing. As for the tactic of positive image creation, Trump takes pride in his work and communicates the importance of his policies and activities to others. The personal pronoun “*I*” is moved to the fore in the combination with positively connotative words. Yet the tactic can demonstrate conceit and arrogance of the former president.

The strategy of opponent discredit. The confrontational communicative strategies are usually manifested in the pre-election discourse, namely during electoral campaigns.

The discredit presupposes the publicity of criticizing statements and is aimed to get a certain response of the electorate [49, p.130]. Donald Trump does not miss the opportunity to expose, present in a negative light and humiliate his opposition. Thus, in his Acceptance speech the tactic of accusation and the tactic of offense are considered to be critically important despite the fact that our world and the world of politics, in particular, tries to become more politically correct. Our analysis will show that Donald Trump usually neglects this change in the use of language.

The tactic of accusation or exposing. The analysed speech of the candidate slowly and surely proceeds to the forming of a negative image of his opponent Joe Biden. Donald Trump is frequently prone to criticise his rival directly and explicitly. His choice of lexemes is usually taken from the semantic field of incompetence, ignorance, neglect, betrayal, failed administration, mistakes: *Joe Biden is not a savior of America's soul. He is the destroyer of America's jobs, and if given the chance, he will be the destroyer of America's greatness. For 47 years, Joe Biden took the donations of blue-collar workers, gave them hugs, and even kisses, and told them he felt their pain, and then he flew back to Washington and voted to ship our jobs to China and many other distant lands.* The use of lexemes with exceptionally negative connotation is the first feature that we pay our attention to. Furthermore, he repeats word “*destroyer*” twice putting the label on his opponent to achieve the desired effect. The use of repetitions is an effective way to influence consciousness because the repeated information gradually begins to influence subconscious. It contributes to the associative remembrance of certain information in the suitable emotional context. Then, this fixation of information starts acting in the opposite direction, i.e. it influences consciousness again [40, p.16]. The repetitions are filled with associations and acquire specific psychological and symbolic depth which creates a solid basis for the perception of suggestion.

In addition, we can trace the use of antithesis “*savior – destroyer*” in the first two sentences which can urge the public to think who their savior is then; it is quite possible that it is Donald Trump. Then, he resorts to listing some facts that can shed a negative

light on Biden's reputation using the contrasting statements with negative contextual meaning: *give hugs, kisses, feel the pain, ship jobs to China*. The reference to China is definitely persuasive and influential comment for the supporters of Donald Trump, so that deep hatred against Biden can arise in the circles of the defenders the former president's policies.

The usage of the words of the semantic field "war" with vivid negative semantics against the opponent is an influential means to make the electorate feel insecure about the democratic candidate: *Joe Biden spent his entire career outsourcing their dreams and the dreams of American workers, offshoring their jobs, opening their borders and sending their sons and daughters to fight in endless foreign wars, wars that never ended*. The topic of war awakes the innermost feelings of the public, especially of those members of the American society who somehow relate to these tragic events. Trump specifies that Biden sends "sons and daughters" of the workers to the war, it definitely plays on the emotions and feelings of people. The adjective "endless" intensifies the negative meaning of word "wars", and this collocation is followed by the paraphrased clause with the same meaning to make it sound sadder and more dramatic. In brief, Donald Trump simply lists the accusations which have features of agony and are explicit.

It is distinctive of Trump to accuse Joe Biden by providing some specific examples as well, though they cannot be proved immediately by the listeners. One more instance is: *As vice president, he supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which would have been a death sentence for the U.S. auto industry. He backed the horrendous South Korea trade deal, which took many jobs from our country, and which I've reversed and made a great deal for our country. He repeatedly supported mass amnesty for illegal immigrants. He voted for the Iraq war. He opposed the mission that took out Osama bin Laden. He opposed killing Suleimani, he oversaw the rise of ISIS, cheered the rise of China as a positive development for the world*. In the excerpt he refers to the past events of Biden's vice-presidency where he mostly presents the semantic field of word "betrayal": *death sentence, horrendous trade deal, illegal immigrants, Iraq war, to oppose, oversee the rise*

of ISIS, rise of China. In the first sentence his allegations possess actually no power because of the use of the third conditional (unreal past) in the second clause. The speaker uses the anaphora repeating “*he*” and therefore continues drawing the line between “*I and he*” and “*our and their*”.

As always Trump takes advantage of the situation and mentions that he has stopped the incompetent policies of his opponent and has made “*a great trade deal for our country*”; unfortunately, it is not clear again what is the deal. Nevertheless, the antithesis is used again: *horrendous deal – great deal*.

Although Donald Trump seems to use a range of plausible facts and accusations, this overload of spoken information is also a well-thought tactic, as the whole information can neither be remembered nor analysed by the general public.

The tactic of offence (humiliation and ridicule). Unsurprising as it may sound, the development and the frequent usage of aggressive statements or so-called “hatespeech” is considered to be closely connected with the start of political career of Donald Trump in the American political discourse [17]. The offence can be fulfilled with a help of implicit and explicit linguistic means. The mockery is usually implemented through debunking and labeling. The former president is prone to implement the tactic directly by using the explicit means while describing his opponent. For instance: *Unfortunately, from the beginning, our opponents have shown themselves capable of nothing but a partisan ability to criticize*. In this excerpt he incorporates the offence rather than mockery and uses the collocation “*capable of nothing*” which seems to be more expressive in the comparison with its alternative “*incapable*”. The collocation “*partisan ability to criticize*” has certain features of ridicule since it means that Trump criticises Biden and his party without any solid reason for that, just for the sake of undermining his reputation. Moreover, the structure “*nothing but + noun phrase*” is usually used for complaining or the description of negative aspects of something. He intensifies his statement with negatively connotative words: *unfortunately, nothing, criticize*.

The most suitable example of labeling is the following statement: *Biden is a Trojan horse for socialism. If Joe Biden doesn't have the strength to stand up to wild eyed Marxists like Bernie Sanders and his fellow radicals, and there are many, there are many many, we see them all the time. It is incredible, actually. Then how is he ever going to stand up for you? He's not.* Implicitly and metaphorically Donald Trump wants to embarrass his opponent calling him “a Trojan horse for socialism” in the first sentence. This political cliché is a means to slam the opponent while being iniquitous, evil and ill-intentioned, again without any explanation, though. The journalists call such an act rather desperate one of Donald Trump, despite the fact the metaphor is frequently employed in the political circles, especially during electoral campaigns [14].

Then, the claim is followed by other allegations which can be not clear and understandable for an ordinary American, nevertheless, it will cause the flow of negative emotions against the democratic candidate. To conclude the saying, the republican candidate seems to add a rhetorical question in the end. In spite of this fact, he personally finds a short and expected answer for the question. The adverb “ever” in the question makes it sound more expressive and dramatic. The implementation of the rhetorical question expresses doubts about Biden’s ability to lead the country. The most hurling insults in this piece are directed at other opponents of Donald Trump, namely “*Bernie Sanders and his fellow radicals*”. He compares them to “*wild eyed Marxists*” that is not interpreted as a positive comparison. The attribute “*wild eyed*” is an explicit insult of which Donald Trump cannot steer clear even during his nomination. Additionally, he insistently repeats the word “*many*” that describes “*radicals*”, so that it can seem threatening for the American people.

In the following utterance Donald Trump nominates Joe Biden as weak: *Joe Biden is weak. He takes his marching orders from liberal hypocrites who drive their cities into the ground while fleeing from the scene of the wreckage.* He wants to fix this negative image of his opponent in the consciousness of the listeners, although it is not distinctly clear what he means by “*weak*” in the first place. Therefore, he supports his bold statement

with some not proved example, so that the public can interpret “*weak*” as “*easily influenced by other people*”. The words with the negative connotation: *hypocrites*, *wreckage* and the metaphor “*...who drive their cities into the ground*” intensifies the perception of the word “*weak*” and build the negative associations about the democrat.

In conclusion, there is a range of notable examples of the strategy of discredit in Trump’s acceptance speech. The former president expresses many direct accusations concerning his opponent which usually are presented as lists of unproved facts which are difficult to comprehend and analyse while listening. Due to the peculiarity of the traditional communicative norms of American political discourse which presupposes the preservation of diplomatic relations, election campaigns rarely allow the use of direct forms of insults. However, in Donald Trump’s speech a number of destructive elements of behavior can be noticed, and it therefore exemplifies the use of the tactic of offence [61]. Those destructive elements rarely have an implicit character and are clearly articulated by Trump with a help of the words with negative connotation, negative epithets and metaphors, sarcastic statements, antithesis and repetition, which are again supported with certain exposing facts and definitely interest the general public, as well as build negative image of the opposition. Ultimately, the positive image of the speaker is being formed due to the contrastive negative background formed by Donald Trump that is one of the initial goals of the discussed strategy.

The strategy of theatricality. The creation of performance in front of the potential voters has recently become one of the frequently employed strategies, especially in the discourse of politics. Donald Trump’s speeches usually possess the character of performance due to its expressiveness and bold statements which easily attract the listener’s attention because this kind of behaviour is not a given on the arena of American politics. The discussed strategy normally has implicit nature and is implemented with the tactics of cooperation, prognostication, promising, prompting and warning in the nomination speech of Donald Trump.

The cooperative tactic. The tactic entails some similar features with the tactic of identification, which is a component of the self-representation strategy because of its relation to the values of the public. Despite this fact, the tactic of cooperation is also aimed at the collaboration with the American society towards a common goal, i.e. “*making America great again*”. Trump as a speaker is repeatedly inclined to use the pronouns “*we*” and “*our*” when making an appeal to the general public as it has already been mentioned in the discussion of the self-representation strategy: *In the new term as president, we will again build the greatest economy in history, quickly returning to full employment, soaring incomes and record prosperity. We will defend America against all threats and protect America against all dangers. We will lead America into new frontiers of ambition and discovery, and we will reach four new heights of national achievement. We will rekindle faith in our values, new pride in our history and a new spirit of unity that can only be realized through love for our great country.* He claims that his presidency is and will be “*the teamwork*” rather than simply his keeping the rein. The speaker influences the audience while constantly repeating the pronouns “*we*” and “*our*”, in this way he discredits the role of the third person and produces the image of his unity with all Americans. In addition, it is noticeable that all the statements are in the form of promises / predictions as they are expressed in the Future Simple tense, so it should raise the voters’ hope. However, the grandeur of expressions and the accumulation of the words with positive connotation can cause the opposite effect. The adjective “*great*” is one of Trump’s favourites, which he can use either in the simple or in the superlative form. A lot of attention is paid to the economic issues such as employment, incomes and prosperity; the speaker collocates all those nouns with the adjectives which mean “*big*” or “*increasingly big*”.

In the following piece, the tactic of cooperation is employed by mentioning this common goal rather than just aimlessly repeating the pronoun “*we*”: *Together we have ended the rule of the failed political class, and they are desperate to get their power back by any means necessary. You have seen that. They are angry at me because instead of*

putting them first, I very simply said, “America first.” Just the beginning of the statement is marked by the explicit usage of cooperative techniques, i.e. the pronoun “*we*” and the adverb “*together*”, which intensifies the pronoun. Then, the most important point is expressed in the last sentence as the former president refers to his “*America first*” policy which helps him to evoke the feeling and the desire of collaboration in the voters. In addition, the slogan “*America first*” is clearly outlined by Donald Trump because of the use of direct speech that is a clear example of theatricality. It is extremely wrong for an American citizen to disagree with this statement. The group of Donald Trump voters is mostly made up of lower middle-class blue-collar workers and, therefore, they usually feel deceived by the administration or “political establishment” as Trump puts that in the speech [18]. It is easy for Donald Trump to connect with this overwhelming majority by appealing to their traditional values on the campaign trail. He wants America to come first, and for American middle-class it means that their jobs and families are the priorities in Trump’s policy.

The prognostication tactic. The next tactic which sets out to ensure the public in the bright future is the tactic of prognostication. This forecast of the future is fulfilled by the application of judgments and statements about eventual developments based on the interpretation of various data. Although it is not always the rule for Donald Trump because his prognoses can have no valid basis. Unsurprisingly, the most widespread technique to make political and social forecasts is the use of Future Simple tense, which is favoured in Trump’s speech. He begins his acceptance speech with the projection for the future of the USA and the whole world, especially in the nearest future: *In recent months, our nation and the entire planet has been struck by a new and powerful invisible enemy. Like those brave Americans before us, we are meeting this challenge. We are delivering lifesaving therapies and will produce a vaccine before the end of the year, or maybe even sooner. We will defeat the virus and the pandemic and emerge stronger than ever before.* First, he uses the structures in Present Continuous which supposedly relate to the time of speaking but also can be interpreted as plans for the future. In the next sentence his forecasting in

Future Simple is supported by the adverbial phrase “*before the end of the year*”. However, Future Simple has relatively low probability rate but, nevertheless, Trump ends up adding the adverb “*maybe*” that inspires almost no hope and acts as just raw words. It is obviously that the topic of coronavirus responds to a lot of listeners, moreover, backed up by such bold prognoses. Besides, Trump continues to apply his technique of cooperation confidently saying that even the most severe problems will be resolved collectively, i.e. government and people will act together. It frees him of the responsibility, to some extent. Notwithstanding these flaws of the speech, such a positive picturing of the future helps to programme people to succeed.

