

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

“Communication strategies in the 1960 and 2020 US presidential debates”

Master’s thesis

Yaroslava Dobrenka,
the 2nd year student,
Master’s programme

“English Communication Studies and Translation and two Western European
Languages (foreign languages of instruction)”

Field of science – 03 “Humanities”

Specialty – 035 “Philology”

Supervised by:

Alla D. Belova,

Dr.Sc. in Philology, Full Professor

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 18.04.2023

Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV - 2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	
1.2. Televised debates as a speech genre in American political discourse.....	13
1.3. Communication strategies and tactics in American political discourse	17
Conclusion.....	29
II. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN THE AMERICAN DEBATES 1960 ...	32
2.1 Reason and logic as a component of Richard Nixon’s communication strategies during the first presidential debates 1960	32
2.2. Dramaturgy and theatricality as a component of John Kennedy’s communication strategies during the first presidential debates 1960	46
Conclusion.....	57
III. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN THE AMERICAN DEBATES 2020..	60
3.1. Donald Trump as a representative of the coercive power during the first presidential debate 2020.....	61
3.2. Joe Biden as a representative of the collaborative power during the first presidential debate 2020.....	78
Conclusion.....	95
SUMMARY	97
Appendix 1	110
Appendix 2	138
SUMMARY	228

INTRODUCTION

The intersection of language and politics is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that has found expression in the concept of political discourse. This concept is characterized by ongoing development and has been subject to various interpretations, one of which regards political communication as equivalent to political discourse. Among the various forms of political discourse, oral political discourse, which encompasses political debates, has gained particular attention among linguists due to its extensive use of diverse communication and speech techniques. Furthermore, scholars have focused on the dynamic nature of political discourse and its evolution from positive to negative campaigning over the years, which is especially evident in the American presidential debates. In this regard, political thought and actions are inextricably linked with political communication, and the use of specific communicative means and techniques, known as "communication strategies" and "communication tactics", is critical for politicians to achieve their communicative objectives and goals.

Notably, communication strategies and tactics play a crucial role in maintaining power, promoting ideas, and influencing public opinion. With the steady development of political communication and the genre of political debates in the United States, various strategies and tactics have emerged, which are employed by politicians to exert their power on the audience. As such, it is essential to identify which communication strategies and tactics have an impact on the public's perception of politicians and assist them in winning political battles. Electoral campaigns provide an ultimate environment for politicians to demonstrate their strategic and tactical prowess, and studying their deployment of these techniques is therefore critical in understanding the role of speech and language in the political arena.

The theoretical core of this research includes the publications of foreign and domestic scholars: Arutiunova N. D., Chilton P., Dijk van T., Fairclough N., Issers O.S., Kondratenko N., Leeuwen T., Levinson S., Parshina O.M., Tannen D., Sheigal E. I., Wodak R.

Given the significant influence of the United States' political arena on the global economy and politics, considerable attention is devoted to the presidential campaigns and the race for the presidency in America. Of particular significance are the 1960 and 2020 electoral campaigns, which are widely considered to be historical and transformative events that have had a profound impact on the world. The 1960 debates were the first televised presidential debates and had a profound effect on the way presidential campaigns were conducted. Conversely, the 2020 debates were marked by non-normative behaviour, and have been described by some as the worst in the history of presidential debates. Given the central role of language in the political arena and its potential to sway voters, a comprehensive analysis of the communication strategies and tactics employed by political candidates is critical to understanding the causes of electoral victory or defeat.

The present thesis investigates the communication strategies and tactics employed by Richard Nixon and John Kennedy in the first televised presidential debate of 1960, and by Donald Trump and Joe Biden in the first televised presidential debate of 2020. As a critical juncture in the election process, these debates set the tone for the entire campaign and play a crucial role in shaping the public's perception of the candidates. The research focuses on the strategies of self-representation, opponent discredit, and theatricality, which are key elements in the creation of a candidate's image, as perceived by potential voters, who ultimately determine the outcome of the election.

Through the analysis of the impact of strategic-tactic employment on voter perception, the research also examines the linguistic personalities of American political figures from different historical periods, contributing to a better understanding of individual communication styles of politicians and its modifications over the century. Overall, this study aims to shed light on the importance of communication strategies and tactics in the electoral process and their potential impact on the voters' perception of 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 over the years.

The **aim** of this paper is to investigate the communication strategies and tactics of the presidential candidates of the 1960 elections, Richard Nixon and John Kennedy, and the presidential candidates of the 2020 elections, 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 investigate the classification of genres within oral political discourse;
- to define the most salient features of the genre of a political debate;
- 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 first 1960 televised presidential debate used by Richard Nixon and John Kennedy;
- to analyse the implementation of communication strategies and tactics in the first 2020 televised presidential debate used by Donald Trump and Joe Biden.

The **object** of the thesis is the communication strategies and tactics of Richard Nixon and John Kennedy, based on the first 1960 televised presidential debate, and the communication strategies and tactics of Donald Trump and Joe Biden, based on the first 2020 televised presidential debate.

The **subject** of the diploma paper is the language of Richard Nixon and John Kennedy, Donald Trump and Joe Biden.

The **research material** consists of the transcripts of the first 1960 presidential debate, held on September 26, 1960, and the first 2020 presidential debate, held on September 29, 2020.

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 thesis presents the analysis of communication strategies and tactics implemented during the televised presidential debates and their modifications in the span of 100 years.

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 is composed of 226 pages and three parts. The first part includes the theoretical background of political discourse and its typology, the notion of the genre of political debates, 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 American televised presidential debates of 1960 and 2020 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 science, the discourse is at the centre 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 [35, 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 [8, p. 64]. He adheres to the idea that discourse has processional character, and utterance is the individual transformation of language into discourse [8, p.135].

From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, the 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 [11, 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 [33, 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's interaction and the mechanisms of their consciousness; it is a speech with the deep roots in people's life [2, 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 above-mentioned 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 [50, 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 [45, p.8]. While discussing such close interconnection of the language and politics, we are likely to refer to the term "political discourse" which can be seen as a tool for the analysis of political language, and to some extent, of the relationships between language and politics [19]. The term political discourse is extremely broad and, therefore, can refer to a range of various types of talk and text [87]. The consideration of this peculiarity of the term may lead us to the conclusion that political discourse can be analysed from several points of view: of political science,

linguistics, sociopsycholinguistics and from the point of view of individual hermeneutics [14, p. 34]. Therefore, political discourse analysis entails content, task and form analysis of discourse which appears in specific situations of a political life [41].

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 such concepts as “language of politics”, “political language”, “political communication” [15, pp. 30-32]. 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 [38, p. 139]. O. Sheigal suggests that the concepts “language of politics”, “political communication” and “political discourse” are usually interrelated. That’s why she equals the terms “political discourse” and “political communication”, and considers “language of politics” to be a structured collection of signs which create a semiotic area for political discourse [38, p.99]. K. Serazhym presents a generalised definition of the term where political discourse is the text created by the situation of political communication [30, p.240].

As for the interrelation of political discourse, social context and power relations, N. Fairclough argues that political discourse is a site of struggle, where different groups and individuals compete to shape public opinion and decision-making. It suggests that political discourse is a tool for maintaining or challenging existing power relations. Therefore, political discourse should be studied in its social context, including the relationships among people, institutions, and other social factors [58, pp. 265-269]. T. Van Dijk adds that political discourse is used to reproduce and maintain power relations in society. He argues that it is important to analyse the ways in which language is used to reproduce and maintain these power relations

[91, pp. 249-283]. E. Goffman, a sociologist, also suggests that politicians often use discourse to create a certain impression or identity of themselves, which can influence public opinion. For example, he has studied the ways in which politicians use language and non-verbal cues to present themselves as trustworthy, charismatic, or in control [71].

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. We also believe that political language used within this type of discourse exerts an influence on the formation of public opinion and the actions a society undertakes under this influence. This approach appears to be more restricted, as in the process of political discourse it is the political language which we study, i.e. the primary focus is on aspects of language structure since it displays specific political functions [87].

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 [46]. 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 [92, 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 [60]. Teun A. van Dijk has written extensively on the extralingual nature of political discourse, arguing that political discourse is shaped by the institutional and power structures within which it takes place [4].

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 generalised in the key concepts of this institution, in particular, functioning of political discourse as a power [18]. 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 [38, 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. It must be also noted that political discourse is not solely determined by institutional structures, but also influenced by factors such as social, economic and cultural conditions. This means that political discourse cannot be fixed or determined by institutions as it is always changing based on the context and the society [56].

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 phantomisation fideism, remoteness, authoritarianism and dynamism [38, 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 [22, p.15]. Many recent studies underline the unyielding emotional charge of political discourse and therefore the application of theatricality which is mainly achieved with the help of emotive language or non-verbal cues. For instance, creating a sense of fear or urgency, even when it is not warranted, and the use of props or gestures to create a sense of authenticity or authority. Additionally, they highlight the significance of emotions in determining the effectiveness of political speeches, particularly during election campaigns [48].

We tend to single out the following features of political discourse that we consider to be 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 classification of political discourse is analysed with a help of different approaches by Ukrainian and foreign linguists. For N. Kondratenko, it is important to consider form (oral or written), the function of an addresser (a direct addresser and a mediated one), 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 [23, pp. 12-13].

O. Kovalova provides the classification of political discourse based on the type of communicative interaction, i.e. agonizing (debates) and harmonizing (a New Year greeting of a president) [21, pp.101-107]. 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 [43]. 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 as monologue types of oral political discourse and an interview, a press-conference and debates as dialogue ones.

The concept of "discourse" has been widely used in fields such as linguistics, philosophy, and political science. It generally refers to speech communication that involves critical consideration of values, norms, and rules of social life. Political discourse refers to the use of language in a political situation. Language plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion and maintaining societal power relations. Our research focuses on the extralingual nature, interactivity, thematisation, assertion of political actors' interests, emotionality, and theatricality of political discourse. We will examine oral political discourse genres, namely the genre of debates. Our perspective is that political discourse is influenced by social, economic, and cultural conditions, rather than solely determined by institutional structures.

1.2. Televised debates as a speech genre in American political discourse

There are a number of factors and approaches for genre classification of oral and written texts in political discourse, although 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. Besides, it is critical to point out that a genre is a reflection and reinforcement of power, which is manifested in how they reflect its user's values and practices. Therefore, they cannot be neutral and usually reinforce the power structures that exist in the community within which they are used [66]. In the case of political discourse, it is not purely the influence of a community, but a political party and its beliefs to a greater extent. All those factors predetermine the problem of language genre division and description of their characteristic features in political discourse.

The study of political genres is grounded on Bakhtin's investigation of speech genres. Ukrainian and foreign researchers attempted to work out the typology of genres: for example, N. Arutiunova [2], F. Batsevych [7], N. Fairclough [57], N. Kondratenko [22], O. Sheigal [38]. 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 [9, pp. 152–155].

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. E. Laclau and C. Mouffe, who developed the concept of "agonistic democracy," argue that rituals play an important role in creating a sense of community and solidarity among political groups, and that they help to express and reinforce the values and beliefs of a political movement [78]. 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 above-mentioned ones and are expressed in a form of a slogan, political speech and leaflets [22, pp. 19-21].

The considerable scope of political talk and texts can be referred to as agonally-argued or adversarial language genres which are the ways for the expression of verbal aggression, they are marked by a high emotive degree and expressiveness. In presidential election debates, election speeches, electoral meetings, the element of competition is exemplified in the most explicit manner, while the participants endeavour to occupy the post of a president. It implies that the performance of presidential candidates in this verbal political competition might be decisive for the future course of action [3,pp.14-16]. Besides, its features affect the lingual organisation of speech, for example, the frequent use of lexical items with pejorative, invective and similar semantics is characteristic of the verbal behaviour of a speaker whose intentions are to gain electoral advantage.