Despite the extensive usage of positive prognostication, the negative forecasting regarding his opponent can also be found in the speech: *Biden has promised to abolish the production of American oil, coal, shale and natural gas, laying waste to the economies of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Colorado and New Mexico — destroying those states, absolutely destroying those states, and others. Millions of jobs will be lost, and energy prices will soar.* From his own promises the speaker switches to the promises of the opposition. The distinctive difference is, however, that the prognoses relating to the policies of Joe Biden are full of lexemes with negative connotation: *lay waste to, destroy (repeated two times), lost, soar*. He provides a brief introduction into the current state of Biden’s activities and, then, go on commenting on the negative outcomes of his present acts. The tactic of cooperation is not present in the negative prognostication tactic, passive and impersonal structures are predominant.

The tactic of promising. The tactic of promising is a logical continuation of our analysis as it possesses characteristics similar to the tactic of prognostication. One distinctive feature is that the tactic of promising is expressed, by and large, by simple statements in Future Simple tense, with no supporting data or facts which usually should explain why some consequences and prognoses are drawn. According to that, there is no validity in the words of candidates and, therefore, those promises are purely for the effect of eloquence and theatricality.

Donald Trump is not afraid of making promises at all, that is why his speech is saturated with such structures: *Over the next four years, we will prove worthy of this magnificent legacy. We will reach stunning new heights, and we will show the world that for America there is a dream, and it is not beyond your reach. Together, we are unstoppable. Together, we are unbeatable. Because together, we are the proud citizens of the United States of America.*

On November 3, we will make America safer. We will make America stronger. We will make America prouder. And we will make America greater than ever before. I am very proud to be the nominee of the Republican Party. With the example of the closing statement, we can notice the abundance of “we + will” structure that is responsible for promises, and the exuberance of the pronoun “we” is in charge of the creating of a collaborative atmosphere. The choice of lexemes is exclusively positive one in order to finish the speech on the high note and ensure the public remembers only pleasing and encouraging things: *magnificent legacy, stunning new heights, dream, unstoppable, unbeatable, proud, safer, stronger, prouder, greater*. Speaking of lexemes, some positive connotations are created with a help of the various affixes, mostly prefixes and suffixes: un- (*unstoppable, unbeatable*) and -er (*safer, stronger, prouder, greater*). The repetition also is included in the excerpt, still with the same aim to emphasise the good perspectives and to leave the listeners with those ideas cling in their heads.

The tactic of prompting. This tactic is key one in political discourse, to be more precise, in agitation speeches. It acts as a conclusion of everything told before since it encourages to some actions or embracing of certain points of view. Nowadays the tactic can be expressed in both ways: implicitly and explicitly. Donald Trump makes use of it implicitly in most cases, so that it interrelates with the other strategies and tactics. However, there is a couple of instances when he does not hesitate to directly appeal to the public with the request to make a call once and for the next four years: *There is violence and danger in the streets of many Democrat-run cities throughout America. This problem could easily be fixed if they wanted to. Just call, we’re ready to go in. We will take care*

of your problem in a matter of hours. Just call. We have to wait for the call. It is too bad we have to, but we have to wait for the call. In this excerpt, he chooses some specific audience to refer to, namely Democrats, those who are not in favour of his political activity. The slogan “*just call*” is a pithy saying that is surrounded with the promising statements. This usage of prompting sounds more reliable if we compare it with raw calls for action or vote. Moreover, he doesn’t miss the opportunity to put an emphasis on that by repeating the phrase twice. Donald Trump approaches the audacious call after mentioning a disaster in Democrat-run cities with the lexemes of negative connotation: *violence and danger*. In the next sentences he positions himself as a solver of all the problems caused by his Democratic opposition, generally, employing abstract words which, however, create a positive emotional field.

The imposition of certain ideas and the calls for their protection which are supported by the creation of an image of an enemy can generate the sense of competition and even hatred to the opposition among the audience [62, p. 68].

The tactic of warning. The tactic of warning is for alerting people about possible outcomes of their choice usually with negative comments towards the opponent: *If the left gains power, they will demolish the suburbs, confiscate your guns, and appoint justices who will wipe away your second amendment and other constitutional freedoms.* The warning is presented with a conditional structure, namely the 1st conditional, i.e. the event that is likely to happen in the future. Obviously, the probable events are exclusively negative for the Republican supporters, and it is stressed with a help of the verbs with negative inherent connotation: *demolish, confiscate, wipe away*. The statement is undoubtedly projected at the supports of the Republican party as the speaker mentions all those concepts which are the values for Republicans. Hence, the division into “*they*” and “*we*”, “*you*”, “*your*” is presented in the extract again. First, Donald Trump employs the pronoun “*they*” and employs the structure “*the + adjective*” to refer to the group of people (*the left*). Therefore, the audience understands that “*they*” equals “*the left*”, and this association is stored in their brains.

There is one more warning expressed with a conditional structure: *And if we don't win, your second amendment doesn't have a chance, I can tell you that. I have totally protected it.* In this case Trump makes his warning sound even more realistic while using the zero conditional which is applicable for the facts or situations that are always true. Once again, he accentuates his attention on the second amendment that allows American citizens to keep and bear arms, although this amendment is not supported by Democrats. By reproducing it again, he draws attention of his Republican allies to the subject matter in order to consolidate their faith in his policies. In the excerpt, Trump repeats the personal pronoun “I” twice so as to flaunt his achievements.

To sum up, the strategy of theatricality adds the features of eloquence to the speech of Donald Trump. Within the strategy, the candidate tries to pay more attention to the American people, not solely to himself, and it can be observed especially in the tactics of cooperation and promising. Whilst making predictions, he employs both positive and negative statements, with the latter referring to his opponent's policies. As for the tactic of prompting and warning, they are not numerous, however, they both possess the ideas of polarization of two parties, which can receive some derogatory remarks of the public. The emphasis on the pronoun “I” is preserved in the discussed strategy as well. The tactics in the strategy of theatricality, however, do not provide any reliable information or facts. Nevertheless, they may sound catchy and, as a result, be perceived by the listeners as genuine and true.

2.2. Communication strategies in Joe Biden's National Convention

Acceptance Speech

The opponent of Donald Trump in the electoral campaign 2020 was Joe Biden whose language use is next to undergo our strategic-tactic analysis. Although it is difficult for Joe Biden to compete with Trump's eccentric behaviour as a presidential candidate,

the Democrat has the capacity to draw the attention of the American electorate to his figure.

Whilst Donald Trump is widely known for his simplicity and directness of speech that bring him closer to the public, and for the use of insults, exaggeration, slogans, and occasional disinformation, Joe Biden has also already created his own image of a politician in general and a presidential candidate, in particular. The style of speaking and language itself have added to the image: more complex sentence structures but rather incoherent ones, a lot of digressions and mix-ups [9]. However, his adherence to more positive concepts, democratic values and empathetic character, compared to Trump, while delivering speeches influences the attitude of potential voters to his political personality [23].

We are going to analyse **the strategy of self-representation, the opponent discredit strategy** and **the strategy of theatricality** used by Joe Biden in his National Convention Acceptance Speech during the final night of the Democratic National Convention on August 20, in Wilmington, Delaware. The conducted research is a way to study the language peculiarities of Joe Biden and its influence on the choice of American voters.

The strategy of self-representation. Although for many politicians the self-representation strategy is a key instrument to create their positive image in front of the public and to verbally demonstrate their personal qualities, Joe Biden exercises restraint in his acceptance speech and does not devote a lot of attention for praising himself. Hence, the tactic of positive image creation that is usually based on self-congratulation is not employed in the speech of the democratic candidate. However, the former vice president still attempts to make use of the strategy of self-representation in his speech by relating himself to some famous personalities and identifying himself with the American people. This tactic is mainly presented at the beginning of his address, so that positive associations about the candidate are being formed immediately.

First of all, he tends to demonstrate the unity of the USA and to communicate that he is an equal member of this nation: *America isn't just a collection of clashing interests of Red States or Blue States. We're so much bigger than that. We're so much better than that.* In this statement, Biden draws a parallel between America and the American people due to the use of the personal pronoun “we” in the next two sentences as an identification for the word “America” in the first sentence. The Democrat avoids the employment of the personal pronoun “I” in order not to spoil the mood and effect of the statement. The tactic of identification is successfully exemplified in the last two sentences which also draw the listeners’ attention with the repetition. Besides, Joe Biden emphasises and strengthens the comparative adjective “bigger” with the intensifier “much”. The topic of the splitting of America is a widespread one in Biden’s speeches and acts an implicit way to criticise the existing authority and to position himself as “an apostle of political conciliation” [20].

The next step which Joe Biden takes is the formation of connections between himself and successful all-liked American politicians: *Nearly a century ago, Franklin Roosevelt pledged a New Deal in a time of massive unemployment, uncertainty, and fear. Stricken by disease, stricken by a virus, FDR insisted that he would recover and prevail and he believed America could as well. And he did. And so can we.* This allusion to the past history is a powerful technique to persuade the general public as it is a real example when the similar problems which Americans face nowadays were overcome a century ago. In addition, Biden implicitly compares himself to Roosevelt implying that he has the capacity to repeat the deeds of his predecessor, albeit still steering clear of using the personal pronoun “I”. The usage of anaphora in the last two sentences creates the interrelation between him and Roosevelt.

One more good instance of Biden’s relating to the folks of the US is to find in the middle of his speech: *On this summer night, let me take a moment to speak to those of you who have lost the most. I know how it feels to lose someone you love. I know that deep black hole that opens up in your chest. That you feel your whole being is sucked into it. I know how mean and cruel and unfair life can be sometimes.* Joe Biden is a master of

sympathy, and it is distinctly demonstrated in the example. The empathy to the American people and the identification with their feelings are the important tools to obtain the support of the potential voters. Finally, he makes use of the personal pronoun “*I*” while sympathizing with the Americans and their losses due to Covid-19. To be more precise, he tends to use an anaphora and starts a couple of sentences with “*I know*”. It exemplifies his ability to influence people’s feelings and that can probably serve as his powerful weapon in the campaign 2020. Moreover, this strategy is opposite to that of Donald Trump during the most severe time of the pandemic since the former president commanded people not to be afraid of the virus [16].

So, Joe Biden, Donald Trump’s democratic opponent, is not inclined to use the strategy of self-representation in the analysed speech. In particular, the only tactic of relating and identifying oneself to the American people or famous personalities as a component of the strategy of self-representation is applied in the acceptance speech delivered by Joe Biden. Within this tactic he prefers not to highlight his personality and deeds but to create the image of unity and togetherness of the American nation by using the pronoun “*we*”. To put an emphasis on the ideas of him and to make them be engraved in the memory of the listeners Joe Biden is prone to repeat the concepts and sometimes to apply anaphoric repetition. In addition, the Democrat, who his republican rival likes to call “Slow Joe”, is known for his empathetic and comforting nature that can be distinctly observed in the analysed excerpts of his speech. The sad and sympathetic mood of these statements is achieved with a help of lexemes of the semantic field of love and grief.

The strategy of opponent discredit. Although the implementation of the strategy of opponent discredit is a critical instrument among politicians to discourage potential voters from giving their votes for their rival, Biden “tries to neutralize the political poison of the moment with the language of unity, decency, integrity, hard work, democracy and hope” [2]. Therefore, he mainly steers clear of criticizing the opposition or provides his critique in a milder and calmer manner. Overall, his criticizing of the Republican opponent seems to be simply a counterattack on the former president but, generally, Joseph Biden’s

campaign is aimed at optimism over pessimism, as we will prove in our further analysis of the speech.

The tactic of accusation. In spite of Biden's preferences mentioned above, he does not hesitate to implement the tactic of accusation straightaway at the beginning of his address. The first lines of his speech include: *The current president has cloaked America in darkness for much too long. Too much anger. Too much fear. Too much division.* The democratic candidate makes the accusations using the words with adherent "has cloaked America" and inherent "in darkness" negative connotation. To be more precise, he implements the metaphor "has cloaked America in darkness" in the extract meaning "has led America to a crippling state". The implementation of metaphor dramatises the statement and influences the mood of the potential voters. The phrase "much too long" is also used for a dramatic effect and exaggeration because the adverb "too" already possesses a negative meaning and, then, it is emphasized with the adverb "much". After that, Joe Biden applies anaphora in the three consequent sentences repeating the same exaggerated pattern "too much" in collocations with words of inherent and adherent negative connotation, respectively: *anger, fear, division.* To accentuate the last three statements of accusation, Biden makes them relatively pithy and with pauses.

The next example of more direct accusations and claims is as follows: *A president who takes no responsibility, refuses to lead, blames others, cozies up to dictators, and fans the flames of hate and division. He will wake up every day believing the job is all about him. Never about you.* The first sentence is formed with a range of parallel constructions which are presented with the verbs of adherent and inherent negative connotation. What is interesting, the speaker does not mention the name of the person he describes but uses the nouns and pronouns for the identification. Hence, it adds to the creation of a negative image of Biden's opponent as we usually do not pronounce out loud some unpleasant or frightening things. The last sentence of the extract has the common form of expression for Joe Biden because of its lengths and clarity.

To back up the candidate's preference for the use of repetitions, namely anaphoric structures, while putting claims on his opponent, here is one more instance: *Our current president has failed in his most basic duty to this nation. He failed to protect us. He failed to protect America. And, my fellow Americans, that is unforgivable.* Again, the name of the person described is omitted, which seems to be characteristic of Joe Biden's speech. Then, the repetition of the verb "fail" which has a negative connotation acts as a good instrument to manage listeners' opinion. The next linguistic means is manifested in the use of a vocative to Americans. To bring himself closer to the general public, Biden uses the word "fellow" meaning "someone who is in the same situation as you". So, firstly, he sets people against Donald Trump and then he tries to position himself as a savior from all the failures of the previous president.

The tactic of offense. Joe Biden definitely presents a contrast to his republican opponent and, as a result, there are almost no offences or direct insults in the National Convention Acceptance Speech. His delivery is apparently reserved concerning the application of insulting language units. Nevertheless, one example of the tactic is to find in the speech: *And speaking of President Obama, a man I was honored to serve alongside for 8 years as Vice President. Let me take this moment to say something we don't say nearly enough. Thank you, Mr. President. You were a great president. A president our children could -- and did -- look up to. No one will say that about the current occupant of the office.* In the extract he opposes Donald Trump to Barack Obama emphasising the respect Biden pays Obama and, consequently, Joe Biden shifts to Donald Trump not mentioning his name again, and that adds up to a desirable contrast as well. The statement describing his opponent begins with the indefinite adjective "no" to build negative associations immediately. Then, Biden calls Donald Trump "the current occupant of the office" employing the periphrasis of the word "president" which he skillfully circumvents every time while referring to his republican competitor. It highlights the contemptuous attitude of the speaker to his opponent [21].

In conclusion, Joe Biden has proved to be not the best instance of a politician because of his scarce usage of the opponent discredit strategy and the tactics within the strategy. During the delivery of his acceptance speech, he criticizes the opposition a couple of times with a help of the accusations which are marked with the emotionally-colored vocabulary, namely lexical units which awaken negative emotions such as anger and hatred. Another feature of opponent discredit is the avoidance of the rival's name. As a result, Biden is inclined to use either periphrasis or the personal pronoun "he". Some of the statements are built on the contrast "I-he", "we-they", "good-bad", albeit implicitly. As for offences, we have found only one instance of an offensive statement in Biden's speech, and the offence cannot be described as violent or outraged one.

The strategy of theatricality. Although there were no great expectations put in Biden's acceptance speech delivery, he impressively outshone himself while giving his address to the American people as a nominee from the Democratic party. His speech possesses a lot of features of the theatricality strategy which is manifested with a help of the tactic of promising, the prognostication tactic, the tactic of informing, the tactic of prompting, the cooperation tactic, and even with the tactic of irony. In our research we will discuss the tactics in detail in order to understand whether the speech is a sharp attack on Donald Trump due to Biden's moving and high-minded performance [3].

The tactic of prompting. Rhetorical questions serve as the most effective instruments for calls to action and engagement in rhetorical demagoguery. That's why they are employed by Joseph Biden to make listeners, i.e. potential voters, think and probably reconsider their decisions: *A president who takes no responsibility, refuses to lead, blames others, cozies up to dictators, and fans the flames of hate and division. He will wake up every day believing the job is all about him. Never about you. Is that the America you want for you, your family, your children? I see a different America.* The tactic of prompting is embedded with the accusations of the opponent from the one side and the tactic of delimitation from the other side. Apparently, it intensifies the application of the rhetorical question in the middle of the statement. The speaker puts the definite article

“*the*” before the word “*America*”, so that to ensure that listeners understand that he refers to the USA of Donald Trump but not of America of his vision. In addition, for appealing to electorate’s feelings Biden mentions the concepts valuable for the American people in a form of enumeration such as family and children. They are emphasised with the pronouns “*you*” (personal), “*your*” (possessive) which are repeated by the speaker.

Another instance of prompting revolves around the topic of human rights and American values as it states: *History has thrust one more urgent task on us. Will we be the generation that finally wipes the stain of racism from our national character?* First, Biden makes an introductory statement which acts as a prerequisite for the next prompting statement expressed in a question form. The presented prompting is not direct and entails one of the most important issues for Americans, namely racism. So, the topic of utterance is the first thing to draw listeners’ attention to. Therefore, the rhetorical question starts with “*will*”, which means either certainty in the future or a request in this case. The use of the metaphor “*to wipe the stain of racism from our national character*” perfectly complements the saying by creating a strong effect. The collocation “*our national character*” and the pronoun “*we*” in the beginning of the sentence unite the speaker and the recipients of the information, so that the statement is more likely to receive a response and will be probably evaluated in favour of the speaker. We should pay our attention to the adverb “*finally*” which accentuates the urgency of people’s action.

The cooperation tactic. The number of instances of the cooperation tactic in Joe Biden’s speech is immense. He is more likely to bring himself closer to the Americans than to delimit and draw lines between himself and his Republican opponent. Hence, these cooperation and unity form the borders of delimitation themselves. Besides, the candidate is required to strike an optimistic tone about overcoming challenges and the turmoil of the past months caused by his rival if Americans can forget about their differences and cooperate [8].

That is why, the tactic of cooperation is to be found in the first lines of the acceptance speech: *It's time for us, for We the People, to come together.* The most efficient

element here is the use of collocation “*We the People*” which is not created by Joe Biden himself but is borrowed from the Preamble to the US Constitution, so it is expected from every member of the Biden’s audience to realise the power of these words and relate themselves to the concept. Although the phrase is not grammatically correct, it is well-known and therefore cannot be altered as it also serves as a reference to the past of the USA, the Founding Fathers and the Constitution, in particular. It is a well-thought way to fulfill the tactic of cooperation and, as a result, to exercise an influence on the American citizens. The expression “*it’s time + to-infinitive*” refers to the present moment and to the speaker and listeners together. Additionally, it can be noted that the statement also calls the public to action.

The next example of the tactic is indirect and, by that, not comprehensible for all listeners, only for those who are preoccupied with the issue of “*racism*” and the last events taken place in America: *I met with a six-year-old Gianna Floyd, a day before her Daddy George Floyd was laid to rest. She is incredibly brave. I'll never forget.*

When I leaned down to speak with her, she looked into my eyes and said "Daddy, changed the world." *Her words burrowed deep into my heart. Maybe George Floyd's murder was the breaking point. Maybe John Lewis' passing the inspiration.*

However, it has come to be, America is ready to in John's words, to lay down "the heavy burdens of hate at last" and to do the hard work of rooting out our systemic racism. Overall, the example is a perfect illustration of the strategy of theatricality. Joe Biden begins with a short pre-story that seems to be heart-wrenching for an average American citizen. In the second paragraph he approaches the cooperative tactic. The speaker uses the words of George Floyd’s daughter in order to awaken the emotions of the public and also to show his closeness to the members of American society. Except for the girl’s words, Biden describes his encounter with her in precise detail that can be definitely viewed as a performance. Thus, in the last paragraph we can observe the communicative goal of the speaker achieved. The employment of concepts that are valuable and worrying for the American society such as racism, inequality and human rights complement the

extract because they are critical for the creation of sympathetic and consequently even despising mood. In the end, the tactic of cooperation is interconnected with the tactic of prompting, both of them are indirect. Joe Biden refers to “*America*” in the last sentence as to the people of America and it is fulfilled with a help of a trope that is called metonymy.

The tactic of informing. As for the tactic of informing, there are only two instances of Joe Biden reporting the information. Even though he provides the listeners with some facts and figures, the candidate’s appraisal is also present in the statements. The most applicable example is the following: *Just judge this president on the facts. 5 million Americans infected with COVID-19. More than 170,000 Americans have died. By far the worst performance of any nation on Earth. More than 50 million people have filed for unemployment this year. More than 10 million people are going to lose their health insurance this year. Nearly one in 6 small businesses have closed this year.* The first sentence in the statement applies that the former president is going to be estimated by the speaker. Moreover, the word “*judge*” is used that usually presupposes some negative outcomes and has rarely something to do with an objective point of view. Apparently, the statement is followed up by the list of facts and figures which again cannot be immediately proved by the audience but have an instant effect on their consciousness; Biden starts almost every sentence in the list with the words “*more than*”, so that the use of anaphora, i.e. repetition at the beginning of a clause, is remembered by the public, although it implies some inaccuracy. However, Joe Biden might deliberately use these inexact structures in order to avoid the confusion of data.

In addition, every sentence possesses at least one word which has either inherent or adherent negative connotation, e.g. *infected with COVID-19, Americans have died, the worst performance of any nation, people have filed for unemployment, people are going to lose their health insurance, small businesses have closed.* The application of death, unemployment and other figures will definitely have a profound influence on the public, and it is one of the most widespread techniques of the tactic of informing.

The tactic of promising. Making promises is one of the methods which can lead to the formation of a positive image of a nominee, although it can be viewed as an element of the political performance. So, Joe Biden lays out his first bold and ambitious promises straight after the introductory words of his speech: *Here and now, I give you my word: If you entrust me with the presidency, I will draw on the best of us not the worst. I will be an ally of the light not of the darkness.* The extract is worded extremely poetically as the statement found at the beginning of the speech, by and large, seems to be lyrical one. The candidate does not simply make promises but rather declares his intention to promise first and, therefore, deliver his promise. The promise has, however, conditional nature (expressed in the 1st conditional), i.e. it can be fulfilled only on one condition. Then, we notice a couple of metaphors to express the promises, e.g. *I will draw on the best of us not the worst. I will be an ally of the light not of the darkness.* The metaphors are built on the opposition: best-worst and light-darkness. Undoubtedly, the discussed statements perfectly represent the strategy of theatricality, in general, since they have no real value and validity due to its vague and metaphoric expressions but notwithstanding that adorn the speech.

As for accurate and valid promises, these can be found later in the address: *If I'm president on day one we'll implement the national strategy I've been laying out since March.*

We'll develop and deploy rapid tests with results available immediately.

We'll make the medical supplies and protective equipment our country needs. And we'll make them here in America. So we will never again be at the mercy of China and other foreign countries in order to protect our own people.

We'll make sure our schools have the resources they need to be open, safe, and effective.

We'll put the politics aside and take the muzzle off our experts so the public gets the information they need and deserve. The honest, unvarnished truth. They can deal with that.

We'll have a national mandate to wear a mask-not as a burden, but to protect each other.

Unsurprisingly, the topic that unites all the aforementioned statements is “Covid-19”, the main burden which should be overcome. Providing promises concerning the pandemic and virus is a successful method to make people listen to you. It is interesting that in the case of coronavirus Joe Biden does not make only himself accountable for the planned measures, he uses the pronoun “we” to list the actions to be undertaken if he is the president elect. The statements are expressed in Future Simple that is a usual way to display such commitments. Undoubtedly, the words with adherent and inherent positive connotation are applied to make optimistic projections on the future: *rapid tests with results available immediately, protective equipment, safe and effective, to protect each other, etc.*

Joe Biden refers to the topic of health and Medicare not once within his address: *If I'm your president, we're going to protect Social Security and Medicare. You have my word.* Social Security appears to be one of the frequently discussed subjects in the speech as well. Both topics are important to hear for the public. Once again Biden incorporates the 1st conditional into his promise telling all the changes are possible provided he is the president. Moreover, he again tends to use the pronoun “we” rather than “I” when giving his word to the American people, although it can be treated as the unwillingness to be held accountable. Nevertheless, while employing the pronoun “we” he also can be referring either to his supporters and office or to all Americans partially implying the cooperative strategy, albeit not so successfully in this case. The last sentence in the excerpt is again a bold statement for effective performance as those words spoken can be easily vanished from the memory of a listener.

The tactic of irony. Surprising as it may seem, we do not encounter the instances of irony in the speech of Donald Trump but we come across a couple of such ironical statements in the speech of his more restraint opponent. Irony is one of the convincing and

expressive techniques which contributes to a politician's ability to manipulate an audience [10].

Both examples of irony are obviously directed at the opponent of Joe Biden, i.e. Donald Trump, his office and his policies: *The President keeps telling us the virus is going to disappear. He keeps waiting for a miracle. Well, I have news for him, no miracle is coming*. The speaker ironically incorporates such phrases as “*the virus is going to disappear*” and “*waiting for a miracle*” to point to the inaction of his rival. This case of irony appears to be fairly recognizable and understandable for an addressee and therefore can fulfil its function. Although there exists a wide range of possible interpretations of irony, this one clearly expresses the negative attitude of Joe Biden to Donald Trump. Biden's tendency to avoid the use of the former president's name accentuates the speaker's disparaging attitude towards the person. The interjection “*well*” indicates certain nervousness and impatience in the extract. Hence, the elements create a powerful effect altogether, although it is a way to release tension and aggression.

Discussing his economic plan, Biden refers to a wide variety of issues to which he will pay his attention while rebuilding the economy of the USA. However, in this flow of aspirational promises he also resorts to the use of irony: *...With newly empowered labor unions. With equal pay for women. With rising wages, you can raise a family on. Yes, we're going to do more than praise our essential workers. We're finally going to pay them.* Even without mentioning the former president, the last two sentences of the extract perfectly imply ironical and contemptuous meaning. The irony is employed to accentuate the flaws and faults of the former policies and the person who is responsible for them. It is an efficient instrument to criticize and accuse. However, it cannot be obvious for everyone what the speaker means as the statements suggest some hidden sense. So, addressees should be familiar with the extralinguistic factors to interpret the ambiguous sentences in a correct way. The given irony is constructed on the opposition, i.e. antithesis, although the opposition is not explicit and cannot be deduced without the context.

Conclusion

To conclude the tactic-strategic analysis of the National Convention Acceptance speeches of two candidates, we can highlight that the communication strategy of self-representation and the strategy of opponent discredit play an important role for wielding influence on the potential voters in the Republican National Convention speech by Donald Trump. As for the strategy of theatricality, it adds essential features to the speech, however, the strategy has rather a subsidiary character and is employed for the reinforcement of two aforementioned strategies. Within the strategy of self-representation, the pronoun ‘*we*’ is important for President Trump because it is a method of inclusion. Despite this fact, the personal pronoun “*I*” is regularly emphasised. In addition, on the “*we-they*” contrast he gradually begins employing the radical and devastating critique of the opposition changing the mood of the statements to more outraged and irritated one. According to the theatricality strategy, most tactics within this strategy are the projections for the future course of events and are expressed with the grammatical structures and lexical forms which possess a future meaning or indicate the level of probability of the statements.