Having analysed the goal and functioning of the agitation and agonally-argued language genres, we conclude that the televised presidential debate that is characteristic of American political discourse appropriates characteristics of both types discussed. The genre can be defined as a genre of political discourse, a clearly structured and organised format of public communicative interaction between, as a rule, two (rarely three or more) communicators who are persons or represent persons running for a certain electoral position. The televised election debate commonly represents a mixture of well-structured and well-presented argumentation that seems to have been prepared beforehand, and impromptu argumentation originating from the need to cope with the interactional dynamics [94].

As Y. Ivanova outlines, the dialogue between opponents within the genre maintains a rigid structure prescribed by the system of rules regarding its temporal structure. The basis of such communication that can accelerate the win of a candidate lies in the effective verbal influence on an audience and productive opposition [67].

Even though one of the objectives of presidential debates is to inform and educate about candidates' key ideas, political programmes, attitude to all the spheres of life of a society, this communication is predominately focused on the agitation in order to assert a direct influence on the audience. Frequently, positive self-representation and negative opponent's presentation are involved while debates are being held. The

degree of competitiveness and therefore emotiveness of a presidential debate is remarkable nowadays compared to the 20th century, when the first teledebate of the US presidential candidates took place. As for other peculiarities of the genre which is in the centre of our research, persuasiveness and argumentation have to be outlined, which are expressed in a balanced and carefully presented content of the election process with its inherent significant manipulative intentions [69, pp.180-187]. Besides, this genre of political discourse is characterised by communicative rivalry or agony - a mode of communication where each of the communicators, with the help of their communicative strategies and tactics, seeks to gain an advantage over their opponent in order to convince the electorate that they are an ideal candidate for the corresponding post [16, pp.34-40]. E. Goffman has studied the role of impression management in social interactions and has argued that debaters use various tactics to present themselves in a favourable light, such as "face-work" and "face-saving" strategies [62]. Furthermore, the role of framing in political debates was analysed by R. Entman, who suggested that politicians use framing to create a narrative that supports their position and discredits the opposing view [53]. According to Chilton, presidential debate involves references to political context and historical events that are identified by the audience. The purpose of these debates is to showcase the views and aspirations of the candidates [47].

Apart from the above-mentioned features of political discourse genres and a genre of televised debate, in particular, 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 institutionalised 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) [57, p.32].

Our research is predominantly concerned with the genre related to the system of politics and the public sphere of communication, since presidential candidates directly appeal to the mass addressee, i.e. addressers and a moderator express their political beliefs considering the fact that the messages they exchange are primarily however indirectly addressed to the public [24].

Agitation and agonally-argued language genres and its varieties are in the centre of our research. Presidential debate as a genre variety belongs to oral genres of political discourse and is aimed at indirect communication with the electorate, while politicians are having a moderated strictly structured and well-organised exchange about their would-be presidential intentions, plans and policies. Addresses cannot be fully prepared in advance, as the genre involves answering questions raised on the spot. Nevertheless, candidates are likely to have an introduction and a closing note written for them beforehand. The primary goal of the genre is not only to exert a verbal impact on an audience, but also to be capable of withstanding and reacting to the opponent's verbal attack. The theoretical framework for the nature of the televised debate genre that is at the centre of our research serves a fundamental role for our further analysis which will shed light on the communication strategies and tactics employed in this particular genre type.

1.3. Communication strategies and tactics in American political discourse

The concept of discourse in American culture is of considerable importance, this significance is even increasing, especially in the political life of the country. It is the most prevalent in the office of presidency. Starting with the 20th-century presidency, it tends to embrace more and more rhetorical and oratorical as its primary features every decade. Beginning with Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, rhetorical presidency, known as a style of governing that relies heavily on public discourse and whose rhetoric equals action, acted as a standard for future presidents and presidential candidates [60].

While analysing a political discourse of a certain country, it is crucial not to disregard its cultural, historical and national peculiarities as they usually directly impact such a branch of social life as politics. The political structure, economic conditions, the nature of vertical power (between the ruling class and ordinary citizens) are the first elements to consider. Thus, the United States is characterised by political pluralism and mixed forms of mass communication institutions. The structure and functioning of mass media in America and in American political discourse, in particular, is the subject of extensive public debate [27].

In addition, there is a very wide range of expectations from society in relation to the ruling class. Therefore, it presupposes that American political discourse possesses the high level of positivity which appears due to the patriotism and pride (they, as a result, generate confidence and relaxing, positive attitudes) of American citizens in regard to their country [36]. One of the instances of their positivity as a symbol of assertiveness is a smile which politicians are likely to wear even in such stressful settings as a presidential debate. The next feature of American political discourse which Batalov E. Y. describes is its competitive character, since politics is always a battle between a ruling party and opposition [5]. The organization of the American political discourse has an axiological nature. The most important to an American citizen value concepts have a significant impact on their cognitive system. The main characteristic features of American people are actualized in the following nationally marked concepts of American political discourse: individualism, freedom, prosperity, American promise/spirit/dream, democracy, equality, nationalism, patriotism, security, etc. Apparently, the system of values of American nation also has a changeable character and to a great extent depends on the economic, social, political conditions and events in the country. This nature of American political discourse was especially notable on the onset of Covid-19 pandemic since one of the predominant value back then became healthcare system for American society and everyone was anxiously waiting for the political response to the event [59]. Whilst analysing American political discourse, we also have to ponder the fact that the population of the US is a mix of multiethnic, religious, racial, class and status, gender groups. The

division of these diverse groupings has been gradually healing over the years, at least on the surface, however it had its implications on the institute of politics in the previous century and definitely has nowadays [93, pp. 5-29]. Thus, it leads to so-called polarization of American society, one more peculiarity characteristic of the American political discourse which is extremely vivid during presidential campaigns when a Democratic candidate tries to win more red states and their competitor from the Republican Party fights for blue ones. It has to be highlighted that the process of polarization of society is widely echoed in the rhetoric of those who run for the post of the US president. Looking back to 1960 when the first teledebaten made its debut, we can notice the increasing trend of American presidential candidates more actively engaging in voicing polarizing ideas since then [95]. Apparently, negative campaigning and uncivil language have also been gaining their momentum in the nowadays' political world, and the amount of it has been increasing with each and every campaign cycle [51]. Negative campaigning includes negative advertising of one's opponent or opposing party in mass media, as well as negative references and commentary in speeches and interviews of politicians. Hence, the comparison of the first televised debates in 1960 and those in the 21st century shows that they have lost its intelligent and civil nature and are constantly becoming full of nastiness and evasions [75, pp. 437-455].

This brief description of the essence of American political arena and discourse, in particular, will be useful for our research while classifying communication strategies and tactics in presidential campaigning of the analysed time periods, namely 1960 and 2021, the first televised debate and the last one for the time being, respectively. Before proceeding with the analysis of the concepts such a communication strategy and a communication tactic, it can be summarised that characteristics of American political discourse include: positivity for keeping the morale of American voters high and playing up to their patriotic mood, however, the degree of it tends to fluctuate every new cycle of a presidential campaign, competitive character which seems to be rocketing every year and, therefore, leads to the overuse of negative campaigning, polarizing and uncivil language, the emphasis put on the values cherished by

American society is enormous, however, they are also in the process of changing and shifting in compliance with history.

As we have already understood, the communicative interaction in political discourse involves singling out the specific ways of the communicative intention realisation, intention through particular models of behaviour of participants in political communication. Thus, the concepts of a communication strategy and a communication tactic has to be brought about in our discussion.

Communication 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: D. Tannen [86], O. Issers [17], O. Parshina [28], R. Wodak [97], T. van Dijk [90, 91], V. Leeuwen [72]. The two interrelated concepts “communication strategy” and “communication 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 “communication strategy” and “communication 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 communication 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 [38]. 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 the illocutionary and communicative intentions of a speaker to achieve the specific goal of communication [7, p.119].

T. van Dijk characterizes communication strategy as “the property of cognitive plans” [11, p. 272]. The cognitive plans represent “the general organization of some sequence of actions and include the purpose or purposes of interaction” [11, p. 274].

O.S. Issers suggests that a communication 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 [17, p. 100]. According to the linguist, a communication 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 communication strategy, and it is not realized by communicators, but can be decoded by them later [86, p. 47]. Therefore, in agreement with the interpretations mentioned above, we deal with a communication 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 communication strategy is a combination of verbal and non-verbal techniques and methods for problem-solving of communicative interaction [13, pp. 114-115].

Thus, we can conclude that a communication 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 communication 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 communication 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 [25, p.139]. They do not correspond with the communicative purpose but with the set of separate communicative intentions.

As for the interrelation of communication strategies and tactics, a speaker puts forward a communicative purpose and, while following certain communicative intentions, employs or creates a communication strategy which will be transformed into appropriate communication tactics. Thus, a speech tactic is the certain stage of communication strategy fulfilment. Altogether, they undertake and accomplish the specific speech task and purpose of a particular stage of communicative process.

As political communication is directly aimed at maintaining power, 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. In the field of our interest is a more specific area, namely the classification of communication strategies and tactics in American political discourse in the 20th and the 21st century. As we have discerned some differences in the analysed discourse type in the mentioned time periods, we consider it to be significant to observe how and with which frequency the same communication strategies and tactics are used in the first and the last teledebates in the US.

As research approaches to communication strategies and tactics within political discourse differ (with some linguists providing detailed classifications into communication strategies and tactics based on various criteria and others creating dichotomies), we will look into different categorisations in order to define the most prevalent strategies and tactics in the American political discourse in the 20th-21st centuries.

While dwelling on the concept of political discourse and political ideology, in general, T. Van Dijk categorizes strategies based on polarization between the “we” group and the “they” group. He puts an emphasis on a polarized structure of ideologies, which is manifested in the competition between ingroups (“we”) and outgroups (“they”) members. As a result, two main discursive strategies are outlined:

the strategy of positive self-representation and negative other-presentation. Such a classification implies that all good things are associated with the ingroup of a speaker and all opposing things are employed for the enemy description and representation. In his research, T. Van Dijk selects various categories (e.g. actor description, authority, comparison etc.) to exemplify the usage of the above-mentioned strategies within a specific category. The categories provided in the linguist's analysis may occasionally coincide with communication tactics other scientists delineate as tactics used exclusively within the positive self-representation and negative other-presentation strategies [90].

R. Wodak's idea that "the discursive construction of 'us' and 'them' is the fundamentals of discourses of identity and difference" supports the discussed classification in discursive strategies of positive self and negative other presentation [99]. As for the discursive strategy classification proposed by Wodak, it consists of the referential nomination strategy (the speaker's intent to categorize people into ingroup and out-group), the prediction strategy (the intention of speakers to describe social actors negatively and positively), the argumentation strategy (justification of the actions a speaker is to be held accountable for), the perspectivisation (the attempt of a speaker to engage with their audience), and the intensification strategy (used to reveal the moment when a speaker intends to produce utterances implicitly or explicitly) [96, 97, 98].

According to P. Chilton, there are some strategic functions that can be revealed in the usage of certain linguistic expressions employed within political discourse. He speaks of coercion strategies that are actions responsible for compelling addressees to act in a way that otherwise they would not have chosen. The scholar points out that the strategy is not fully linguistic, though, but may depend on the speaker's resources and power. Then, Chilton mentions the concepts of legitimisation and delegitimisation which are the basis for the strategies of delegitimisation (of the other) and legitimisation (of the self). Thus, delegitimisation can be expressed "in acts of negative other-presentation, acts of blaming, scape-goating, marginalising, excluding, attacking the moral character of some individual or group, attacking the

communicative cooperation of the other, attacking the rationality and sanity of the other”. On the other hand, legitimisation is in charge of “positive self-presentation, manifesting itself in acts of self-praise, self-apology, self-explanation, self-justification, self-identification as a source of authority, reason, vision and sanity”. The self part here is either an individual or the group the individual identifies themselves with. The last strategies, which are tightly interconnected with the above-mentioned ones in practice, are those of representation and misrepresentation. Their goal is to limit the truth and defocus addressees with the help of incorporating euphemisms, omissions, verbal evasion or denial into language while delivering information [47].