As for the Democratic National Convention of Joe Biden, it is possible to distinguish the strategy of theatricality as the most numerous one. The candidate pays a lot of attention to the concept of cooperation that is mainly implemented by such means as the extensive use of the pronoun “*we*”, the word “*America*” (metonymy) and therefore by eliminating the usage of the pronoun “*I*”. By and large, the strategy of positive self-representation is neglected by Joe Biden since he is not inclined to put emphasis on his political figure that is representative of democratic values. The strategy of opponent discredit is marked by the deliberate avoidance of the rival’s name. In addition, while discrediting Trump, Joe Biden involves a range of emotionally-marked epithets, metaphors, comparisons, repetitions mainly with a negative connotation in his speech. Nevertheless, the mood and the manner of Joe Biden’s speech appear to be strikingly calm and balanced that is undoubtedly contrasted to the rhetoric of Donald Trump.

In spite of the lengthy and worded speech delivered by Donald Trump, it has definitely little resonance compared to the speech of his opponent Joe Biden. Apparently, the American people longed for substantial changes in the time of all-embracing crisis, and Joe Biden with an ear for the people, the comfort with sentiment and sympathy has definitely become a beacon of hope for Americans by providing the solace they needed.

SUMMARY

The research on the topical issue of the implementation of communication strategies and tactics in the political discourse of the American politics has met its objectives and therefore allows us to draw the following conclusions.

The concept of political discourse was investigated. Since the sphere of politics is marked by the frequent use of language as a means of expressing political ideas and performing political action, it stipulates the emergence and development of a new communicative environment where political actors express their intentions and struggles for political power with the help of specific language signs, i.e. political language.

As political discourse is a multi-faceted concept, we have identified its main features. The extralingual nature is one of those characteristics because this type of discourse is dependent on the presence of an addressee. This results in the development of the next feature that is called interactivity. The choice of a theme in the political discourse is always interrelated with the political reality, and within it politicians are aimed to assert their interests, which marks the fourth feature of the discourse. Finally, the nature of the discourse is expressed by the use of emotionality and theatricality. The described features can be altered or modified in accordance with a situation in the political environment.

Certain amendments are also brought about by the existence of various types of political discourse which are stipulated by its form, function of an addresser, goal and sphere of functioning. According to its form the political discourse is divided into written and oral, with the latter including speech as a form of its manifestation. A political speech within oral political discourse belongs to agitation language genres which are usually employed during electoral campaigns.

The concepts of a communication strategy and a communication tactic were analysed. The communication in political discourse and the implementation of its forms and genres are prescribed by numerous communication techniques which are called communication strategies and tactics. Both concepts are interconnected, however, with

the dominance of a communication strategy which was defined as a certain scheme of speech acts which is aimed to achieve specific goals and to realise intentions in a politician-audience monologue or dialogue communication. A communication tactic is the form of employing a communication strategy, so that it is identified as a local rhetoric means and lines of speech behaviour.

We have singled out three main communicative strategies which play a crucial role in the process of getting voters' support and maintaining power during the electoral campaign: the strategy of self-representation (the tactic of identification or relating oneself to somebody, the tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something, the tactic of the positive image creation), the strategy of discredit (the tactic of accusation, the tactic of offense) and the strategy of theatricality (the tactic of prompting, cooperation tactic, delimitation tactic, the tactic of informing, the tactic of promising, prognostication tactic, the tactic of warning, the tactic of using irony, provocation tactic). Every strategy entails a number of tactics which assist in their resultative implementation. However, both strategies and tactics are not employed equally by politicians, there are always those which tend to prevail.

As for the peculiarities of these speech strategies and tactics, the strategy of self-representation is responsible for the demonstration of politician's strengths and also for the positioning of a politician on the same level with the audience. Moreover, the strategy of discredit adds contrast while providing critique or insults towards a political speaker's opponent. Then, the strategy of theatricality with its plethora of tactics creates a public performance to keep the audience interested in the aforementioned information.

The analysis of the National Convention Speeches of both presidential candidates during the US elections 2020 has shown which strategies and tactics prevail and how they can possibly influence the public's perception of a politician and, therefore, the election results. Donald Trump stands out because of his constant self-praise and playing up his strongest sides, so, the strategy of self-representation is implemented to the fullest. The strategy of discredit is almost equally used due to Trump's adherence to explicitly attack

the opposition with accusations and negative comments. Promise and prognostication are frequently used by Donald Trump as a means of performance in front of the audience since the public can be captivated by eloquent statements.

On the other hand, Joe Biden is characterized by an extremely modest percentage of the strategy of self-representation in his speech. He is famous for his commonality and the ability to sympathise with the American society; the democratic values are brought to the fore in the speech. Even though the discredit is not eliminated from Biden's speech, it is expressed in a more restraint manner that is especially marked by his avoidance to pronounce Trump's name out loud. Within the strategy of theatricality, Biden refers to such issues as Medicare, Covid-19, green policies, social security (those are usually neglected by Trump) and supports them with the structures of promising. The cooperation tactic permeates through the whole address.

The strategic-tactic analysis of the National Convention Acceptance speeches of the presidential candidates provides us with the remarkable insights into the linguistic personalities of Donald Trump and Joe Biden. The data amassed can function as a source of information while researching either linguistic personalities or idiostyles of the political figures in more detail.

ABSTRACT

Політика – це комбінація різного роду дій, спрямованих на досягнення першочергового впливу на суспільство. Для здійснення поставлених політичних інтенцій та цілей політик залучає різноманітні стратегії та тактики під час своєї політичної діяльності. Такі методи впливу можуть мати різні форми вираження, але однією із ключових форм здійснення впливу на політичній арені залишається промова, важливий компонент кар’єри кожного політика.

Одним із середовищ використання мовних стратегій та тактик у формі промови є виборча кампанія. Успіх чи невдача політика тісно пов’язані з підбором доцільних комунікативних стратегій та тактик у промовах, з якими вони ведуть свою кампанію перед загальною публікою, тобто перед потенційними виборцями. З цього випливає, що інтерпретація імплементованих мовних сигналів політичних діячів є важливим аспектом для розуміння. Також, варто взяти до відома, які стратегії та тактики мають позитивний і негативний вплив на суспільство, як аудиторія реагує на певні мовні прийоми, та на скільки правдивою є подана інформація.

Метою бакалаврської роботи є дослідження комунікативних стратегій та тактик Дональда Трампа та Джозефа Байдена під час виборчої кампанії 2020 року на матеріалі промови, виголошеної відповідно під час республіканської або демократичної національної конвенції (National Convention Acceptance Speeches).

Для досягнення поставленої мети було виконано ряд **завдань**:

- надано визначення поняттю політичний дискурс;
- досліджено риси та типологію політичного дискурсу;
- окреслено поняття комунікативної стратегії та комунікативної тактики;
- описано основні комунікативні стратегії та тактики в усному політичному дискурсі;
- проаналізовано особливості комунікативних стратегій та тактик;

- досліджено використання комунікативних стратегій та тактик у промові під час республіканської національної конвенції Дональда Трампа;
- досліджено використання комунікативних стратегій та тактик у промові під час демократичної національної конвенції Джо Байдена;

Об'єктом дослідження є мова Дональда Трампа та Джо Байдена.

Предметом дослідження є комунікативні стратегії та тактики Трампа та Байдена на матеріалі промови National Convention Acceptance Speeches.

Матеріалами дослідження були промова республіканця Дональда Трампа та промова демократа Джо Байдена під час національної конвенції 2020.

Відповідно до мети та завдань бакалаврської роботи було використано **методи** описового, контекстуального та дискурс-аналізу, а також метод інтерпретації. Крім того, було залучено метод спостереження з узагальненням результатів дослідження.

Наукова новизна роботи полягає в тому, що було вперше проаналізовано промови кандидатів у президенти США, виголошені на національних конвенціях, з точки зору комунікативних стратегій та тактик.

Робота складається зі 102 сторінок та двох частин. Перший розділ висвітлює теоретичну базу поняття дискурс та його типологію, поняття комунікативної стратегії та тактики, їхню класифікацію та характерні особливості. Другий розділ роботи презентує аналіз комунікативних стратегій Дональда Трампа та Джо Байдена під час виголошення промови на національній конвенції. У висновку надано огляд результатів наукового дослідження.

У першому розділі визначено, що поняття політичного дискурсу є багатоаспектним явищем, що має конкретну тему у певній комунікативній ситуації, де співрозмовники виражають свої політичні інтереси та наміри за допомогою особливої політичної мови. Одними з основних характеристик цього виду дискурсу є важливість екстралінгвального контексту та контакту між адресантом та адресатом, а отже, політична промова є одним з гібридних жанрів політичного

дискурсу. Також було досліджено поняття комунікативної стратегії політичного дискурсу як певної схеми чи плану мовних актів, спрямованих на досягнення політичних намірів у монологі чи діалозі «політик-публіка». Тактика, в свою чергу, – це засіб реалізації комунікативних стратегій. У розділі окреслено теоретичне підґрунтя трьох основних стратегій політичних кандидатів, а саме: стратегії самопрезентації, стратегії дискредитування опонента та стратегії театральності й тактик, які є їхніми складовими.

У другому розділі дослідження надано детальний огляд комунікативних стратегій та тактик двох політичних кандидатів, що дає змогу визначити стратегії самопрезентації та дискредитації опонента як одних із найпоширеніших у промовах республіканця Дональда Трампа. На противагу, Джо Байден уникає використання стратегії самопрезентації та надає перевагу взаємодії та кооперації з потенційними виборцями, а також вираженні співчуття та прихильності до американського народу, що є яскравими рисами стратегії театральності.

Аналіз промов політичних кандидатів відкриває нові аспекти та характеристики американських політиків як мовних особистостей. Результати роботи можуть слугувати корисним джерелом інформації під час подальшого дослідження мовних особистостей чи їх ідіостилів.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Charaudeau P. A quoi sert d'analyser le discours politique * ? [Электронный ресурс] / Patrick Charaudeau. – 2002. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <http://www.patrick-charaudeau.com/A-quoi-sert-d-analyse-le-discours,161.html>.
2. Clark R. What we can learn from the language of President Biden's inauguration [Электронный ресурс] / Roy Peter Clark // Poynter.. – 2021. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.poynter.org/reporting-editing/2021/what-we-can-learn-from-the-language-of-president-bidens-inauguration/>.
3. Denning S. Joe Biden And The Rhetoric Of Restoration [Электронный ресурс] / Steve Denning // Forbes. – 2019. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2019/04/28/joe-biden-and-the-rhetoric-of-restoration/?sh=161e8dec5b44>.
4. Dieckmann W. Politische Sprache, politische Kommunikation Vorträge, Aufsätze, Entwürfe / Walther Dieckmann. – Heidelberg, 1981. – 279 p.
5. Edelman M. The Symbolic Uses of Politics / Murray Edelman. – Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1985. – 221 с.
6. Egan L. Trump criticizes Biden's DNC acceptance speech as 'just words' [Электронный ресурс] / Lauren Egan // NBC News. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/trump-accuses-biden-abandoning-his-home-state-ahead-dnc-acceptance-n1237520>
7. Fairclough N. Genres in political discourse. // Encyclopedia of language and linguistics / – Boston: Elsevier, 2006. – (5). – P. 32–38.
8. Franck T. Biden's inauguration speech to stress unity amid a national crisis [Электронный ресурс] / Thomas Franck // CNBC. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/19/bidens-inauguration-speech-to-stress-unity-amid-a-national-crisis.html>.
9. Glueck K. The Many Ways That Joe Biden Trips Over His Own Tongue [Электронный ресурс] / Katie Glueck // The New York Times. – 2019. – Режим

- доступу до ресурсу: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/30/us/politics/joe-biden-debate-gaffes.html>.
10. Gornostayeva A. American Political Discourse: Irony in Pre-Election Campaign 2016 / Anna Gornostayeva. // Russian Journal of Linguistics. – 2016. – №20. – P. 179–195.
 11. Hart R. Why Trump Lost and How? A Rhetorical Explanation / Roderick P. Hart. // American Behavioral Scientist. – 2021. – P. 1–21.
 12. Here are the key moments from President Trump's Republican National Convention speech [Электронный ресурс] // CNBC. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.cnn.com/2020/08/28/trump-rnc-speech-highlights.html>.
 13. Jamieson K. The Interplay of Influence: News, Advertising, Politics and the Mass Media / K. Jamieson, K. Campbell. – Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1997. – 368 с.
 14. Lange J. How the Trojan Horse became everyone's favorite political metaphor [Электронный ресурс] / Jeva Lange // THE WEEK. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://theweek.com/articles/935394/how-trojan-horse-became-everyones-favorite-political-metaphor>.
 15. Levinson S. Pragmatics / Stephen Levinson. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 с.
 16. Mahncke J. US election: For Joe Biden, empathy wins the presidency [Электронный ресурс] / Julia Mahncke // Deutsche Welle. – 2021. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.dw.com/en/us-election-for-joe-biden-empathy-wins-the-presidency/a-55408733>.
 17. Malakhova V.L. The role of conceptual metaphor in formation of English discourse through the example of political texts / V.L.Malakhova, K.L.Smirnova // 6th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM 2019. Conference Proceedings. – Vienna, 2019. – Volume 6. – Issue 2.1. Ancient Science. – P. 359-366.