Van Leeuwen also postulates a set of five categories that is grounded on the phenomenon of legitimisation in discourse. He defines four main categories of legitimisation: authorization (reference to authority figures or tradition), moral evaluation (reference to a value system), rationalization (references to goals and uses of institutionalized social action) and mythopoesis (narratives that reward legitimate actions). Having analysed the theoretical framework proposed by Leeuwen, we can claim that the notion of “category” in the research conducted by foreign linguists directly correlates with the notion of “tactic” we discuss in our paper, since a tactic is the employment of concrete linguistic means and techniques. It is significant to highlight that the categories of legitimisation can appear separately or in combination and might be used for both purposes, namely for legitimising and delegitimising, i.e. criticizing [72].

O. Mikhaleva considers the classification that is based on the “we-they” opposition to be prevalent in political discourse. The linguist distinguishes the lowering strategy which reduces the importance of the opponent’s status and the elevating strategy which increases the significance of the speaker’s status. However, she also is of the opinion that the audience has to be brought to “the game” and a politician has to exert an influence on the public while implementing the strategy of theatricality. Mikhaleva provides a more thorough analysis of the linguistic means of influence in political

discourse and therefore singles out a number of tactics that are sub-categories of the strategies proposed.

As for the lowering strategy, it is realised with the help of the analysis - “minus” tactic (a fact-based analysis of a situation that is followed with the expression of a negative attitude to the actions and actors involved), the accusation tactic (the process of criticising an opponent and revealing one’s drawbacks, bad intentions), the impersonal accusation tactic (accusation without mentioning the perpetrators of criticised actions and deeds), the exposure tactic (disclosure of facts and arguments that represent one’s guilt), and the insulting tactic (insulting and humiliation of an opponent, accompanied by the expression of the emotions instead of providing evidence).

The elevating strategy also consists of numerous tactics which are analysis - “plus” (a fact-based analysis of a situation that involves an implicit positive attitude to the situation and actors), the presentation tactic (a positive representation of something/someone), the tactic of implicit self-representation, the tactic of deflecting criticism (providing arguments and/or facts to explain certain actions and deeds to prove innocence), and self-justification tactic (a denial of negative statements towards oneself).

The last strategy outlined by O.L. Mikhaleva is the theatricality strategy. 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 [38, pp. 92-96]. Thus, there is always a recipient of information, at whom politicians, in our case political candidates, aim their speeches and performances. The following strategy includes a great number of tactics: the tactic of prompting (a call to action, accepting a 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). Having studied the detailed classification proposed by the scholar, it is noteworthy to mention that some of the strategy sub-categories, i.e. tactics, are very close in their meaning and function, so they can be grouped together. For instance, the presentation tactic and the tactic of positive self-representation are quite similar in their essence, with the first tactic being more general and broad in meaning so that it can include the second tactic as its sub-category.

Professor O. Parshina classifies strategies and tactics within political discourse according to the goal of political subjects. Hence, the strategy of self-representation, the discredit strategy, the manipulative strategy, the self-defence strategy, the information-interpretation strategy, the strategy of the formation of the addressee's emotional mood, the agitational and argumentative strategies are suggested as the principal ones depending on the goal of political communication. Each strategy encompasses an array of tactics that can be employed as concrete linguistic techniques in one or another communicative situation of political discourse.

The predominant objective of the self-representation strategy is the image-building of a speaker. The tactics with the help of which this strategy is employed can be divided into three types: the tactic of identification or relating oneself to somebody, the solidarity tactic (establishing contact and developing trust between a speaker and audience by highlighting common interests and values), the tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something, the tactic of the negative image neutralization, the tactic of hypertrophying the "I-topic", the tactic of emphasising positive information, etc.

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 pursuit, the following tactics are used: the tactic of accusation (exposing) and the tactic of offence (humiliation and ridicule of the opposition).

The manipulative strategy is used to deceptively convince the addressee to support the speaker's position by means of different discursive techniques, despite the inability to provide a factual or logical argumentation. The tactics covered by the strategy are quite numerous: falsification of facts, information limitation, exaggeration, lies, the shift of emphasis, the substitution of concepts, half-truths, false analogies, etc.

The strategy of self-defence is implemented through the tactics of justification, denial (refuting negative appraisals and expressing one's position), criticism of the opponent's position, reproach, etc.

In the information-interpretation strategy, information is delivered from one specific perspective, in a certain interpretation that is advantageous for a speaker. To this strategy belong the tactic of recognizing the existence of a problem, the tactic of emphasizing positive information, the tactic of clarification, the tactic of commenting, consideration of the problem from another perspective, and the tactic of indicating ways to solve the problem.

The strategy of the formation of the emotional mood of the addressee is implemented mainly with the use of tactics of unity, appeal to the emotions of the addressee, and tactics of consideration of moral or spiritual values of the addressee (appeal to the value system of society).

Regarding the argumentative strategy, it is employed in the speeches of political discourse predominantly with the assistance of the tactic of reasonable assessment, the tactic of contrastive analysis (comparison of facts, events, results, forecasts), the tactic of indicating the perspective (forecasting the development of events), the tactic of illustration (the use of specific facts and examples). The agitation strategy is a variety of the argumentative strategy. Its goal is to wield an influence on listeners in order to encourage them to take a certain action. Within this strategy, both

argumentative tactics and specific tactics of promise and calling to action are used [28].

In general, the overview of theoretical material demonstrates that the classifications of the scholars echo one another to some extent, with some linguists adhering to more precise and detailed categorisation and others adopting a dichotomous approach. Furthermore, from one theoretical perspectives, the division of communication strategies into a specific set of tactics is provided, whilst, from other viewpoints, more abstract division in the form of categories is proposed.

As our research concerns the analysis of communication strategies throughout the variable of time (the first and the last televised presidential debates of the US), we find it viable to focus on three principal communication strategies that consistently prevail in global political discourse and in American political discourse, in particular. However, the current study will not adhere to a concrete selection of communication tactics since they may vary substantially for every historical period and political actor. On the contrary, while perusing the debate speeches of presidential candidates, we will be wary of the unique linguistic techniques and means employed by political actors within one or another communication strategy.

We find legitimization and delegitimization to be quite salient features in the political discourse of the US. With the increasing polarization between the two parties, i.e. Republican and Democratic parties, the constitution of the “we” and “they” groups commonly takes precedence in the American political discourse [74]. Politicians accomplish this linguistically through an array of tactics and techniques which may vary depending on various factors such as a genre, communicative goal, audience, value system, setting, etc. Hence, our research will take into account the strategy of positive-self representation which implies an exclusively positive portrayal of oneself through a great variety of tactics such as the tactic of identification or relating oneself to somebody (especially an authority figure), the tactic of the positive image creation, self-explanation, self-justification, etc.

We will also trace how the strategy of an opponent discredit is applied by American politicians in the political discourse since this strategy stands in opposition

to the positive self-representation strategy and is a manifestation of the delegitimization phenomenon that is a frequent feature of the political discourse outlined by scholars. Similarly, the opponent discredit strategy can have different forms of implementation such as attacking of a political opponent, the tactic of accusation and the tactic of offence (humiliation and ridicule of the opposition), the tactic of exposure, etc. While analysing the American presidential debates, we will concentrate on arguments or argumentation schemes, linguistic structures and rhetorical devices used to justify, legitimize and naturalize the exclusion, discrimination or demonization of others.

The last communication strategy that we find logical to single out while analysing the US presidential debates is the theatricality strategy. The given strategy can be fulfilled with the help of a countless number of linguistic means and tactics to make the performance of a presidential candidate efficient and for it to have a long-lasting influence on the potential voters. As we have mentioned before, the presidential campaigns in the US is well-thought and planned plays to the crowd that have an important role in shaping the images of politicians. Which tactics are employed within the strategy is largely dependent on the context of the debate as well as the personalities of the two candidates. However, undoubtedly, a certain amount of theatricality is inevitable in the TV debate if candidates want to hold the attention of the viewers to their persona. It will be of interest for our research to analyse and compare how the theatricality strategy is deployed just at the beginning of TV debating and almost a century after, and whether the discussed strategy performs a crucial or secondary role during such a political discourse event as televised presidential debates.

Conclusion

The concept of political discourse is rooted in the intersection of language and politics and has been analysed from multiple perspectives, including political science, linguistics, sociopsycholinguistics, and individual hermeneutics. This study focuses on political discourse from a linguistic standpoint. While there are various

interpretations of political discourse, we contend that it is synonymous with the language of politics and political communication, rather than a distinct phenomenon. Additionally, we assert that political discourse is closely linked to the social context and is employed to maintain power relations through language and other factors. Despite its ambiguity, there are distinctive characteristics of political discourse, such as its extralinguistic nature, interactivity between addresser and addressee, thematization of political realities, assertion of political actors' interests, emotionality, and theatricality. The classification of political discourse is based on form, function of the addresser, goal, addressee factor, sphere of functioning, and type of communicative interaction. It is crucial to recognize that political discourse can overlap with other discourse types. This study concentrates on oral political discourse, which encompasses genres such as political speeches, appeals to the public, official statements, interviews with politicians, press conferences, and debates - the genre at the heart of our analysis.

The classification of genres within political discourse is a continually evolving and adapting field, influenced by various factors such as the goals, motives, and functions of political language, as well as the desire to exert power and influence on potential recipients. Several linguists have examined the nature of information distribution when classifying language genres in political discourse, leading to the identification of several genre groups, including phatic, informative, presentation and image, ritual, agitation, and agonally-argued ones.

In this study, we have observed that the genre of American televised presidential debate belongs to the combination of agitation and agonally-argued categories, characterized by the element of verbal competition and the frequent use of lexical items with pejorative and invective semantics. The primary objective of this genre is to gain an electoral advantage, a common goal of agitation language genres. The salient features of this genre are its persuasiveness, argumentation, manipulative nature, and communicative agony. Therefore, our research will focus on these above-mentioned features of the genre.

Upon analyzing communication strategies and tactics used in American political discourse, our findings indicate that the political structure, economic conditions, and nature of vertical power are some of the factors that shape the discourse in the United States. The discourse is characterized by high levels of positivity, patriotism, competitiveness, axiology, and polarization. Moreover, we observe a shift from dialectic to rhetoric and from positive to negative campaigning in recent decades, which we will explore further in subsequent chapters by examining televised presidential debates from 1960 and 2020.

We define communication strategies as schemes or plans of speech acts that aim to achieve specific goals and intentions in a politician-audience monologue or dialogue. Speech tactics facilitate this process and can be described as concrete rhetoric means or techniques. Our research identifies three primary communication strategies within the US political discourse: self-representation, discredit, and theatricality. Although various tactics exist, we do not limit our analysis to specific communication tactics, but rather focus on unique rhetorical means and techniques employed by politicians. By interpreting verbal signals, we aim to determine which strategies have positive or negative impacts on politicians' general images, how audiences react to different strategies, and the authenticity of the information conveyed.

Our study also explores differences between political discourses and communication strategies in two distinct time periods: the first televised presidential debate in 1960 and the most recent presidential debate in 2020. Our theoretical generalizations about American political discourse, including its features, typology, genres, functions, communication strategies, and tactics, serve as the foundation for the practical portion of our research.

II. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN THE AMERICAN DEBATES

1960

Politics is a multidimensional field that encompasses various activities aimed at exerting influence on society. In order to achieve their objectives, politicians employ a wide range of strategies and tactics. These methods of influence can take various forms of implementation, with the most fundamental being the use of speech as a means of persuasion. Political debates, particularly those conducted through televised mediums, are a genre within the field of political communication in which the speech of a political candidate plays a significant role in shaping the trajectory of events. In these events of political discourse, candidates must demonstrate their leadership capabilities and persuade the electorate to support them by strategically implementing various communication techniques during their interactions with opponents. Overall, it is a rhetoric way for gaining power.

As a result, it is of scholarly interest for our research to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the communication strategies employed during two seminal political events in American society: the first televised presidential debate of 1960 between Kennedy and Nixon, and the most recent presidential debate of 2020 between Trump and Biden. The transcripts of these events will be thoroughly examined to identify the primary communication strategies employed by politicians from different eras and to discern any significant changes in political candidates' rhetoric over time.

2.1 Reason and logic as a component of Richard Nixon's communication strategies during the first presidential debates 1960

On September 26, 1960, a significant event in American political history occurred: the first presidential debate was broadcast live on television and viewed by a large portion of the American population. It is estimated that approximately 70 million Americans, or 60% of the adult population, tuned in to observe the impact of this new medium on the election outcome. It is commonly believed that the visual modality, such as appearance, non-verbal language, clothing, and setting, played a significant

role in Kennedy's perceived advantage over Nixon during the debate [63]. In our study, we will focus specifically on the linguistic aspect, disregarding the visual component. Specifically, we will conduct a comprehensive analysis of the language usage of Richard M. Nixon, the Vice President at the time, during his interactions with his opponent and discussion of domestic policy matters, the topic of the debate. The language means employed by R. Nixon on September 26, 1960 during the First Kennedy-Nixon presidential debate in Chicago will undergo the strategic analysis to identify the unique characteristics of the following strategies:

- 1) **the strategy of positive self-representation;**
- 2) **the strategy of opponent discredit;**
- 3) **the strategy of theatricality.**

The linguistic style employed by Richard Nixon, a Republican representative, was characterized by an emphasis on reason and logic, as evidenced by the use of complex vocabulary, formal grammar, and lengthy sentence structures. Nixon's discourse focused on issues rather than personalities, and adopted a defensive and reserved rhetoric, as opposed to an aggressive and irrational one. In his debate statements, Nixon emphasized his own experience and presented his opponent, Senator John F. Kennedy, as being inexperienced [81].

The first communication strategy on which we will dwell in our analysis is **the strategy of positive self-representation** that is quite salient in the remarks made by R. Nixon as the answers to his rival. Nixon sought to present himself as a mature, capable, and experienced statesman in order to contrast with Kennedy, who was perceived as being younger and less experienced. This self-presentation strategy was primarily employed by the Republican candidate for the purpose of self-defence and self-explanation. Additionally, Nixon occasionally used this strategy to emphasize his perceived superiority over Kennedy. A variety of tactics were employed within this strategy, and we will delve into them in further detail in the following paragraphs [44].

The tactic of positive image creation of oneself within the strategy of self-representation can be observed in the opening statement delivered by Richard Nixon.

It is noteworthy that as the Republican candidate was the second to present his opening statement, there was a clear urgency to protect his reputation in front of the electorate. This can be seen in the following statement, where Nixon attempts to enhance his image through the use of contrasting statements: *We heard tonight, for example, the statement made that our growth in national product last year was the lowest of any industrial nation in the world. Now last year, of course, was 1958. That happened to be a recession year. But when we look at the growth of G.N.P. this year, a year of recovery, we find that it's six and nine-tenths per cent and one of the highest in the world today. More about that later.* This utterance illustrates the employment of the tactic of positive image creation, as well as the tactic of informing. Nixon responds to Kennedy's accusations by highlighting that despite negative outcomes in the previous year, the presidential administration of which he is a part has been able to address the issues and contribute to the country's recovery. Nixon employs the rhetorical device of antithesis, utilizing the phrases "the lowest" and "the highest" to convey that it was also his accomplishment to bring about the highest Gross National Product (G.N.P.). In this statement, Nixon provides a significant amount of specific information, including a year and percentages, indicating that he is not solely engaging in self-praise, but rather supporting his claims with logical arguments.

It is quite a rare thing to find in the speeches of modern politicians, but it is a salient characteristic of the statements made by R. Nixon. By that feature we mean the use of the pronoun "we" rather than "I" while establishing the positive image of oneself. He mentions a plethora of positive things which had been done on behalf of the Eisenhower Administration, where Nixon was a Vice President, in various spheres of society such as education, health care, national security and other domestic issues. The following excerpt demonstrates the peculiarity: *Let's take schools. We have built more schools in these last seven and a half years than we built in the previous seven and a half, for that matter in the previous twenty years. Let's take hydroelectric power. We have developed more hydroelectric power in these seven and a half years than was developed in any previous administration in history. Let us take hospitals. We find that more have been built in this Administration than in the*

previous Administration. In addition, the Vice President uses the rhetorical technique of repetition to emphasize the significant impact of the Eisenhower Administration and his own contributions to the prosperity of the United States. Furthermore, the Vice President employs the use of comparative degree, specifically the adverb "more", to contrast the achievements of previous administrations with those of the current administration, further emphasizing the magnitude of their accomplishments.

Once in the candidate opening remarks he directly opposes his image to the one of his opponent, saying: *I think that the means that I advocate will reach that goal better than the means that he advocates.* The statement in question serves as a conclusion to the assertions given above and highlights the importance of the speaker's role in the policymaking and improvement processes. The use of comparative degree, specifically the adverb "better", implies a comparison between two distinct courses of action or, more specifically, between the speaker and their opponent. This serves to present a positive image of the speaker by contrasting their own actions with those of their opponent, a common strategy in American political discourse where a division between an inner and outer circle is present. The use of pronouns, specifically "I" and "he," further emphasizes this contrast and implies that the opponent belongs to the latter group. In addition, later in the analysis, we will notice that it is always "we" for Nixon when voting and leadership are concerned and "I" when it comes actually to providing and carrying out programmes to benefit the "we [44].

Later in the course of debate, we can encounter another instance of Nixon's positive image creation forced by the urge to save his face and reputation and withstand his rival's accusations: *Through the years I have sat in the National Security Council. I have been in the cabinet. I have met with the legislative leaders. I have met with the President when he made the great decisions with regard to Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, other matters. The President has asked for my advice. I have given it.* In this particular case, it was highly important for the Vice president to accentuate the things he accomplished by himself and delineate himself from the Eisenhower's Administration. This is achieved through the repetition of the first-person pronoun "I" in nearly every sentence. Additionally, the grammatical structures

that predominate in the excerpt are in the perfect aspect, indicating that the actions or events described have been completed or finished at some point in the past and have a connection to the present.

Moving forward, the tactic of distancing oneself from somebody or something is also quite noticeable in the rhetoric of Richard Nixon within the strategy of positive self-representation. As for example, in the following extract: *I know Senator Kennedy feels as deeply about these problems as I do, but our disagreement is not about the goals for America but only about the means to reach those goals.* Throughout the debate, Richard Nixon emphasizes the fact that his opponent has different methods or strategies for achieving goals that are shared by the American nation. By expressing this viewpoint, he aims to distinguish his own candidacy, party, and campaign from that of John Kennedy. The use of the word "disagreement" serves to highlight this differentiation. The statement implies, albeit discreetly, that Nixon's methods are superior to Kennedy's in terms of benefiting America. In these statements, we can also trace how R. Nixon tries to be a smooth political campaigner rather than a tough political foe. It portrays him as the man who wishes great things for his country, even it costs him the presidency.

One more example of such distancing and delimitation can be observed in the closing part of the debate produced by Nixon: *I agree with Senator Kennedy completely on that score. Where we disagree is in the means that we would use to get the most out of our economy.* This sentence is expressing agreement with a statement made by Senator Kennedy, but also expressing disagreement with the Senator's suggested means of achieving a common goal. It uses the pronouns "we" and "our" to indicate a shared understanding of the goal and the subject of disagreement. The phrase "completely on that score" is used to indicate full agreement with the Senator's statement, while "where we disagree" indicates the point of contention. The implicit meaning here is the opposition "I - he" where the "I" part is definitely used to express his superiority and advantage. The use of the verb "disagree" in the present tense indicates that this is a current or ongoing disagreement.

To emphasize the distinctions in their programmes and clearly differentiate himself from John Kennedy, Nixon frequently initiates his responses with claims that pertain to the dissimilarities of their respective programs: *Well obviously my views are a little different*. In this statement, the candidate employs words that mitigate potential negative connotations. For example, the use of the adverb "a little" implies that there are some similarities in the candidate's views to those of Kennedy, even though his views fully contrast those of Kennedy. Additionally, the use of the adverb "obviously" serves to indicate to the audience that the two candidates and their programmes are fundamentally distinct by default. Even though these adverbs serve as filler words, they contribute to the positively-toned nature of the statement.

As the debate progresses, the more allegations are made by Senator Kennedy and journalists against Vice President Nixon that, therefore, requires for the latter candidate to legitimize his decisions, words and actions. The tactics of self-explanation and self-justification are repeatedly implemented by Nixon within the strategy of positive self-representation. One of such instances is the following: *I'm awfully glad you ge- got that question because as you know I got into it at the last of my other question and wasn't able to complete the argument*. Richard Nixon demonstrates professional and skilled behaviour in addressing criticisms and negative statements made by journalists. Despite potentially uncomfortable or challenging topics, he maintains composure in the presence of potential voters. Additionally, Nixon uses an informal and expressive phrase, "awfully glad", to convey a sense of eagerness to provide explanations. This is further complemented by the statement, "I got into it at the last of my other question and wasn't able to complete the argument", which implies a dissatisfaction with previous interruption.

One more peculiar instance of self-justification and self-defence was expressed in the answer to the journalist Mr. Vanocur: *Well, I would suggest, Mr. Vanocur, that uh – if you know the President, that was probably a facetious remark. Uh – I would also suggest that insofar as his statement is concerned, that I think it would be improper for the President of the United States to disclose uh – the instances in which members of his official family had made recommendations, as I have made them through the*

years to him, which he has accepted or rejected. The President has always maintained and very properly so that he is entitled to get what advice he wants from his cabinet and from his other advisers without disclosing that to anybody – including as a matter of fact the Congress. In this excerpt, Nixon attempts to provide an explanation for why President Eisenhower refrained from disclosing which key ideas of the Vice President were adopted. The first sentence, which is worded in an ironic manner, implies that Vanocur lacks insight into Eisenhower's decision-making processes and thoughts. Nixon seeks to legitimize the actions of President Eisenhower by providing a justification for them. It is also notable that phrases such as "I would suggest" serve to mitigate the contentious nature of the discussion. The central assertion made by Nixon is that, despite Eisenhower's reluctance to comment on Nixon's contributions, the Vice President maintains that he repeatedly offered such ideas "through the years."

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. Nixon sought to depict himself as a seasoned, competent, and accomplished politician, in contrast to his rival, John Kennedy, who was viewed as youthful and less accomplished. This strategy was primarily employed for self-defence and self-explanation, but Nixon also used it to emphasize his perceived superiority over Kennedy. Tactics used within this strategy include positive image creation, the use of the pronoun "we" to emphasize his contributions to the Eisenhower Administration, and the use of comparative degree and the opposition "I - he" to contrast his own actions with those of his opponent. In addition, Nixon also used the tactic of emphasizing his specific roles and experiences in the government to further enhance his image. Overall, Nixon's use of positive self-representation was a way of protecting his reputation and portraying himself as a competent leader in front of the electorate.

The strategy of opponent discredit is present in the rhetoric of Richard Nixon during the first debate, however he focuses on issues rather than personalities, and uses a defensive and reserved rhetoric instead of aggressive and unreasonable one. It

is plausible that former President Nixon sought to demonstrate his aptitude in executing a successful campaign while defending his position, rather than attacking that of his opponent. Given his extensive background in debate, he may have believed that he possessed a thorough understanding of both offensive and defensive strategies, thereby allowing him to achieve victory in either scenario. It is uncertain whether this defensive approach was a result of his incumbent Vice Presidential position or simply a manifestation of his self-confidence [81].