18. McGill A. The Trump Bloc [Электронный ресурс] / Andrew McGill // The Atlantic. – 2016. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/09/dissecting-donald-trumps-support/499739/>.
19. Rixon P. Popular newspaper discourse / P. Rixon. // Journal of Historical Pragmatics. – 2014. – С. 314–330.
20. Rose M. Joe Biden Democratic National Convention Acceptance Speech Analysis [Электронный ресурс] / M. Rose // OurPolitics.net. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://ourpolitics.net/joe-biden-dnc-acceptance-speech-analysis/>.
21. Sartika T. Critical analysis of Donald Trump's and Joe Biden's language in use in the 2020 United States presidential debates / Tini Sartika. // Proceedings International Conference on Education of Suryakancana 2021. – 2021. – С. 412–417.
22. Schneider Ch. Donald Trump's Twitter assault on the English language weakens him and America / Ch. Schneider. [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2018/05/29/donald-trump-tweets-assault-english-language-undermine-america-column/638888002/>
23. Stelter B. Biden hits Trump where it hurts: in the convention speech ratings [Электронный ресурс] / Brian Stelter // CNN Business. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/08/28/media/ratings-trump-vs-biden-convention-speeches/index.html>.
24. Strauss D. Ideological closure in newspaper political language during the U.S. 1872 election campaign / Dafnah Strauss. // Journal of Historical Pragmatics. – 2014. – С. 255–291.
25. Tannen D. Gender and Discourse / D. Tannen. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. – 203 p.
26. Tarde G. On Communication and Social Influence / G. Tarde. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969. – 332 с.

27. van Dijk T. Ideology and Discourse Analysis / T. van Dijk. // Journal of Political Ideologies. – 2004. – №11. – С. 115–140.
28. van Dijk T. What is political discourse analysis? / T. van Dijk. // Belgian Journal of Linguistics. – 1997. – №11. – С. 11–52.
29. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М., 1990. С. 136—137.
30. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. – 2-е изд., испр. / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М. : Языки русской культуры. – 1999. – 896 с
31. Баранов А. Н., Казакевич Е. Г. Парламентские дебаты: традиции и новации. М.: Знание, 1991.
32. Бацевич Ф.С. Лінгвістична генологія: проблеми і перспективи: [монографія] / Ф.С. Бацевич. — Львів : ПАІС, 2005. — 264 с
33. Бацевич Ф.С. Основы коммуникативной лингвистики. – К.: ВЦ „Академія”, 2004. – 344 с.
34. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика / Эмиль Бенвенист. – Москва: "Прогресс", 1974. – 407 с.
35. Білик О. І. Лінгвостилістичні особливості реалізації стратегій передвиборчого дискурсу (на матеріалі промов Дональда Трампа) / О. І. Білик, І. П. Козак. // Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. – 2017. – №27. – С. 14–16.
36. Бузинова Л. Особенности немецкой академической коммуникации / Л. Бузинова. // Языкознание. – 2017. – С. 1–7.
37. ван Дейк Т. А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация / Т. А. ван Дейк. — М., 1989. – 312 с.
38. ван Дейк Т. Дискурс и власть. Репрезентация доминирования в языке и коммуникации. Пер. с англ. - М.: Либриком, 2013. - 337с.

39. Гайкова О. В. Предвыборный дискурс как жанр политической коммуникации (на материале англ. яз.) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філ. наук / Гайкова О. В. – Волгоград, 2003. – 19 с.
40. Германов В.Г. Вплив ЗМІ на підсвідомість : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.01.08 / В.Г. Германов ; КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка. – К., 2003. – 174 с.
41. Голоднов А. В. Персуазивная стратегия текстообразования в риторическом метадискурсе / А. В. Голоднов. // «Вестник ЛГУ им. А.С. Пушкина. – 2007. – №2. – С. 113–125.
42. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. М., 2002. № 3. С. 32-43.
43. Желтухина М. Л. Тропологическая суггестивность масс-медиального дискурса: о проблеме речевого воздействия тропов в языке СМИ. // Язык, сознание, коммуникация. – 2003. – №25. – С. 197–200.
44. Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Изд. 3-е. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 284 с.
45. Карасик В. И. Структура институционального дискурса. / В. И. Карасик. // Саратовский национальный исследовательский государственный университет имени Н.Г. Чернышевского. – 2000. – С. 25–33.
46. Ключев Е. В. Речевая коммуникация / Е. В. Ключев. – Москва: Рипол классик, 2002. – 315 с.
47. Кондратенко Н. В. Типологія мовленнєвих жанрів українського політичного дискурсу. // Збірник наукових праць. – 2017. – №9.
48. Кондратенко Н. В. Український політичний дискурс: текстуалізація реальності : [монографія] / Н. В. Кондратенко. – Одеса : Чорномор'я, 2007. – 156 с.
49. Ленец А. В. Языковая манифестация коммуникативной стратегии дискредитации как способа конструирования имиджа политика в

- виртуальном пространстве (на материале предвыборных твитов Д. Трампа) / А. В. Ленец, Д. С. Сергеева. // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Филология.. – 2018. – №52. – С. 98–110.
- 50.Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса. - Москва: Гнозис, 2003. - 261 с.
- 51.Малышева О. П. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики в публичных выступлениях (на материале речей американских и британских политических лидеров) / О. П. Малышева. // ФИЛОЛОГИЯ. – 2009. – №96. – С. 206–209.
- 52.Михалёва О. Л. Политический дискурс как сфера реализации манипулятивного воздействия : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філ. наук / Михалёва О. Л. – Кемерово, 2004. – 21 с.
- 53.Михалёва О. Л. Политический дискурс: способы реализации агональности // Построение гражданского общества: Материалы международного гуманитарного конгресса. – Ч.3: Русский язык: его современное состояние и проблемы преподавания. – Иркутск: Изд-во Ирк.гос.пед.ун-та, 2002. – С. 96–105.
- 54.Олянич А. Презентационная теория дискурса : дис. докт. філ. наук : ВАК РФ / Олянич А., 2019. – 602 с.
- 55.Паршина О. Н. Стратегии и тактики речевого поведения современной политической элиты России : дис. докт. філ. наук : ВАК РФ / Паршина Ольга Николаевна, 2005. – 325 с.
- 56.Почепцов Г. Г. Побудова іміджу як комунікативне програмування / Г. Г. Почепцов // «Нова політика». – К., 1998. – № 5. – С. 41–43
- 57.Серажим К. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність. [На матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики]: Монографія / За ред. В. Різуна. / Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К., 2002. – 392 с. (240)
- 58.Слюсарева Н. А. Проблемы функционального синтаксиса современного английского языка (монография) / Н. А. Слюсарева., 1981. – 206 с.

- 59.Хабермас Ю. Демократия. Разум. Нравственность. – М., 1992. – 224 с.
- 60.Ханина Е. А. Формирование положительного имиджа политика при реализации коммуникативной стратегии превознесения / Е. А. Ханина. // Политическая лингвистика. – 2019. – №4. – С. 156–161.
- 61.Храмченко Д. С. Функционально-лингвистические особенности тактической реализации конфликтных коммуникативных стратегий американского предвыборного политического дискурса / Д. С. Храмченко, Я. Ю. Хлопотунов. // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2017. – №1. – С. 188–191.
- 62.Цуладзе А. Формирование имиджа политика в России / А. Цуладзе. – Москва: Университет, 1999. – 143 с. (р. 68)
- 63.Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса. - М.: ИТДГК "Гнозис", 2004. - 326 с.
- 64.Шейгал Е. И. Театральность политического дискурса / Е. И. Шейгал. // Единицы языка и их функционирование. – 2000. – №6.

THE SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. Full Transcript: President Trump’s Republican National Convention Speech [Электронный ресурс]. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/28/us/politics/trump-rnc-speech-transcript.html>.
2. Transcript: Joe Biden's DNC speech [Электронный ресурс]. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/08/20/politics/biden-dnc-speech-transcript/index.html>.

The classification of communicative strategies and tactics

№	The name of a researcher	Communicative strategies	Communicative tactics
1.	O. S. Issers [44]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) self-representation; - (2) discredit; - (3) argumentation; - (4) manipulation; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>no tactics are singled out;</i> - (2) <i>insult;</i> - (2) <i>mockery;</i> - (2) <i>accusation;</i> - (3) <i>no tactics are classified;</i> - (4) <i>no tactics are classified;</i>
2.	E. A. Sheigal [63]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) veiling; - (2) hoax (exaggeration of particular qualities, usually unreal ones); - (3) anonymity; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>obscuring the unwanted information;</i> - (1) <i>hiding the truth;</i> - (2) <i>deliberate misleading;</i> - (3) <i>depersonalization;</i> - (3) <i>abdicating responsibility;</i>
3.	O. M. Parshina [55]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) self-representation; - (2) discredit; - (2) attacking; - (3) self-defense; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>identification or relating oneself to somebody;</i> - (1) <i>distancing oneself from somebody or something;</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (4) the formation of the emotional mood of the addressee; - (5) information-interpretation; - (6) argumentative; - (7) agitational; - (8) manipulative; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>the tactic of positive image creation;</i> - (2) <i>accusation;</i> - (2) <i>offense;</i> - (3) <i>justification;</i> - (3) <i>criticism;</i> - (3) <i>arguing;</i> - (4) <i>unity;</i> - (4) <i>appealing to emotions;</i> - (4) <i>consideration of moral and spiritual values;</i> - (5) <i>acceptance of the problem existence;</i> - (5) <i>clarification;</i> - (5) <i>commenting;</i> - (5) <i>consideration of the problem from another perspective;</i> - (5) <i>indication of the ways for solving a problem;</i> - (6) <i>reasonable assessment;</i>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (6) <i>contrastive analysis</i>; - (6) <i>pointing at the future</i>; - (6) <i>illustration</i>; - (7) <i>promising</i>; - (7) <i>call to action</i>; - (8) <i>demagoguery</i>; - (8) <i>politeness</i>; - (8) <i>exaggeration</i>;
4.	O.P Malysheva [51]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) positioning; - (2) cooperation; - (3) conflict; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>reaction (response) tactic</i>; - (1) <i>apology</i>; - (1) <i>authority (demonstration of responsibility, threat, warning)</i>; - (2) <i>integration</i>; - (2) <i>emotional mood formation</i>; - (3) <i>discredit</i>; - (3) <i>opposition</i>;
5.	O.L. Mikhaleva [52]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) lowering; - (2) the strategy of increase; - (3) theatricality strategy; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>analysis – “minus”</i>; - (1) <i>accusation</i>; - (1) <i>insulting</i>; - (1) <i>threat</i>;

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (2) <i>analysis – “plus”</i>; - (2) <i>presentation</i>; - (2) <i>withdrawal of criticism</i>; - (3) <i>the tactic of prompting</i>; - (3) <i>cooperation tactic</i>; - (3) <i>delimitation tactic</i>; - (3) <i>the tactic of informing</i>; - (3) <i>the tactic of promising</i>; - (3) <i>prognostication tactic</i>; - (3) <i>the tactic of warning</i>; - (3) <i>the tactic of using irony</i>; - (3) <i>provocation tactic</i>;
6.	T. van Dijk [27]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) positive self-presentation; - (2) negative opponent-presentation; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>emphasis on positive things about “us” and ignorance of negative things about “us”</i>; - (2) <i>emphasis on negative things about</i>

			<i>“them” and ignorance of positive things about them”.</i>
--	--	--	---

The National Convention Acceptance Speech of Donald Trump

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

Friends, delegates and distinguished guests, please. I stand before you tonight honored by your support, proud of the extraordinary progress we have made together over the last four incredible years and blooming with confidence in the bright future we will build for America over the next four years.

We begin this evening — our thoughts are with the wonderful people who have just come through the wrath of hurricane Laura. We are working closely with state and local officials in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi. Sparing no effort to save lives while the hurricane was fierce, one of the strongest to make landfall in 150 years. The casualties and damage were far less than thought possible only 24 hours ago.

And this is due to the great work of FEMA, law enforcement and the individual states. I will be going this weekend. And congratulations, thank you for that great job out there. We really appreciate it. We are one national family, and we will always protect, love and care for each other. Here tonight are the people who have made my journey possible and filled my life with so much joy.

For her incredible service to our nation and its children, I want to thank our magnificent first lady. I also want to thank my amazing daughter Ivanka for that introduction, and to all of my children. Ivanka — please stand up — and to all of my children and grandchildren, I love you more than words can express.

I know my brother Robert is looking down on us right now from heaven. He was a great brother and was very proud of the job we are all doing. Thank you. We love you, Robert.

Let us also take a moment to show our profound appreciation for a man who has always fought by our side and stood up for our values, a man of deep faith and steadfast conviction — our vice president, Mike Pence.

And Mike is joined by his beloved wife, a teacher and military mom, Karen Pence.

My fellow Americans, tonight, with a heart full of gratitude and boundless optimism, I profoundly accept this nomination for president of the United States.

The Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, goes forward united, determined and ready to welcome millions of Democrats, independents and anyone who believes in the greatness of America and the righteous heart of the American people.

In the new term as president, we will again build the greatest economy in history, quickly returning to full employment, soaring incomes and record prosperity. We will defend America against all threats and protect America against all dangers. We will lead America into new frontiers of ambition and discovery, and we will reach four new heights of national achievement. We will rekindle faith in our values, new pride in our history and a new spirit of unity that can only be realized through love for our great country.

Because we understand that America is not a land cloaked in darkness. America is the torch that enlightens the entire world. Gathered here at our beautiful and majestic White House, known all over the world as the people's house, we cannot help but marvel at the miracle that is our great American story.

This has been the home of larger-than-life figures like Teddy Roosevelt and Andrew Jackson, who rallied Americans to bold visions of a bigger and brighter future. Within these walls lived tenacious generals like President Grant and Eisenhower, who led our soldiers in the cause of freedom. From these grounds, Thomas Jefferson sent Lewis and Clark to chart our continent. In the depths of a bloody Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln looked out these very windows upon a half-completed Washington Monument and asked God and his Providence to save our nation. Two weeks after Pearl Harbor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt welcomed Winston Churchill, and just inside, they set our people on course to victory in the Second World War.