Now, we will examine the strategy of opponent discredit implemented by Nixon in more detail to outline the main tendencies prevalent in the discussed presidential rivalry. The first snippets of the strategy can be detected in the introductory piece delivered by the Vice-President as he was balancing between legitimizing himself and delegitimizing the opposition: *And I think, first of all, our own record proves that we know the way. Senator Kennedy has suggested that he believes he knows the way. I respect the sincerity which he m- which he makes that suggestion. But on the other hand, when we look at the various programs that he offers, they do not seem to be new. They seem to be simply retreads of the programs of the Truman Administration which preceded it.* In this text, Nixon's preference for contrast is prominently displayed. Firstly, he uses the positive self-representation strategy by making a self-praise statement, "we know the way", implying a thorough understanding of the path to success for America. He employs the second-person plural pronoun, "we", to align himself with the Eisenhower Administration and to stress that he is not embarking on this journey alone.

Subsequently, Nixon employs a discrediting tactic towards Kennedy, albeit in a non-aggressive manner. This tactic appears to be one of exposure, with a tinge of irony. He states, "Senator Kennedy has suggested that he believes he knows the way," using the verb "suggest", which in this context could mean "to make someone believe," thereby indicating to the electorate that Nixon himself is not fully convinced of that suggestion.

Interestingly, in the act of discrediting his opponent, Nixon displays a measure of respect towards his Democratic rival. However, as his speech progresses, it becomes

evident that this friendly attitude was intentionally displayed in order to present himself as a logical, rather than emotional, candidate to the electorate.

Furthermore, Nixon employs the discourse marker "on the other hand" to emphasize contrast and continue his argument, explaining why Kennedy's claim to know the way is misguided, considering factual information such as his programmes being mere adjustments of previous ones.

In the following paragraph we can trace the tactic of insult as the excerpt is emotionally coloured: *And so I would say that in all of these proposals Senator Kennedy has made, they will result in one of two things: either he has to raise taxes or he has to unbalance the budget. If he unbalances the budget, that means you have inflation, and that will be, of course, a very cruel blow to the very people – the older people – that we've been talking about.* In the first sentence, the speaker employs the technique of sweeping generalization by stating, "in all of these proposals", thereby automatically negating the feasibility of Kennedy's proposals. Subsequently, the speaker provides two alternative outcomes in the second part of the sentence, both of which have negative implications for various segments of society.

The last sentence, characterized by its emotional language and negative connotations, such as "unbalances the budget", "inflation", and "a very cruel blow" is provocative towards the general audience. Additionally, the tentative collocation of "older people" serves to further heighten the emotional impact of the statement, as the elderly are considered a vulnerable segment of society. The suggestion that a proposal may have adverse effects on such a vulnerable group is likely to evoke dissatisfaction or even anger among the audience.

The next example once again illustrates the comparison of the candidates' programmes: *But I would propose holding that income up not through a type of program that Senator Kennedy has suggested that would raise prices, but one that would indemnify the farmer, pay the farmer in kind uh – from the products which are in surplus.* The tactic of exposure is employed to reveal the true outcomes of Kennedy's programs. Although the word "would" is used to suggest a possible or hypothetical result, Kennedy's intentions are linked to negative consequences (e.g.

"would raise prices"). Conversely, the speaker's proposals are depicted as having positive outcomes, such as indemnifying the farmer and paying them a surplus. The use of collocations with positive connotations (e.g. "indemnify the farmer" and "pay in surplus") not only highlights the benefits of the speaker's proposals, but also appeals to the undervalued yet numerous group of farmers.

In his summation notes, Richard Nixon continues to compare his proposals with those of his political opponent: *I believe that when we examine the Democratic platform, when we examine the proposals that he has discussed tonight, when we compare them with the proposals that I have made, that these proposals that he makes would not result in greater growth for this country than would be the case if we followed the programs that I have advocated.* In this excerpt, we can see the tactic of delegitimization being carried out by attacking the rationality of the opposing group. Although there are no explicit verbal assaults, the intended outcome is primarily achieved through the use of antithesis. The Vice President is implying that everything associated with his political persona and campaign is positive, whereas everything advocated by Kennedy is not. It is noteworthy that Nixon avoids using negative language to criticize his opponent's proposals and instead adopts a polite tone by using the word "would" to express possibility and the negation particle "not" in conjunction with the phrase "greater growth." He then provides arguments in the following paragraphs to bolster his credibility and reinforce the perception of his logical approach. The choice of pronouns in this paragraph is also intriguing, as Nixon employs the first-person pronoun "I" to emphasize his distinction from Kennedy and the second-person plural pronoun "we" to create the impression of a shared examination of proposals with the general public.

In summary, the strategy of opponent discredit is not prominently used by the Republican presidential candidate, Richard Nixon. Instead, it is employed in a more restrained and understated manner compared to typical aggressive rhetoric. Nixon's approach emphasizes defending his own position rather than attacking that of his opponent, which could reflect his confidence or be a result of his status as incumbent Vice President. Throughout his speech, Nixon strikes a balance between legitimizing

himself and delegitimizing his opponent. The tactic of exposure is frequently employed by Nixon, but he supports his revelations with arguments and examples, which is not a typical characteristic of this tactic. Additionally, Nixon employs the tactic of insult towards Kennedy, but in a measured and controlled manner.

The next strategy that will be under scrutiny in our research is **the strategy of theatricality** that entails a number of tactics and is widely used by politicians in their speeches and campaigns. Vice President Nixon was not an exception, so he put in a lot of effort to effectively incorporate the strategy in his debate statements. The strategy of theatricality can be effective in capturing the attention of an audience and invoking an array of various emotions. As an experienced political leader, Nixon was aware of the importance of the so-called performance and was using it to connect with voters on a personal level and create a lasting impression. In the context of presidential debates, which are structured for television with a focus on confrontation and spectacle, the utilization of the theatricality strategy can further amplify drama and tension, potentially impeding substantive discourse and fostering the use of sound bites. This in turn contributes to the inherent confrontational format of the debate [88].

The Republican candidate Richard Nixon employs the strategy to potentially engage citizens, tell a story, and help them connect issues to their own situation, which can help people reflect on matters more extensively. Also, the usage of moving language is aimed at evoking a wide spectrum of emotions and establish more personal connections with voters. However, it must be noted that the use of such strategies may also have the underlying intention of manipulation and persuasion [49].

The first instance of the strategy of theatricality, namely the tactics of cooperation and prompting, can be observed in the opening statement delivered by the candidate: *There is no question but that this nation cannot stand still; because we are in a deadly competition, a competition not only with the men in the Kremlin, but the men in Peking.* First of all, there is an intention to create the feeling of commonality and to elicit a sense of shared identity and belonging among the electorate, while also calling

for action. The phrases "this nation" and "cannot stand still" were employed to persuade the audience of the necessity for change. The repeated use of negation further emphasized the speaker's stance, conveying that there was no alternative course of action for the United States.

Then, to make the message more emotionally coloured, Nixon makes use of the collocation with negative connotation such as a "deadly competition". The repetition is involved to explain the essence and the actors of the competition. The implied reference to America's Cold War enemies, namely Russia and China, was used to evoke emotions and influence the mass audience's behaviour towards these perceived enemies.

A notable example of the cooperation tactic can be further traced in the introductory word by Nixon: *We are for programs that will expand educational opportunities, that will give to all Americans their equal chance for education, for all of the things which are necessary and dear to the hearts of our people.* The use of the words "we" and "our people" creates a sense of inclusivity and shared identity, while the phrase "expand educational opportunities" highlights the political figure's commitment to providing access to education for all Americans. The appeal to the values of Americans is represented with the collocation "equal chance for education". The sentence is structured in a way that highlights the importance of education by using the words "necessary" and "dear to the hearts," which convey the emotional significance of the issue. The use of language that appeals to emotions and shared values makes the message more compelling and persuasive, demonstrating the political figure's understanding of the importance of education to the audience. The use of the determiner "all" also helps to create a sense of unity and common purpose. The use of "all" emphasizes that the programmes being proposed are meant to benefit everyone in the population, regardless of individual differences or circumstances.

Moving forward with the speech, it is vivid that R. Nixon has a tendency to use the tactic of cooperation combining it with the tactic of prompting and delimitation: *I can only say that my experience is there for the people to consider; Senator Kennedy's is there for the people to consider. As he pointed out, we came to the Congress in the*

same year. *His experience has been different from mine. Mine has been in the executive branch. His has been in the legislative branch. I would say that the people now have the opportunity to evaluate his as against mine and I think both he and I are going to abide by whatever the people decide.* In this excerpt, the focus is on "the people." The use of the definite article "the" specifies that the speaker is referring to the American people, who will have to choose between "I" and "he." The repeated mention of "the people" highlights the significance of the American voters in determining the outcome of the election. This tactic can result in the electorate seeing Nixon as their advocate.

It is crucial for Nixon to differentiate himself from his opponent and emphasize his own experience, as opposed to Kennedy's, through the use of contrastive pronouns such as "he-I" and "his-mine." Despite his attempts to present Kennedy's experience as less practical and noteworthy, Nixon refrains from making direct allegations and instead employs logical explanation and argumentation. The final sentence is a manipulation tactic designed to incite the American people into action.

In an effort to garner the endorsement of potential voters, the Vice President employs a strategic approach that conveys both his commitment to serving the people and the individuals' ultimate responsibility in making consequential decisions. This blend of cooperative, prompting, and provocative tactics can be observed in his rhetoric, which not only aligns with the nation's values, but also places accountability for any adverse outcomes on the general population: *I would say that a president will be able to lead – a president will be able to get his program through – to the effect that he has the support of the country, the support of the people.* A number of repetitions in the statement gives it an agitational character. Here it becomes even more clear that by "the people" the candidate means "the people of the United States" as he uses "the country" as an alternative to "the people" in the excerpt. The emotionally charged expressions, "support of the country" and "support of the people," are repeatedly employed, effectively making the speaker's intention to manipulate the audience more transparent.

The tactic of warning whilst speaking of external enemies evokes the feeling of patriotism in the American people: *That's why we have to continue to be alert. It is also essential in being alert that we be fair; fair because by being fair we uphold the very freedoms that the Communists would destroy. We uphold the standards of conduct which they would never follow.* The language used in referring to adversaries exhibits a negative connotation, serving to heighten tensions. The excerpt further demonstrates the use of prompting and provocative tactics, as exemplified by the use of the subjunctive phrase "it is also essential" and the modal construction indicating necessity "we have to continue to be alert."

For summing up the strategic use of the theatricality by Richard Nixon we can examine the following instance: *It is essential that a man who's president of this country certainly stand for every program that will mean for growth. And I stand for programs that will mean growth and progress. But it is also essential that he not allow a dollar spent that could be better spent by the people themselves.* The employment of the subjunctive mood, as demonstrated twice in the excerpt with the phrase "It is essential," serves to stress the urgency or significance of the message. Throughout the statement, Nixon maintains a strategy of balancing reason and manipulation, including in the concluding passage. This effect is achieved by appealing to the general population and focusing on the well-being of the country rather than his personal interests. He effectively incorporates positive self-presentation through the use of the pronoun "I" and the positively connotative expression "growth and progress" in a single sentence. The statement serves as the conclusion to his overall summation message, ending on a positive note.

The usage of theatricality serves to reinforce the spectator-like nature of American political culture. In his debate statements, Richard Nixon primarily seeks to cultivate the perception that his campaign and presidency are genuinely for the benefit of the people of the United States through the use of cooperative tactics. Prompting and provocation tactics are employed to stimulate the audience to action and evoke patriotic, unity, and community-based emotions. In total, the theatricality strategy

represents a deliberate manipulation of the masses by the Republican candidate, primarily aimed at maintaining a positive atmosphere [42].