In recent months, our nation and the entire planet has been struck by a new and powerful invisible enemy. Like those brave Americans before us, we are meeting this challenge. We are delivering lifesaving therapies and will produce a vaccine before the

end of the year, or maybe even sooner. We will defeat the virus and the pandemic and emerge stronger than ever before.

What united generations past was an unshakable confidence in America's destiny and an unbreakable faith in the American people. They knew that our country is blessed by God and has a special purpose in this world. It is that conviction that inspired the formation of our union, our westward expansion, the abolition of slavery, the passage of civil rights, the space program and the overthrow of fascism, tyranny, and communism.

This towering American spirit has prevailed over every challenge and has lifted us to the summit of human endeavor. And yet despite all of our greatness as a nation, everything we have achieved is now in danger. This is the most important election in the history of our country.

Thank you. At no time before have voters faced a clearer choice between two parties, two visions, two philosophies or two agendas. This election will decide if we save the American dream or whether we allow a socialist agenda to demolish our cherished destiny. It will decide whether we rapidly create millions of high-paying jobs or whether we crush our industries and send millions of these jobs overseas, as has been foolishly done for many decades. Your vote will decide whether we protect law-abiding Americans or whether we give free rein to violent anarchists and agitators and criminals who threaten our citizens.

And this election will decide whether we will defend the American way of life or allow a radical movement to completely dismantle and destroy it. It won't happen. At the Democrat National Convention, Joe Biden and his party repeatedly assailed America as a land of racial, economic and social injustice, so tonight, I ask you a simple question: How can the Democratic Party ask to lead our country when it spent so much time tearing down our country?

In the left's backward view, they do not see America as the most free, just and exceptional nation on Earth. Instead, they see a wicked nation that must be punished for its sins. Our opponents say that redemption for you can only come from giving power to

them. This is a tired anthem spoken by every repressive movement throughout history, but in this country, we don't look to career politicians for salvation. In America, we do not turn to government to restore ourselves. We put our faith in almighty God.

Joe Biden is not a savior of America's soul. He is the destroyer of America's jobs, and if given the chance, he will be the destroyer of America's greatness. For 47 years, Joe Biden took the donations of blue-collar workers, gave them hugs, and even kisses, and told them he felt their pain, and then he flew back to Washington and voted to ship our jobs to China and many other distant lands.

Joe Biden spent his entire career outsourcing their dreams and the dreams of American workers, offshoring their jobs, opening their borders and sending their sons and daughters to fight in endless foreign wars, wars that never ended.

Four years ago, I ran for president because I cannot watch this betrayal of our country any longer. I could not sit by as career politicians let other countries take advantage of us on trade, borders, foreign policy and national defense. Our NATO partners, as an example, were very far behind in their defense payments, but at my strong urging, they agreed to pay \$130 billion more a year — the first time in over 20 years that they upped their payments.

And this \$130 billion will ultimately go to \$400 billion a year, and Secretary General Stoltenberg, who heads NATO, was amazed after watching for so many years and said that President Trump did what no one else was able to do. Thank you.

From the moment I left my former life behind — and it was a good life — I have done nothing but fight for you. I did what our political establishment never expected and could never forgive, breaking the cardinal rule of Washington politics. I kept my promise. Together we have ended the rule of the failed political class, and they are desperate to get their power back by any means necessary. You have seen that. They are angry at me because instead of putting them first, I very simply said, “America first.”

Thank you.

Days after taking office, we shocked the Washington establishment and withdrew from the last administration's job-killing Trans-Pacific Partnership. I then immediately approved the Keystone XL and Dakota Access pipelines, ended the unfair and very costly Paris climate accord and secured, for the first time, American energy independence.

We passed record-setting tax and regulation cuts at a rate nobody had ever seen before. Within three short years, we built the strongest economy in the history of the world. Washington insiders asked me not to stand up to China. They pleaded with me to let China continue stealing our jobs, ripping us off and robbing our country blind, but I kept my word to the American people. We took the toughest, boldest, strongest and hardest-hitting action against China in American history by far.

They said that it would be impossible to replace NAFTA, but again they were wrong. Earlier this year, I ended the NAFTA nightmare and signed the brand-new Mexico-U.S.-Canada agreement into law. And right now, auto companies and others are building their plants and factories in America, not firing their employees, and not deserting us for other countries.

In perhaps no area did the Washington special interests try harder to stop us than on my policy of pro-American immigration. But I refused to back down, and today America's borders are more secure than ever before.

Thank you.

We ended catch and release, stopped asylum fraud, took down human traffickers who prey on women and children, and we have deported 20,000 gang members and 500,000 criminal aliens. We have already built 300 miles of border wall, and we are adding 10 new miles every single week. The wall will soon be complete, and it is working beyond our wildest expectations.

We are joined this evening by members of the Border Patrol union, representing our country's courageous border agents. Thank you very much for being here. Thank you, brave, brave people.

You see, this country loves our law enforcement. They do. They do. They really do. Love and respect. When I learned that the Tennessee Valley Authority laid off hundreds of American workers and forced them to train their lower-paid foreign replacements, I promptly removed the chairman of the board, and now those talented American workers have been rehired and are back providing power to Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina and Virginia.

They have their old jobs back, and some are here with us this evening. Please stand. You went through a lot. Please stand. Thank you. Thank you very much. You have been through a lot. Thank you very much.

Last month, I took on big pharma. You think that's easy? It's not. And signed orders that would massively lower the cost of your prescription drugs and give critically ill patients access to lifesaving cures. We passed the decades-long-awaited right to try, right to try.

We also passed V.A. Accountability and V.A. Choice; our great veterans, we're taking care of our veterans — 91 percent approval rating this month, the V.A. Given by our veterans. First time anything like that has happened.

By the end of my first term, we will have approved more than 300 federal judges, including two new great Supreme Court justices. And to bring prosperity to our forgotten inner cities, we worked hard to pass historic criminal justice reform, prison reform, opportunity zones and long-term funding of historically Black colleges and universities, and before the China virus came in, produced the best unemployment numbers for African-Americans, Hispanic Americans and Asian-Americans ever recorded.

And I say very modestly that I have done more for the African-American community than any president since Abraham Lincoln, our first Republican president.

And I have done more in three years for the Black community than Joe Biden has done in 47 years. And when I am re-elected, the best is yet to come.

Thank you very much.

When I took office, the Middle East was in total chaos. ISIS was rampaging, Iran was on the rise, and the war in Afghanistan had no end in sight. I withdrew from the terrible one-sided Iran nuclear deal.

Unlike many presidents before me, I kept my promise, recognized Israel's true capital and moved our Embassy to Jerusalem.

But not only did we talk about it as a future site; we got it built. Rather than spending \$1 billion on a new building as planned, we took an already owned, existing building in a better location. Real estate deal, right? And opened it at a cost of less than \$500,000. Many things like that the government is doing right now. We also recognized Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights, and this month we achieved the first Middle East peace deal in 25 years. Thank you to the U.A.E. Thank you to Israel.

In addition, we obliterated 100 percent of the ISIS caliphate and killed its founder and leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. Then, in a separate operation, we eliminated the world's No. 1 terrorist by far, Qassim Suleimani.

Unlike previous administrations, I have kept America out of new wars, and our troops are coming home. We have spent nearly \$2.5 trillion on completely rebuilding our military, which was very badly depleted when I took office, as you know. This includes three separate pay raises for our great warriors.

We also launched the Space Force, the first new branch of the United States military since the Air Force was created almost 75 years ago.

We have spent the last four years reversing the damage Joe Biden inflicted over the last 47 years. Biden's record is a shameful roll call of the most catastrophic betrayals and blunders in our lifetime. He has spent his entire career on the wrong side of history. Biden voted for the NAFTA disaster, the single worst trade deal ever enacted. He supported China's entry into the World Trade Organization, one of the greatest economic disasters of all time. After those Biden calamities, the United States lost one in four manufacturing jobs. We laid off workers in Michigan, Ohio, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and many

other states. They did not want to hear Biden's hollow words of empathy. They wanted their jobs back.

As vice president, he supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which would have been a death sentence for the U.S. auto industry. He backed the horrendous South Korea trade deal, which took many jobs from our country, and which I've reversed and made a great deal for our country. He repeatedly supported mass amnesty for illegal immigrants. He voted for the Iraq war. He opposed the mission that took out Osama bin Laden. He opposed killing Suleimani, he oversaw the rise of ISIS, cheered the rise of China as a positive development for the world. Some positive development. That is why China supports Joe Biden and it desperately wants him to win. I can tell you that upon very good information.

China would own our country if Joe Biden got elected. Unlike Biden, I will hold them fully accountable for the tragedy that they caused all over the world — they caused. In recent months, our nation and the world has been hit by the once-in-a-century pandemic that China allowed to spread around the globe. They could have stopped it, but they allowed it to come out. We are grateful to be joined tonight by several of our incredible nurses and first responders. Please stand and accept our profound thanks and gratitude.

Many Americans, including me — I have sadly lost friends and cherished loved ones to this horrible disease. As one nation, we mourn, we grieve, and we hold in our hearts forever the memories of all of those lives that have been so tragically taken so unnecessary.

In their honor, we unite in their memory. We will overcome it. And when the China virus hit, we launched the largest national mobilization since World War II, invoking the Defense Production Act. We produce the world's largest supply of ventilators. Not a single American who has needed a ventilator has been denied a ventilator.

Good job heading the task force by our great vice president — thank you very much. Please, please stand up.

We shipped hundreds of millions of masks, gloves and gowns to our frontline health care workers to protect our nation's seniors. We rushed supplies, testing kits and personnel to nursing homes. We gave everything you can possibly give, and we're still giving it because we are taking care of our senior citizens.

The Army Corps of Engineers built field hospitals, and the Navy deployed our great hospital ships. We developed from scratch the largest and most advanced testing system anywhere in the world. America has tested more than every country in Europe put together and more than every nation in the Western Hemisphere combined — think of that. We have conducted 40 million more tests than the next closest nation, which is India. We developed a wide array of effective treatments, including a powerful antibody treatment known as convalescent plasma. You saw that? On Sunday night when we announced it. That will save thousands and thousands of lives. Thanks to advancements, we have pioneered the fatality rates, and you look at it, and you look at the numbers, it has been reduced by 80 percent since April — 80 percent.

The United States has among the lowest case fatality rates of any major country anywhere in the world. The European Union's case fatality rate is nearly three times higher than ours, but you don't hear that. They do not write about that. They don't want to write about that. They do not want you to know those things. Altogether, the nations of Europe have experienced a 30 percent greater increase in excess mortality than the United States. Think of that.

We enacted the largest package of financial relief in American history. Thanks to our Paycheck Protection Program, we have saved or supported more than 50 million American jobs. That's one of the reasons we're advancing so rapidly with our economy. Great job. As a result, we have seen the smallest economic contraction of any nation, and we are recovering at a much faster rate than anybody.

Over the past three months, we have gained over nine million jobs, and that is a record in the history of our country. Unfortunately, from the beginning, our opponents have shown themselves capable of nothing but a partisan ability to criticize.

When I took bold action to issue a travel ban on China — very early indeed — Joe called it hysterical and xenophobic. And then I introduced a ban on Europe, very early again. If we had listened to Joe, hundreds of thousands more Americans would have died. Instead of following the science, Joe Biden wants to inflict a painful shutdown on the entire country. His shutdown would inflict unthinkable and lasting harm on our nation's children, families and citizens of all backgrounds. The cost of the Biden shutdown would be measured in increased drug overdoses, depression, alcohol addiction, suicides, heart attacks, economic devastation, job loss and much more. Joe Biden's plan is not a solution to the virus, but rather it's a surrender to the virus.

My administration has a very different approach. To save as many lives as possible we are focusing on the science, the facts and the data. We are aggressively sheltering those at highest risk, especially the elderly, allowing lower-risk Americans to safely return to work and to school, and we want to see so many of those great states be opened by Democrats. We want them to be open. They have to be open. They have to get back to work. They have to get back to work, and they have to get back to school.

Most importantly, we are marshaling America's scientific genius to produce a vaccine in record time. Under Operation Warp Speed, we have three different vaccines in the final stage of trials right now, years ahead of what has been achieved before. Nobody thought it could be done this fast. Normally it would be years, and we did it in a matter of a few months. We are producing them in advance so hundreds of millions of doses can be quickly available. We have a safe and effective vaccine this year, and together we will crush the virus.

At the Democrat convention, you barely heard a word about their agenda. But that is not because they don't have one. It is because their agenda is the most extreme set of proposals ever put forward by a major party nominee.

Joe Biden may claim he is an ally of the light, but when it comes to his agenda, Biden wants to keep us completely in the dark. He doesn't have a clue. He has pledged a \$4 trillion tax hike on almost all American families, which would totally collapse our

rapidly improving economy, and once again record stock markets that we have right now will also collapse. That means your 401(k)s. That means all of the stocks that you have.

On the other hand, just as I did in my first term, I will cut taxes even further for hardworking moms and dads. I will not raise taxes; I will cut them, and very substantially. And we will also provide tax credits to bring jobs out of China back to America, and we will impose tariffs on any company that leaves America to produce jobs overseas. We will make sure our companies and jobs stay in our country, as I've already been doing for quite some time, if you have noticed. Joe Biden's agenda is made in China. My agenda is made in the U.S.A.

Biden has promised to abolish the production of American oil, coal, shale and natural gas, laying waste to the economies of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Colorado and New Mexico — destroying those states, absolutely destroying those states, and others.

Millions of jobs will be lost, and energy prices will soar. These same policies led to crippling power outages in California just last week. Everybody saw that. Tremendous power outage. Nobody's seen anything like it, but we saw it last week in California. How can Joe Biden claim to be an ally of the light when his own party can't even keep the lights on?

Joe Biden's campaign has even published a 110-page policy platform. You can't get away from this. Co-authored with far-left senator crazy Bernie Sanders. The Biden-Bernie manifesto calls for suspending all removals of illegal aliens, implementing nationwide catch and release, providing illegal aliens with free taxpayer-funded lawyers. Everybody gets a lawyer. Come over to our country — everybody has a lawyer. We have a lawyer for you. That's is all we need is more lawyers.

Joe Biden recently raised his hand on the debate stage and promised he was going to give it away — your health care dollars — to illegal immigrants, which will bring massive numbers of immigrants into our country. Massive numbers will pour into our

country in order to get all the goodies that they want to give. Education, health care, everything.

He also supports deadly sanctuary cities that protect criminal aliens. He promised to end national security travel bans from jihadist nations, and he pledged to increase refugee admissions by 700 percent.

This is in the manifesto.

The Biden plan would eliminate America's borders in the middle of a global pandemic, and he is even talking about taking the wall down. How about that?

Biden also vowed to oppose school choice and close all charter schools, ripping away the ladder of opportunity for Black and Hispanic children. In a second term, I will expand charter schools and provide school choice to every family in America. And we will always treat our teachers with the tremendous respect that they deserve. Great people. Great, great people.

Joe Biden claims he has empathy for the vulnerable, yet the party he leads supports the extreme late-term abortion of defenseless babies, right up until the moment of birth. Democrat leaders talk about moral decency, but they have no problem with stopping a baby's beating heart in the ninth month of pregnancy. Democrat politicians refuse to protect innocent life, and then they lecture us about morality and saving America's soul. Tonight, we proudly declare that all children, born and unborn, have a God-given right to life.

During the Democrat convention, the words "under God" were removed from the Pledge of Allegiance. Not once, but twice. We will never do that. But the fact is, this is where they are coming from. Like it or not, this is where they are coming from. If the left gains power, they will demolish the suburbs, confiscate your guns, and appoint justices who will wipe away your second amendment and other constitutional freedoms.

Biden is a Trojan horse for socialism. If Joe Biden doesn't have the strength to stand up to wild eyed Marxists like Bernie Sanders and his fellow radicals, and there are many,

there are many many, we see them all the time. It is incredible, actually. Then how is he ever going to stand up for you? He's not.

The most dangerous aspect of the Biden platform is the attack on public safety. The Biden-Bernie manifesto calls for abolishing cash bail, immediately releasing 400,000 criminals onto the streets and into your neighborhoods. When asked if he supports cutting police funding, Joe Biden replied, yes, absolutely. When Congresswoman Ilhan Omar called the Minneapolis Police Department "a cancer that is rotten to the root," Biden would not disavow her support and reject her endorsement. He proudly displayed it shortly later on his website. Displayed it in big letters.

Make no mistake, if you give power to Joe Biden, the radical left will defund police departments all across America. They will pass federal legislation to reduce law enforcement nationwide. They will make every city look like Democrat-run Portland, Oregon.

No one will be safe in Biden's America. My administration will always stand with the men and women of law enforcement.

Every day, police officers risk their lives to keep us safe, and every year many sacrifice their lives in the line of duty. One of these incredible Americans was Detective Miosotis Familia. She was part of a team of American heroes called the NYPD, or New York's finest, who I was very proud to get their endorsement just the other day. Great people.

If they were allowed to do their job, you'd have no crime in New York. Rudy Giuliani knows that better than anybody. Thank you, Rudy.

Three years ago on the Fourth of July weekend, Detective Familia was on duty in her vehicle when she was ambushed just after midnight and murdered by a monster who hated her purely for wearing the badge. Detective Familia was a single mom. She recently asked for the night shift so she could spend more time with her kids.

Two years ago, I stood in front of the U.S. Capitol alongside those beautiful children and held their grandmother's hand as they mourned their terrible loss. And we honored

Detective Familia's extraordinary life. It was extraordinary. Detective Familia's three children are with us this evening. Genesis, Peter, Delilah, we are so grateful to have you here tonight. Thank you very much for coming. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

I promise you that we will treasure your mom in our memories forever. We must remember that the overwhelming majority of police officers in this country, and that's the overwhelming majority, are noble, courageous, and honorable. We have to give law enforcement, our police, back their power.

They are afraid to act. They are afraid to lose their pension. They are afraid to lose their jobs. And by being afraid, they are not able to do the job that they so desperately want to do for you. And those who suffer most are the great people who they protect and who they want to protect at an even higher level.

When there is police misconduct, the justice system must hold wrongdoers fully and completely accountable, and it will. But when we can never have a situation where things are going on as they are today, we must never allow mob rule. We can never allow mob rule.

In the strongest possible terms, the Republican Party condemns the rioting, looting, arson, and violence we have seen in Democrat-run cities all, like Kenosha, Minneapolis, Portland, Chicago, and New York, and many others, Democrat-run.

There is violence and danger in the streets of many Democrat-run cities throughout America. This problem could easily be fixed if they wanted to. Just call, we're ready to go in. We will take care of your problem in a matter of hours. Just call. We have to wait for the call. It is too bad we have to, but we have to wait for the call.

We must always have law and order. All federal crimes are being investigated, prosecuted and punished to the fullest extent of the law.

When the anarchists started ripping down our statues and monuments right outside, I signed an order immediately, 10 years in prison, and it was a miracle. It all stopped. No

more statues. They said, that's just too long as they looked as a statue. I think we'll rip it down. Then they said, '10 years in prison? I think that is too long. Let's go home.'

During their convention, Joe Biden and his supporters remained completely silent about the rioters and criminals spreading mayhem in Democrat-run cities. They never even mentioned it during their entire convention. Never once mentioned. Now, they are starting to mention it because their poll numbers are going down like a rock in water.

It is too late, Joe. In the face of left-wing anarchy and mayhem in Minneapolis, Chicago, and others, Joe Biden's campaign did not condemn it. They donated to it. At least 13 members of Joe Biden's campaign have donated to a fund to bailout vandals, arsonists and anarchists, looters and rioters from jail.

Here tonight is the grieving family of retired police Capt. David Dorn, a 38-year veteran of the St. Louis Police Department, a great man and a highly respected man by all. In June, Captain Dorn was shot and killed as he tried to protect a store from rioters and looters. Or as the Democrats would call them, peaceful protesters. They call them peaceful protesters.

We are honored to be joined tonight by his wonderful wife and beloved family members. To each of you, we will never forget the heroic legacy of Capt. David Dorn. Thank you very much for being here.

Thank you very much. Great man.

As long as I am president, we will defend the absolute right of every American citizen to live in security, dignity and peace. If the Democrat Party wants to stand with anarchists, agitators, rioters, looters, and flag burners, that is up to them. But I as your president will not be part of it. The Republican Party will remain the voice of the patriotic heroes who keep America safe and salute the American flag.

Last year, over 1,000 African-Americans were murdered as a result of violent crime in just four Democrat-run cities. The top 10 most dangerous cities in the country are run by Democrats and have been for many decades. Thousands more African-Americans are victim and victims of violent crime in these communities. Joe Biden and the left ignore

these American victims. I never will. If the radical left takes power, they will apply their disastrous policies to every town, city, and suburban America.

Imagine if the so-called peaceful demonstrators in the streets were in charge of every lever of power in the U.S. government. Just think of that. Liberal politicians claim to be concerned about the strength of American institutions, but who exactly is attacking them? Who is hiring the radical professors, judges, and prosecutors? Who is trying to abolish immigration enforcement and establish speech codes designed to muzzle dissent? In every case, the attacks on American institutions are being waged by radical left. Always remember, they are coming after me because I am fighting for you. That is what is happening. It has been going on from before I even got elected.

And remember this, they spied on my campaign and they got caught. Let's see now what happens.

We must reclaim our Independence from the left's repressive mandates. Americans are exhausted, trying to keep up with the latest lists of approved words and phrases, and the ever more restrictive political decrees.

Many things have a different name now, and the rules are constantly changing. The goal of cancel culture is to make Americans live in fear of being fired, expelled, shamed, humiliated, and driven from society as we know it. The far-left wants to coerce you into saying what you know to be false and scare you out of saying what you know to be true. Very sad. But on November 3, you can send them a very thundering message they will never forget.

Joe Biden is weak. He takes his marching orders from liberal hypocrites who drive their cities into the ground while fleeing from the scene of the wreckage. The same liberals want to eliminate school choice while they enroll their children into the finest private schools in the land. They want to open the borders while living in walled off compounds and communities and the best neighborhoods in the world. They want to defund the police while they have armed guards for themselves. This November, we must turn the page forever on this failed political class.

The fact is, I am here. What is the name of that building? But I'll say it differently, the fact is, we are here and they are not. To me, one of the most beautiful buildings anywhere in the world is not a building, it is a home, as far as I am concerned. It's not even a house, it is a home. Wonderful place with an incredible history. But it is all because of you. Together, we will write the next chapter of the great American story.

Over the next four years, we will make America into the manufacturing superpower of the world. We will expand opportunity zones. Thank you, Tim Scott.

Bring home our medical supply chains, and we end our resilience for bad things, we will go right after China. We will not rely on them one bit. We are taking our business out of China. We are bringing it home. We want our business to come home.

We will continue to reduce taxes and regulations at levels not seen before. We will create 10 million jobs in the next 10 months. And it will be higher than that. We will hire more police, increase penalties for assaults on law enforcement, and surge federal prosecutors into high crime communities. We will ban deadly sanctuary cities and ensure federal health care is protected for American citizens, not for illegal aliens.

We will have strong borders. And I've said for years, without borders, we don't have a country. We don't have a country. Strike down terrorists who threaten our people and keep America out of endless and costly foreign wars. We will appoint prosecutors, judges, justices who believe in enforcing the law, not enforcing their own political agenda. Which is illegal.

We will ensure equal justice for citizens of every race, religion, color, and creed. We will uphold your religious liberty and defend your second amendment right to keep and bear arms. And if we don't win, your second amendment doesn't have a chance, I can tell you that. I have totally protected it.

We will protect Medicare and Social Security. We will always and very strongly protect patients with pre-existing conditions, and that is a pledge from the entire Republican Party. Thank you.

We will end surprise medical billing, require price transparency, and further reduce the cost of prescription drugs and health insurance premiums, they are coming way down. We will greatly expand energy development, continuing to remain the number one in the world, and keep America energy independent.

And for those of you that still drive a car, look how low your gasoline bill is. You haven't seen that in a long time.

We will win the race to 5G and build the world's best cyber and missile defense, already under construction. We will fully restore patriotic education to our schools and always protect — we will always, always protect free speech on college campuses. And we put a very big penalty in if they do anything having to do with your free speech. Colleges have to pay a tremendous, tremendous financial penalty. Again, it is amazing how open they have been lately.

We will launch a new age of American ambition in space. America will land the first woman on the moon, and the United States will be the first nation to plant its beautiful flag on Mars.

This is the unifying national agenda that will bring our country together. So tonight, I say to all Americans, this is the most important election in the history of our country. There has never been such a difference between two parties or two individuals in ideology, philosophy, or vision than there is right now.

Our opponents believe that America is a depraved nation. We want our sons and daughters to know the truth. America is the greatest and most exceptional nation in the history of the world. Our country wasn't built by cancel culture, speech codes, and crushing conformity. We are not a nation of timid spirits. We are a nation of fierce, proud, and independent American patriots. We are a nation of pilgrims, pioneers, adventurers, explorers, and trailblazers who refuse to be tied down, held back, or in any way reigned in. Americans have steel in their spines, grit in their souls, and fire in their hearts. There is no one like us on Earth. I want every child in America to know that you are part of the most exciting and incredible adventure in human history. No matter where your family

comes from, no matter your background in America, anyone can rise with hard work, devotion, and drive. You can reach any goal and achieve every ambition.

Our American ancestors sailed across the perilous ocean to build a new life on a new continent. They braved the freezing winters, crossed the raging rivers, scaled the rocky peaks, trekked the dangerous forests, and worked from dawn till dusk. These pioneers didn't have money. They didn't have fame. But they had each other. They loved their families, they loved their country, and they loved their God. When opportunity beckoned, they picked up their bibles, packed up their belongings, climbed into their covered wagons, and set out West for the next adventure.

Ranchers and miners, cowboys and sheriffs, farmers and settlers. They pressed on past the Mississippi to stake a claim in the wild frontier. Legends were born. Wyatt Earp, Annie Oakley, Davy Crockett, and Buffalo Bill. Americans built their beautiful homesteads on the open range. Soon, they had churches and communities, then towns, and with time, great centers of industry and commerce.

That is who they were. Americans build their future, we don't tear down our past. We are the nation that won a revolution, toppled tyranny and fascism, and delivered millions into freedom. We laid down the railroads, built the great ships, raised up the skyscrapers, revolutionized industry, and sparked a new age of scientific discovery. We set the trends in art and music, radio and film, sport and literature. And we did it with style and confidence and flair because that is who we are.

Whenever our way of life was threatened, our heroes answered the call, from Yorktown to Gettysburg, from Normandy to Iwo Jima. American patriots raced into cannon blasts, bullets, and bayonets to rescue American liberty. They had no fear, but America did not stop there. We looked into the sky and kept pressing onward.

We built a 6 million pound rocket and launched it thousands of miles into space. We did it so two brave patriots could stand tall and salute our wondrous American flag planted on the face of the moon.

For America, nothing is impossible.