In conclusion, upon conducting a thorough analysis of Richard Nixon's communication strategies and tactics during his bid for election against John Kennedy, a young and charismatic Democratic candidate, it becomes apparent that Nixon's approach was characterized by a calm and peace-oriented style of communication. He aimed to demonstrate his strengths as a seasoned politician in contrast to Kennedy's perceived weaknesses as an inexperienced and immature candidate. A significant portion of his debate statements were devoted to refuting allegations against his political persona and reinforcing his credibility. Additionally, Nixon's statements also leveraged the emotional appeal to Americans, showcasing his dedication and commitment to serving the people.

The strategy of positive self-representation was evident in Nixon's communication, where he sought to align himself with the legacy of the incumbent Presidential Administration. This was achieved through the use of the pronoun "we" instead of "I" and avoiding excessive self-praise or self-congratulation, except when refuting claims made by his opponent. On the other hand, Nixon employed the opponent discredit strategy by emphasising Kennedy's lack of expertise and experience, which was conveyed through the contrasting use of "I" and "he." These accusations were substantiated by arguments and facts.

Finally, Richard Nixon also employed the strategy of theatricality, where positively connotative words such as "growth," "progress," and "support" were used to highlight his campaign, while negative connotations were used to describe the enemies of the United States, leaving the audience with a sense of patriotism. The repetitive use of the phrase "the people" in his statements serves as an example of Nixon's prioritization of the American electorate.

2.2. Dramaturgy and theatricality as a component of John Kennedy's communication strategies during the first presidential debates 1960

The first face-to-face encounter between major-party presidential candidates in front of the audience turned to be a key to success in the campaign of John Kennedy. That first debate launched Jack Kennedy onto the national scene [77]. As for the communication style of the Democratic candidate, Kennedy's public communication abilities were highly regarded for his ability to deliver well-crafted and thoughtful speeches while also leveraging his good looks, charm, and self-confidence. This was evident both before and during his presidency, and scholars attribute Kennedy's victory in the 1960 election, in part, to his superior public speaking skills. Kennedy was able to win over the American people with his polished communication style, while Nixon struggled to overcome his insecurities and connect with voters through his public speeches [79].

Our analysis will focus on the three main communication strategies used by Kennedy and their application appeared to be different from the one Nixon presented. The strategies include:

- 1) **positive self-representation;**
- 2) **opponent discredit;**
- 3) **theatricality strategies.**

It is noteworthy to observe how political roles and campaign goals influenced the use of the same communication strategies by two presidential candidates. Due to his image of being immature and inexperienced, Kennedy chose the stance of a challenger and an attacker. On the other hand, Nixon spent a great deal of time refuting Kennedy point by point. Overall, Kennedy's communication strategies played a significant role in his victory in the 1960 presidential election. His ability to connect with voters and project an image of leadership helped him to overcome his relative lack of experience and win the support of the American people [89].

Since Kennedy was the lesser known of the two candidates and was behind in the polls after the Republican convention, it was in his interest to gain as much as possible from the debate. However, while analysing the application of **the strategy of**

positive self-representation, surprising as it may seem, we cannot find any distinct instances of it in his opening statement that usually sets the tone for the whole debate. Nevertheless, while delivering his introduction, John Kennedy had a goal to demonstrate his leadership as a would-be president. We can spot the discrete use of the positive self-representation strategy, namely the tactic of relating oneself to famous personalities, in the opening part. At the beginning of his statement, he quoted Lincoln: *In the election of 1860, Abraham Lincoln said the question was whether this nation could exist half-slave or half-free.* Then, he concluded his statement by drawing the example from the inaugural speech of Franklin Roosevelt: *In 1933, Franklin Roosevelt said in his inaugural that this generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation of Americans has the same rendezvous.* The goal was to identify himself with the leadership shown by the two former US presidents. Besides, Kennedy extensively uses the personal pronoun “I” in the opening part to stress his leadership.

What is even more peculiar in his introductory statement is that he was trying to place his leadership both on the domestic as well the world scene: *I want people in Latin America and Africa and Asia to start to look to America; to see how we’re doing things; to wonder what the resident of the United States is doing; and not to look at Khrushchev, or look at the Chinese Communists.* Despite the fact the statement lacks the visible examples of the positive self-representation strategy, the Democrat found the way to stress the need for presidential leadership and indicated his enthusiasm for accepting that burden.

Continuing the discussion of J. Kennedy's statements, it is worth noting that he frequently employs a rhetorical tactic of aligning himself with well-known political figures: *I come out of the Democratic party, which in this century has produced Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, and which supported and sustained these programs which I’ve discussed tonight.* By referencing these leaders, Kennedy aims to create a positive association between himself and their successful legacies. Furthermore, he emphasizes the similarities between his proposed policies and those of past Democratic presidents, positioning them as a tried

and tested approach to promoting the prosperity of the United States. Ultimately, Kennedy seeks to establish himself as a capable leader who can build on the accomplishments of his predecessors, and make the right choices for the American people.

The tactic of positive image creation can as well be found later in his statements that are produced as responses to criticisms from his Republican rival: *I have met met uh – decisions over eight hundred times on matters which affect not only the domestic security of the United States, but as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The question really is: which candidate and which party can meet the problems that the United States is going to face in the sixties?* While it is unlikely that Kennedy has actually counted the exact number of decisions he has made, the use of numbers serves to bolster his credibility and enhance the impact of his message. Additionally, Kennedy employs the correlative conjunction of "not only...but also" to emphasize his diverse contributions to American politics across multiple domains. Finally, he concludes his remarks with a rhetorical question that seeks to engage the audience and encourage them to consider which candidate and party are best equipped to address the challenges facing the United States in the 1960s.

To distance his personality and campaign from the one of his Republican opponent, Kennedy wants to show a wide disagreement on certain political matters: *The Vice President and I disagree on this. The program – the Javits-Nixon or the Nixon-Javits program – would have cost, if fully used uh – six hundred million dollars by the government per year, and six hundred million dollars by the state. The program which I advocated, which failed by five votes in the United States Senate, would have put medical care for the aged in Social Security, and would have been paid for through the Social Security System and the Social Security tax.* The main device used in the excerpt is the opposition “the Vice President and I”. Subsequently, while discussing the programme his opponent stands for, Kennedy wants to emphasise its disastrous consequences for the American economy, bringing up numbers (“six hundred million dollars”) and employing the repetition. By contrasting

his views and policies with those of his opponent, he creates a clear differentiation between himself and his opponent, which can help to mobilize voters who may be undecided or disenchanted with the current political establishment. Additionally, Kennedy's use of specific numerical figures and repetition serves to strengthen his argument and make it more memorable to voters. By presenting his own proposed program as a more viable and financially responsible alternative, Kennedy is seeking to establish himself as a credible and competent candidate who is capable of effectively managing the country's economic affairs.

Overall, the strategy of positive self-representation is not the one that is the most frequently used. However, it is notable that Senator Kennedy's use of this technique differs in certain respects from that of his opponent, Nixon. Specifically, Kennedy tends to align himself with prominent political figures and their accomplishments in order to establish himself as a similarly capable candidate. In some cases, Kennedy's use of positive self-representation appears somewhat contrived, as he feels the need to counter his opponent's arguments by presenting data that cannot be immediately fact-checked. Additionally, both Kennedy and Nixon employ the strategy of distancing themselves from the opposition by explicitly stating their disagreements, which is a common characteristic of political debates.

The opponent discredit strategy is a preferred one in the statements of Kennedy as he was maintaining his image as a challenger. He was the first speaker and from the very beginning was attempting to attack the current government and therefore Nixon, as a Vice President. The overall theme of the strategy was that the current administration is not doing enough to get the country moving again. This was consistent with his campaign of leadership and his speeches since he set out to get America moving again.

In his opening remarks, Senator Kennedy explicitly expresses his dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs, making it clear that he believes more must be done to address pressing issues: *I should make it very clear that I do not think we're doing enough, that I am not satisfied as an American with the progress that we're making.* Although the statement does not contain any overt accusations or direct claims, it is

apparent that Kennedy is implicitly criticizing the current administration, which includes Richard Nixon. The ultimate aim of this approach is to delegitimize and castigate the Republican opposition. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that Kennedy chooses to bolster the statement with added emotional resonance by associating himself with the concerns of average Americans (“I am not satisfied as an American”), thereby emphasizing his commitment to representing the needs and desires of ordinary citizens. Then, Senator Kennedy proceeds to enumerate a range of pressing issues confronting American society, expressing his dissatisfaction with each in turn. Employing a rhetorical device of repetition, Kennedy begins nearly every sentence with the phrase "I'm not satisfied" and then provides factual data to implicitly criticize the performance of the current administration. Through this strategy, Kennedy seeks to imprint his dissatisfaction with the status quo in the minds of voters and encourage them to reflect on the issues at hand. Using the tactic of delegitimization, Kennedy presents a meticulously crafted list of urgent domestic problems facing the country, each designed to put his opponent on the defensive.

However, Kennedy does not stay impersonal during the whole debate. He has a goal to create the negative image of his opponent that appears quite a logical decision as the whole campaign of Nixon is focused on representing the Democratic candidate as an immature one. Following a brief effort to establish his own position and credibility, Senator Kennedy launches direct accusations against Richard Nixon: *Mr. Nixon comes out of the Republican party. He was nominated by it. And it is a fact that through most of these last twenty-five years the Republican leadership has opposed federal aid for education, medical care for the aged, development of the Tennessee Valley, development of our natural resources.* The direct accusations with hints of irony is employed by John Kennedy in the piece. The criticism is targeted not only against the persona of Richard Nixon himself, but also against the Republican government. The speaker makes a witty comment, saying that in spite of being 25 years in power, Republicans failed to deliver for those in need. This suggests that experience does not necessarily equate to effectiveness or success in the realm of politics. Moreover, the phrase "the Republican leadership" is paired with the verb

"opposed," which carries negative connotations, to underscore the party's reluctance to address pressing issues. Finally, to emphasize the extent of the party's shortcomings, the sentence references key areas of concern for the American people, including education, medical care, and the well-being of the elderly. Also, while stressing party identification, Kennedy wants to unite his party behind him and to remind viewers that Nixon was a Republican, something Nixon usually avoided mentioning in his campaign speeches as he attempted to reach out to independents and southern Democrats.

The following critique of Richard Nixon's campaign pertains to his proposed farm policy: *I think Mr. Benson's program has failed. And I must say, after reading the Vice President's speech before the farmers, as he read mine, I don't believe that it's very much different from Mr. Benson's. I don't think it provides effective governmental controls.* Kennedy proceeds to compare the policy currently in effect, which can be evaluated by the electorate, with Nixon's proposed policy. It is important to note that the implied criticism is not overly harsh, as Kennedy refrains from using negatively charged language when referring to Nixon. Instead, he appears to be offering an evaluative perspective on Nixon's campaign.

In the following excerpt, a difference in the approach of Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy is observed, as Kennedy employs more extreme and emotional language while Nixon refrains from being insulting: *I think it shows the difference between the two parties. One party is ready to move in these programs. The other party gives them lip service.* The polarity between the parties is established through the use of collocations, such as "two parties," "one party," and "the other party." The speaker avoids explicitly naming the parties, but there is no ambiguity as to which parties are being referenced. The use of the collocation "lip service" appears informal and carries a negative connotation, indicating the expression of insincere approval or support for something without any meaningful action.

In summary, Senator Kennedy employed the opponent discredit strategy by delegitimizing and criticizing the current administration led by Richard Nixon, emphasizing the urgent domestic issues that needed to be addressed. Kennedy

launched direct accusations against Nixon and the Republican government, while employing emotionally charged language to create a negative image of his opponent. In contrast, Nixon refrained from being insulting and used a more restrained approach in his statements.