Over the next four years, we will prove worthy of this magnificent legacy. We will reach stunning new heights, and we will show the world that for America there is a dream, and it is not beyond your reach. Together, we are unstoppable. Together, we are unbeatable. Because together, we are the proud citizens of the United States of America.

On November 3, we will make America safer. We will make America stronger. We will make America prouder. And we will make America greater than ever before. I am very proud to be the nominee of the Republican Party.

I love you all. God bless you, and God bless America.

The National Convention Acceptance Speech of Joe Biden

Good evening.

Ella Baker, a giant of the civil rights movement, left us with this wisdom: Give people light and they will find a way.

Give people light.

Those are words for our time.

The current president has cloaked America in darkness for much too long. Too much anger. Too much fear. Too much division.

Here and now, I give you my word: If you entrust me with the presidency, I will draw on the best of us not the worst. I will be an ally of the light not of the darkness.

It's time for us, for We the People, to come together.

For make no mistake. United we can, and will, overcome this season of darkness in America. We will choose hope over fear, facts over fiction, fairness over privilege.

I am a proud Democrat and I will be proud to carry the banner of our party into the general election. So, it is with great honor and humility that I accept this nomination for President of the United States of America.

But while I will be a Democratic candidate, I will be an American president. I will work as hard for those who didn't support me as I will for those who did.

That's the job of a president. To represent all of us, not just our base or our party. This is not a partisan moment. This must be an American moment.

It's a moment that calls for hope and light and love. Hope for our futures, light to see our way forward, and love for one another.

America isn't just a collection of clashing interests of Red States or Blue States.

We're so much bigger than that.

We're so much better than that.

Nearly a century ago, Franklin Roosevelt pledged a New Deal in a time of massive unemployment, uncertainty, and fear.

Stricken by disease, stricken by a virus, FDR insisted that he would recover and prevail and he believed America could as well.

And he did.

And so can we.

This campaign isn't just about winning votes.

It's about winning the heart, and yes, the soul of America.

Winning it for the generous among us, not the selfish. Winning it for the workers who keep this country going, not just the privileged few at the top. Winning it for those communities who have known the injustice of the "knee on the neck". For all the young people who have known only an America of rising inequity and shrinking opportunity.

They deserve to experience America's promise in full.

No generation ever knows what history will ask of it. All we can ever know is whether we'll be ready when that moment arrives.

And now history has delivered us to one of the most difficult moments America has ever faced.

Four historic crises. All at the same time. A perfect storm.

The worst pandemic in over 100 years. The worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

The most compelling call for racial justice since the 60's. And the undeniable realities and accelerating threats of climate change.

So, the question for us is simple: Are we ready?

I believe we are.

We must be.

All elections are important. But we know in our bones this one is more consequential.

America is at an inflection point. A time of real peril, but of extraordinary possibilities.

We can choose the path of becoming angrier, less hopeful, and more divided.

A path of shadow and suspicion.

Or we can choose a different path, and together, take this chance to heal, to be reborn, to unite. A path of hope and light.

This is a life-changing election that will determine America's future for a very long time.

Character is on the ballot. Compassion is on the ballot. Decency, science, democracy.

They are all on the ballot.

Who we are as a nation. What we stand for. And, most importantly, who we want to be.

That's all on the ballot.

And the choice could not be clearer.

No rhetoric is needed.

Just judge this president on the facts.

5 million Americans infected with COVID-19.

More than 170,000 Americans have died.

By far the worst performance of any nation on Earth.

More than 50 million people have filed for unemployment this year.

More than 10 million people are going to lose their health insurance this year.

Nearly one in 6 small businesses have closed this year.

If this president is re-elected we know what will happen.

Cases and deaths will remain far too high.

More mom and pop businesses will close their doors for good.

Working families will struggle to get by, and yet, the wealthiest one percent will get tens of billions of dollars in new tax breaks.

And the assault on the Affordable Care Act will continue until its destroyed, taking insurance away from more than 20 million people -- including more than 15 million people

on Medicaid -- and getting rid of the protections that President Obama and I passed for people who suffer from a pre-existing condition.

And speaking of President Obama, a man I was honored to serve alongside for 8 years as Vice President. Let me take this moment to say something we don't say nearly enough.

Thank you, Mr. President. You were a great president. A president our children could -- and did -- look up to.

No one will say that about the current occupant of the office.

What we know about this president is if he's given four more years he will be what he's been the last four years.

A president who takes no responsibility, refuses to lead, blames others, cozies up to dictators, and fans the flames of hate and division.

He will wake up every day believing the job is all about him. Never about you.

Is that the America you want for you, your family, your children?

I see a different America.

One that is generous and strong.

Selfless and humble.

It's an America we can rebuild together.

As president, the first step I will take will be to get control of the virus that's ruined so many lives.

Because I understand something this president doesn't.

We will never get our economy back on track, we will never get our kids safely back to school, we will never have our lives back, until we deal with this virus.

The tragedy of where we are today is it didn't have to be this bad.

Just look around.

It's not this bad in Canada. Or Europe. Or Japan. Or almost anywhere else in the world.

The President keeps telling us the virus is going to disappear. He keeps waiting for a miracle. Well, I have news for him, no miracle is coming.

We lead the world in confirmed cases. We lead the world in deaths.

Our economy is in tatters, with Black, Latino, Asian American, and Native American communities bearing the brunt of it.

And after all this time, the president still does not have a plan.

Well, I do.

If I'm president on day one we'll implement the national strategy I've been laying out since March.

We'll develop and deploy rapid tests with results available immediately.

We'll make the medical supplies and protective equipment our country needs. And we'll make them here in America. So we will never again be at the mercy of China and other foreign countries in order to protect our own people.

We'll make sure our schools have the resources they need to be open, safe, and effective.

We'll put the politics aside and take the muzzle off our experts so the public gets the information they need and deserve. The honest, unvarnished truth. They can deal with that.

We'll have a national mandate to wear a mask-not as a burden, but to protect each other.

It's a patriotic duty.

In short, I will do what we should have done from the very beginning.

Our current president has failed in his most basic duty to this nation.

He failed to protect us.

He failed to protect America.

And, my fellow Americans, that is unforgivable.

As president, I will make you this promise: I will protect America. I will defend us from every attack. Seen. And unseen. Always. Without exception. Every time.

Look, I understand it's hard to have hope right now.

On this summer night, let me take a moment to speak to those of you who have lost the most.

I know how it feels to lose someone you love. I know that deep black hole that opens up in your chest. That you feel your whole being is sucked into it. I know how mean and cruel and unfair life can be sometimes.

But I've learned two things.

First, your loved ones may have left this Earth but they never leave your heart. They will always be with you.

And second, I found the best way through pain and loss and grief is to find purpose.

As God's children each of us have a purpose in our lives.

And we have a great purpose as a nation: To open the doors of opportunity to all Americans. To save our democracy. To be a light to the world once again.

To finally live up to and make real the words written in the sacred documents that founded this nation that all men and women are created equal. Endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

You know, my Dad was an honorable, decent man.

He got knocked down a few times pretty hard, but always got up.

He worked hard and built a great middle-class life for our family.

He used to say, "Joey, I don't expect the government to solve my problems, but I expect it to understand them."

And then he would say: "Joey, a job is about a lot more than a paycheck. It's about your dignity. It's about respect. It's about your place in your community. It's about looking your kids in the eye and say, honey, it's going to be okay."

I've never forgotten those lessons.

That's why my economic plan is all about jobs, dignity, respect, and community. Together, we can, and we will, rebuild our economy. And when we do, we'll not only build it back, we'll build it back better.

With modern roads, bridges, highways, broadband, ports and airports as a new foundation for economic growth. With pipes that transport clean water to every community. With 5 million new manufacturing and technology jobs so the future is made in America.

With a health care system that lowers premiums, deductibles, and drug prices by building on the Affordable Care Act he's trying to rip away.

With an education system that trains our people for the best jobs of the 21st century, where cost doesn't prevent young people from going to college, and student debt doesn't crush them when they get out.

With child care and elder care that make it possible for parents to go to work and for the elderly to stay in their homes with dignity. With an immigration system that powers our economy and reflects our values. With newly empowered labor unions. With equal pay for women. With rising wages you can raise a family on. Yes, we're going to do more than praise our essential workers. We're finally going to pay them.

We can, and we will, deal with climate change. It's not only a crisis, it's an enormous opportunity. An opportunity for America to lead the world in clean energy and create millions of new good-paying jobs in the process.

And we can pay for these investments by ending loopholes and the president's \$1.3 trillion tax giveaway to the wealthiest 1 percent and the biggest, most profitable corporations, some of which pay no tax at all.

Because we don't need a tax code that rewards wealth more than it rewards work. I'm not looking to punish anyone. Far from it. But it's long past time the wealthiest people and the biggest corporations in this country paid their fair share.

For our seniors, Social Security is a sacred obligation, a sacred promise made. The current president is threatening to break that promise. He's proposing to eliminate the tax that pays for almost half of Social Security without any way of making up for that lost revenue.

I will not let it happen. If I'm your president, we're going to protect Social Security and Medicare. You have my word.

One of the most powerful voices we hear in the country today is from our young people. They're speaking to the inequity and injustice that has grown up in America. Economic injustice. Racial injustice. Environmental injustice.

I hear their voices and if you listen, you can hear them too. And whether it's the existential threat posed by climate change, the daily fear of being gunned down in school, or the inability to get started in their first job — it will be the work of the next president to restore the promise of America to everyone.

I won't have to do it alone. Because I will have a great Vice President at my side. Senator Kamala Harris. She is a powerful voice for this nation. Her story is the American story. She knows about all the obstacles thrown in the way of so many in our country. Women, Black women, Black Americans, South Asian Americans, immigrants, the left-out and left-behind.

But she's overcome every obstacle she's ever faced. No one's been tougher on the big banks or the gun lobby. No one's been tougher in calling out this current administration for its extremism, its failure to follow the law, and its failure to simply tell the truth.

Kamala and I both draw strength from our families. For Kamala, it's Doug and their families.

For me, it's Jill and ours.

No man deserves one great love in his life. But I've known two. After losing my first wife in a car accident, Jill came into my life and put our family back together.

She's an educator. A mom. A military Mom. And an unstoppable force. If she puts her mind to it, just get out of the way. Because she's going to get it done. She was a great Second Lady and she will make a great First Lady for this nation, she loves this country so much.

And I will have the strength that can only come from family. Hunter, Ashley and all our grandchildren, my brothers, my sister. They give me courage and lift me up.

And while he is no longer with us, Beau inspires me every day.

Beau served our nation in uniform. A decorated Iraq war veteran.

So I take very personally the profound responsibility of serving as Commander in Chief.

I will be a president who will stand with our allies and friends. I will make it clear to our adversaries the days of cozying up to dictators are over.

Under President Biden, America will not turn a blind eye to Russian bounties on the heads of American soldiers. Nor will I put up with foreign interference in our most sacred democratic exercise -- voting.

I will stand always for our values of human rights and dignity. And I will work in common purpose for a more secure, peaceful, and prosperous world.

History has thrust one more urgent task on us. Will we be the generation that finally wipes the stain of racism from our national character?

I believe we're up to it.

I believe we're ready.

Just a week ago yesterday was the third anniversary of the events in Charlottesville.

Remember seeing those neo-Nazis and Klansmen and white supremacists coming out of the fields with lighted torches? Veins bulging? Spewing the same anti-Semitic bile heard across Europe in the '30s?

Remember the violent clash that ensued between those spreading hate and those with the courage to stand against it?

Remember what the president said?

There were quote, "very fine people on both sides."

It was a wake-up call for us as a country.

And for me, a call to action. At that moment, I knew I'd have to run. My father taught us that silence was complicity. And I could not remain silent or complicit.

At the time, I said we were in a battle for the soul of this nation.

And we are.

One of the most important conversations I've had this entire campaign is with someone who is too young to vote.

I met with six-year old Gianna Floyd, a day before her Daddy George Floyd was laid to rest.

She is incredibly brave.

I'll never forget.

When I leaned down to speak with her, she looked into my eyes and said "Daddy, changed the world."

Her words burrowed deep into my heart.

Maybe George Floyd's murder was the breaking point.

Maybe John Lewis' passing the inspiration.

However it has come to be, America is ready to in John's words, to lay down "the heavy burdens of hate at last" and to do the hard work of rooting out our systemic racism.

America's history tells us that it has been in our darkest moments that we've made our greatest progress. That we've found the light. And in this dark moment, I believe we are poised to make great progress again. That we can find the light once more.

I have always believed you can define America in one word: Possibilities.

That in America, everyone, and I mean everyone, should be given the opportunity to go as far as their dreams and God-given ability will take them.

We can never lose that. In times as challenging as these, I believe there is only one way forward. As a united America. United in our pursuit of a more perfect Union. United in our dreams of a better future for us and for our children. United in our determination to make the coming years bright.

Are we ready?

I believe we are.

This is a great nation.

And we are a good and decent people.

This is the United States of America.

And there has never been anything we've been unable to accomplish when we've done it together.

The Irish poet Seamus Heaney once wrote:

"History says,
Don't hope on this side of the grave,
But then, once in a lifetime
The longed-for tidal wave
Of justice can rise up,
And hope and history rhyme"

This is our moment to make hope and history rhyme.

With passion and purpose, let us begin -- you and I together, one nation, under God
-- united in our love for America and united in our love for each other.

For love is more powerful than hate.

Hope is more powerful than fear.

Light is more powerful than dark.

This is our moment.

This is our mission.

May history be able to say that the end of this chapter of American darkness began here tonight as love and hope and light joined in the battle for the soul of the nation.

And this is a battle that we, together, will win.

I promise you.

Thank you.

And may God bless you.

And may God protect our troops.