With regard to the strategic communication techniques used by the candidates in the debate, both Jack Kennedy and his opponent relied heavily on the use of **the strategy of theatricality**. Upon closer analysis of Kennedy's statements, it becomes evident that he employed a higher degree of dramaturgy than his opponent. Kennedy's selection of the theme of "getting America moving" and promoting national satisfaction, as well as his use of various rhetorical devices, set him apart as an eloquent debater. In contrast, Nixon's focus on fiscal conservatism was less attention-grabbing compared to Kennedy's call for a forward-looking approach to the next decade's challenges facing the United States' next President.

Senator Kennedy recognized that the primary goal of the debate was to boost his campaign, and thus developed a strategic approach in communication to achieve this objective. His use of theatricality helped him gain recognition from the public, as exemplified by the specific examples discussed below.

John Kennedy raised the stakes at the very outset of his opening statement by making clear that nothing less than the survival of the American society hung in the balance: *Therefore, I think the question before the American people is: Are we doing as much as we can do? Are we as strong as we should be? Are we as strong as we must be if we're going to maintain our independence, and if we're going to maintain and hold out the hand of friendship to those who look to us for assistance, to those who look to us for survival?* In this extract he uses the tactic of prompting, expressed with the help of rhetorical questions. The implied meaning is that the current government is not doing enough to make America prosperous, and Kennedy is questioning their actions in front of the public to make them doubt and think over the decisions they might have already made. The tactic of cooperation is also evident in the piece as the speaker operates with the words such as "independence", "friendship", "assistance" and "survival" to elicit an emotional response from the

audience. The aforementioned lexicon resonates with the values espoused by American society. By highlighting at the beginning that he poses his questions exclusively to the American people is to demonstrate his commitment before the nation and also to evoke the feeling of accountability in people. We can also notice that he does not put himself on distance from the American people, on the contrary, Kennedy identifies himself with them by using the inclusive pronoun “we” extensively.

Later, in his introduction, the Senator keeps insisting he wants effective government meeting its national responsibilities, not big government for big government’s sake. And he links meeting these responsibilities at home to meeting its responsibilities in the world: *I think we can do a better job. I think we’re going to have to do a better job if we are going to meet the responsibilities which time and events have placed upon us. We cannot turn the job over to anyone else. If the United States fails, then the whole cause of freedom fails.* The tactic of warning can be observed in this statement that is masterly worded with the help of the conditional structure, namely the 1st conditional that is used to express the future consequence of a realistic possibility now or in the future. He repeats the word “fails” for even more dramatic effect twice. The tactic of cooperation also cannot be omitted and is one of the principal means of Kennedy’s strategic communication during the debate. The excessive use of the inclusive pronoun “we” is aimed to get the following message across to the electorate: “we” are John Kennedy, Democrats and the voters who are going to express their support to the Democratic campaigner. It is obvious that the speaker excludes Republicans and his opponent from the “we” group as they have already failed to do the job taken. If we look at the vocabulary the Senator uses it seems to be basic as the simpler the message is, the wider audience will comprehend it and make the sense of it.

John Kennedy seems to be an ardent fan of the rhetorical questions in his statements: *I think Mr. Nixon is an effective leader of his party. I hope he would grant me the same. The question before us is: which point of view and which party do we want to lead the United States?* Again, the tactic of provocation is used to incite their

potential voters to action. The provocation lies in that he allegedly suggest that the two candidates are powerful and experienced leaders who can occupy the office of the US President. Kennedy is even complementing Nixon on being an effective leader, that might be done on purpose to demonstrate his favourable attitude to his opponent, whereas Richard Nixon was trying to discredit Kennedy's persona. John Kennedy again addresses the question to every American, including himself. He focuses on the party now and not on the leader of that party, not to name the personalities and sound more indirect or even impartial. More important, he elevated the issue beyond mere questions of competence to issues of leadership. It was a repetition of his campaign theme and the thrust of his opening statement.

Most attention is drawn to the theatricality strategy skilfully implemented by Kennedy in his summation speech. The third point he makes while providing a closing sounds extremely provocative and manipulative at the same time: *Thirdly, I think the question before the American people is: as they look at this country and as they look at the world around them, the goals are the same for all Americans. The means are at question. The means are at issue. If you feel that everything that is being done now is satisfactory, that the relative power and prestige and strength of the United States is increasing in relation to that of the Communists; that we've b-gaining more security, that we are achieving everything as a nation that we should achieve, that we are achieving a better life for our citizens and greater strength, then I agree. I think you should vote for Mr. Nixon.* To begin with, the Democrat anew poses a question to the American people, making them again accountable for the outcome of their decision. Such transfer of responsibility is aimed at forcing the public to dwell on choices they make more carefully. Then, the cooperation and commonality technique is in play in the statement as well which is evidenced in the collocations such as “the American people”, “all Americans” and the inclusive pronoun “we”. His indirect criticism of the opponent helps him sustain the positive image of himself since there is no explicit negative commentary of Nixon. The speaker continues coming back to the main theme of his campaign and puts emphasis on “the means” by using the rhetorical device of repetition. The reference to the

nation's enemies, i.e. "the Communists", is an effective strategy to warn the viewers, make them feel the potential threat even closer than it really is. Besides, it evokes the feeling of patriotism and devotion to the United States. In the last sentence, he allegedly grants the public a chance to reach their own decision, however, he implicitly has been dropping hints throughout his statements that if Nixon is the president, then the state of affairs will not get better. It is quite peculiar that Kennedy chooses to go personal in the summation statement by naming his opponent and does not try to veil the desired meaning of his message.

In the final sentences of his concluding speech, John F. Kennedy employed a tactic of cooperation and intensified it with the use of prompting: *That's the question before the American people, and only you can decide what you want, what you want this country to be, what you want to do with the future.* He emphasized the crucial role of the American people in determining the country's direction and future. The use of the adverb "only" served to underscore the sole responsibility of the American people in making decisions that would shape the country's future. The repetition of the phrase "what you want" served as a powerful call to action to mobilize the public to make prompt and informed decisions. Additionally, the use of the words "country" and "future" appeal to the public's values, further reinforcing the importance of the decision at hand.

In conclusion, Kennedy employed a higher degree of dramaturgy and used various rhetorical devices to set himself apart as an eloquent debater and an attacker. He used the tactics of prompting, cooperation, warning, and provocation in his statements to elicit an emotional response from the audience and incite potential voters to action. Kennedy's excessive use of the inclusive pronoun "we" aimed to create a sense of accountability and unity among the American people. In his summation speech, Kennedy used the tactic of theatricality skilfully, posing rhetorical questions to the public and implying that his opponent was not doing enough to make America prosperous.

Overall, during the 1960 presidential debate with Richard Nixon, John Kennedy presented himself as a dynamic orator with a fervent ambition to secure victory in the

election through his charismatic leadership. Employing the strategy of positive self-representation, Kennedy quickly aligned himself with past leaders, including Lincoln and Roosevelt. Additionally, he deftly highlighted the contrasts between himself and his opponent using the distancing tactic and the oppositional “I-he” framework. Kennedy employed the strategy of self-representation to rejuvenate his image as a young and formidable leader in the eyes of the audience.

Kennedy also employed the strategy of opponent discredit through personal attacks directed towards Nixon and the Republican Party, making explicit references to their shortcomings and the current state of affairs under the incumbent administration. Kennedy went on to create “we” versus “they” group dynamic, with the latter being characterised as inefficient and responsible for the country's problems.

Finally, Kennedy effectively used the theatricality strategy to appeal to emotions and mobilize the electorate to action. He frequently referred to “the American people” and used the pronoun “we” to encourage cooperation. Additionally, he posed rhetorical questions to engage the audience and encourage reflection. It is through the successful execution of these tactics that Kennedy stood out as a presidential contender during the 1960 debate.

Conclusion

The 1960 United States presidential campaign was a noteworthy event due to several reasons, including the first-ever general election televised presidential debates between the two major-party candidates. The first debate between Nixon and Kennedy had an unprecedented viewership of 70 million people, making it the largest television audience up to that point. The introduction of a new medium for presidential debates is believed to have been a pivotal moment in the 1960 campaign. While some attribute Kennedy's victory to his charismatic televised image, our analysis suggests that JFK's triumph was the result of a successful combination of factors, including communication strategies and tactics.

To begin with, Kennedy delivered a speech that aimed to inspire the nation to strive towards becoming a greater country. In contrast, Nixon adopted a didactic

speaking style, which, despite being logical and reasonable, did not immediately capture the attention of the audience. The Democratic candidate effectively employed dramaturgy and theatricality as tools to captivate the viewers' attention. Nixon's objective was to build on the policies of the Eisenhower Administration by taking a conservative approach to safeguarding America against Communism and promoting economic growth. In contrast, Kennedy presented a well-defined vision for the future of America, highlighting the current challenges facing the country, including issues relating to race and civil rights, poverty, economic development, the Cold War, and Communism. When analysing the communication strategies of the presidential candidates, the first notable distinction lies in the application of self-representation strategies. Richard Nixon relied heavily on his experience and association with the Eisenhower Administration to build a positive image of himself. In contrast, John Kennedy opened with a visionary statement outlining his goals for America and appealed to the typical American through stories and personal examples of his understanding of the country's issues. Kennedy also referred to well-known historical figures, such as Lincoln, Roosevelt, Truman, and Wilson, which served as enticing and attention-grabbing examples for the electorate due to their conventional and widespread nature.

It appeared that Nixon was hesitant to use the personal pronoun "I" to emphasize his superiority in certain areas, instead repeatedly identifying himself with the Eisenhower Administration as if they were one entity. The two candidates explicitly attempted to distance themselves from one another, with the Republican highlighting Nixon's maturity and experience, and the Democrat focusing on his leadership, visions, ideals, and values.

With regard to the opponent-discredit strategy, Richard Nixon's reluctance to voice personal allegations and accusations may be perceived as a mature and well-considered move. In contrast, John Kennedy's emotionally charged and explicit comments made him appear more concerned and occupied with the future of the United States. While Senator Kennedy felt confident criticizing the Republican Party and his opponent, Nixon appeared to lack such an opportunity. The main focus of

Nixon's opponent-discredit strategy was to save face and refute his rival's accusations.

In the context of theatricality strategy, we have observed that John Kennedy and Richard Nixon employed a comparable set of tactics, namely cooperation, prompting, provocation, and warning. Notably, their means and techniques of implementing these tactics differed, with the primary contrast being the level of directness and explicitness employed. Kennedy's language was more forthright and candid, whereas Nixon's tended to be more impersonal and oblique. Although both candidates placed significant emphasis on the cooperation tactic by frequently referring to "the American people," Kennedy highlighted the idea that the people are ultimately responsible for all decisions in the United States.

Kennedy's discourse surrounding leadership and the imperative to revitalize the nation stood in contrast to Nixon's preoccupation with his public image and his focus on countering his opponent's attacks.

In summary, an analysis of the strategic deployment of communication strategies during the 1960 debate between Richard Nixon and John Kennedy can yield further insights into whether verbal elements played a role in shaping the outcomes of the first televised presidential debate. Additionally, the data and conclusions derived from this analysis may facilitate comparative investigations of the communication strategies employed during subsequent televised presidential debates.

III. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN THE AMERICAN DEBATES

2020

The 2020 Trump-Biden debate, occurring six decades after the first televised presidential debate, can be characterized as a decline in the quality of political discourse. In recent years, American presidential debates have become increasingly focused on rhetoric and less on dialectic. This trend is largely due to the pervasiveness of technology in all aspects of modern life, particularly politics. The high volume of information available in today's communicative environment favours rhetoric over dialectic. Political discourse has become predominantly rhetorical, emphasizing the persuasive abilities of the speaker rather than the accuracy of the content. Furthermore, the information-rich environment overwhelms the average listener in the electorate, who lacks the attention and resources to verify the truth or veracity of every piece of information encountered [68]. Since the advent of televised debates in 1960, politicians have progressively shifted their focus from substance to style, adapting their communication strategies to the visual medium. It is important to note that external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic and widespread social unrest should be taken into account when analysing the 2020 presidential debate between then-Republican party nominee, Donald Trump, and then-Democratic party nominee, Joe Biden.

The debate was widely criticized for its chaotic and unproductive nature, with many observers bemoaning the lack of substantive policy discussion. In response, the Commission on Presidential Debates introduced new rules for future debates, including the ability to mute microphones to prevent interruptions. The format of the debate involved six segments of fifteen minutes each, with the moderator posing multiple questions, to which each participant had two minutes to respond.

To further investigate the communication strategies employed in modern American political discourse, we will examine the rhetorical strategies employed in the 2020

presidential debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden in the subsequent subchapters.

3.1. Donald Trump as a representative of the coercive power during the first presidential debate 2020

The 2020 US presidential debate marked Donald Trump's second attempt to secure the presidency. While Trump's unconventional debating style during the 2016 campaign gained the admiration of some, his conduct during the 2020 debates threatened the institution of presidential debates. Trump pursued a strategy of circumventing, controlling, or even undermining the rules and entities responsible for overseeing the debates.

During his debate with Democratic opponent, Joe Biden, Trump employed a bombastic communication style, frequently ignoring both his interlocutor and the moderator. Notably, Trump interrupted Biden a staggering 128 times, averaging more than one interruption per minute. Consequently, the 2020 debate failed to serve its dialectical function and instead devolved into a rhetorical playground [76, pp.149-156].

Trump's challenger mentality and communication strategies aimed to position him as a populist outsider fighting against the establishment. Populist leaders often present themselves as outsiders, and Trump sought to portray himself as separate from the elite circles of Washington D.C., championing the people's interests [83].

In our subsequent analysis, we will examine how Trump's communication strategies of **positive self-representation, opponent discredit, and theatricality** exemplify these features. Additionally, we will investigate how debating approaches of US presidential candidates have evolved over a 60-year period.

Before starting our analysis with the strategy of positive self-representation, it is crucial to acknowledge that the debate is prone to frequent digressions and topic changes, particularly by the Republican nominee, Donald Trump. Consequently, the message can be challenging to discern at times.

In general, the incumbent President Trump employs **the positive self-representation strategy** intermittently, but not frequently. However, he primarily opts to laud himself without presenting substantial supporting evidence or arguments. Positive image creation appears to be the most prominent tactic within this strategy. During the COVID era, the debate centres on the significant death toll caused by the coronavirus and the effectiveness of the measures implemented to contain its spread. To enhance his image concerning COVID policies, President Trump relies on references to authoritative sources, including Dr. Anthony Fauci, the chief medical advisor to the President from 2021 to 2022: *You wouldn't have closed it for another two months. By my doing it early, in fact, Dr. Fauci said, "President Trump saved thousands of lives." Many of your Democrat Governors said, "President Trump did a phenomenal job." We worked with the Governor. Oh really, go take a look. The Governors said I did a phenomenal job. Most of them said that. In fact, people that would not be necessarily on my side said that, "President Trump did a phenomenal job." We did. We got the gowns. We got the masks. We made the ventilators.* President Trump cites Dr. Fauci as an authority in the fields of healthcare and medicine to bolster the credibility of his statements, as the audience is likely to perceive such references as trustworthy. Moreover, he allegedly references Democrat Governors to underscore that even those who oppose him acknowledge his remarkable job during the COVID crisis. He reinforces this point by repeating the phrase "phenomenal job" three times while referring to himself in the third person, using the powerful rhetorical approach of repetition to positively connote his achievements.

Furthermore, he employs the rhetorical device of anaphora, starting four subsequent sentences with the second-person pronoun "we", signifying his administration and himself. President Trump uses this tactic to elucidate what the "phenomenal job" entails in practice. Notably, the four sentences are characterized by brevity and conciseness, a hallmark of his speech style. This approach enables a broad audience, including the average American voter, to easily comprehend and interpret his message.

Continuing the discussion about the coronavirus measures taken in the period of Trump administration, the incumbent president is willing to create a positive image of himself while disputing the charges of his opponent, Joe Biden, and answering the tricky questions of the moderator, Chris Wallace: ... *I've done a great job as a president, and I'll have 25, 35,000 people show up at airports. We use airports and hangers and we have a lot of people-...* The President uses numerical data to highlight the higher attendance of supporters at his campaign rallies in contrast to those of his opponent, Biden. However, he appears uncertain regarding the exact figures. Notably, the personal pronoun "I" is frequently employed by the speaker, reflecting his confidence in using the 1st person pronoun in comparison to his adversary. The phrase "great job" is a favoured collocation employed by President Trump while referencing his accomplishments.

Despite being questioned about the risks posed by large crowds amid the COVID pandemic, the President appears to pay little attention to the matter, instead emphasizing the fact that people are willing to show their support for his candidacy despite the challenging circumstances. It has been established that during the pandemic, Donald Trump adhered to a sceptical stance towards scientific perspectives and practitioners. Consequently, this viewpoint was adopted by his Republican Party supporters, exacerbating the pre-existing divide and polarization between the two political factions. Notably, the former president's political discourse appears to be marked by polarization, as evidenced by the consistent usage of "we" and "they" in his rhetoric. Furthermore, the variability of numerical data presented by the speaker during their discourse is noticeable. For example, Donald Trump cited varying estimates of attendance at his rallies, as illustrated in the excerpt provided, wherein he initially referred to 25 or 35 thousand attendees, followed shortly after by a claim of 35 or 40 thousand individuals present, with the number increasing even further subsequently: *We've had no negative effect, and we've had 35, 40,000 people at these rallies.* While numerical data are frequently employed in political speeches to bolster trustworthiness and veracity, in this instance, such information may have an

adverse effect, as the Republican speaker appears to be proffering arbitrary statistics without justification or substantiation [55].

Then, moving on with the topic of pandemic which is one of the key topics during the 2020 debate, Donald Trump is making an effort to revive his image and its of his administration by saying: *So we built the greatest economy in history. We closed it down because of the China plague. When the plague came in, we closed it down, which was very hard psychologically to do*. Within this discourse, the speaker responds to a moderator's inquiry concerning the condition of the economy during their administration, which is perceived to be weak and faltering. An endeavour to ameliorate his unfavourable image and cultivate a positive portrayal is discernible in the initial sentence, wherein Donald Trump emphasizes that the economy was thriving and robust prior to the advent of COVID-19, attributing this success to his administration. He employs the superlative form of the adjective "great" to suggest that the United States had never experienced such a prosperous economy previously. Notably, the adjective "great" is one of the most recurrently employed terms by Donald Trump and is embedded in his discourse, which can be associated with the popularized slogan "Make America Great Again" or MAGA.

After expounding on positively connotated information, the speaker elucidates the factors contributing to the current lacklustre state of the economy. He attributes the blame to China for the emergence of COVID-19 and the resulting pandemic, which significantly impacted the economy. The speaker accentuates that difficult decisions had to be made, with the employment of the pronoun "we," to divert accountability from himself and his administration. It is noteworthy that Donald Trump typically employs the personal pronoun "I" when conveying exclusively positive information.

When questioned by the moderator why Americans should place their trust in the Republican nominee to manage racial issues over their Democrat counterpart, Donald Trump initially resorts to a strategy of discrediting his opponent. Subsequently, he employs the tactic of creating a positive image to establish contrast: *You did the 1990—and that's why, if you look at the polls, I'm doing better than any Republican has done in a long time, because they saw what you did. You call them super-*

predators, and you've called them worse than that. Because you look back at your testimony over the years, you've called them a lot worse than that. As far as the church is concerned, and as far as the generals are concerned, we just got the support of 200–250 military leaders and generals, total support. Law enforcement, almost every law enforcement group in the United States. I have Florida. I have Texas. I have Ohio. I have every... Excuse me, Portland, the sheriff just came out today and he said, "I support President Trump." Upon examining the quote, it is apparent that the personal pronoun "I" surpasses the usage of "we." Donald Trump names important institutions, such as the church, military, and law, to underscore his credibility and establish that all sectors of society support him. He uses anaphora, a rhetorical device, in four subsequent sentences that commence with "I have" and the name of states to assert that he has their backing. Additionally, he employs synecdoche, a figure of speech, when naming various states to imply that he has the support of their inhabitants, specifically their voters. The candidate purportedly cites a sheriff in the final sentence to bolster his credibility. The extensive use of repetition in the excerpt can be attributed to the emotional oratorical style of the politician or the intention to emphasize critical information.

A distinct attribute of Trump's communication style is his tendency to refrain from using the tactic of associating oneself with prominent political figures or former presidents, which is evident in the rhetoric of other candidates. Instead, the Republican nominee frequently highlights his superiority over other administrations: *Because there has never been an administration or president who has done more than I've done in a period of three and a half years.* Essentially, Trump's main argument for his election as the President of the United States is based on the notion that he is superior to all 44 former presidents and administrations. He uses a comparative structure and a negative adverb to reinforce this assertion, and employs the personal pronoun "I" to ensure that no one else is associated with his accomplishments. Additionally, the speaker references his relatively short period of time as president, which is only 3.5 years, in order to emphasize that its brevity does

not diminish his effectiveness. However, Donald Trump rarely provides any supporting evidence or constructive arguments to substantiate his claims.

The same tendency can be observed in the following example: *But despite going through all of these things where I had to fight, both flanks and behind me and above, there has never been an administration that's done what I've done. The greatest, before COVID came in, the greatest economy in history, lowest employ-unemployment numbers, everything was good. Everything was going.* In this discourse, Donald Trump is attempting to construct a positive self-image and evoke sympathy from the electorate by recounting his experience dealing with hardships, notably the COVID-19 pandemic during his presidency. The use of past tense to describe the economic state of the country prior to the pandemic implies agreement with the current fragile and stagnant state. Trump employs generalizations by frequently using the term "everything" without specifying the components of the aforementioned everything and the actions taken by his administration. The superlative form of the adjective "great" appears twice in the excerpt, alongside the positively connotative adjective "good".

A notable distinction between the rhetoric of Trump and Biden is the former's infrequent identification with the American populace and lack of emphasis on their welfare, unlike the latter. The following excerpt highlights Trump's perception of himself as a rescuer rather than as a representative of the people: *And by the way, there was unity going to happen. People were calling me for the first time in years, they were calling, and they were saying it's time maybe and then what happened? We got hit. But now we're building it back up again.* The Republican nominee seeks to highlight his significance and improve his favourable political image by asserting that people require his leadership. Nonetheless, he inadvertently implies his inability to deliver due to the outbreak of the pandemic. As previously noted, when the context is negative, Donald Trump avoids using the pronoun "I" and instead employs "we" to dissociate himself from any unsatisfactory outcomes.

To summarise the use of the strategy of positive self-representation by Donald Trump during the 2020 debate, we come to the conclusion that the Republican

nominee was primarily employing the tactic of positive image creation. While analysing the debate, it can be noted that there was not enough time for Trump to concentrate on establishing his positive image and speaking of his considerable accomplishments since his main focus during the televised debate was combating his Democratic opponent, Joe Biden.

Trump's main theme centred on his perceived superiority over former US political leaders and presidential administrations. He often used the adjective "great" in a superlative form to assert his status as the most prominent president ever elected. Although he rarely identified himself with famous political figures, Trump referenced authorities or provided quotes to establish credibility with voters. When discussing positive events, Trump used the personal pronoun "I" and displayed confidence in separating himself from ordinary American citizens. However, when the context was negative, he used the pronoun "we" to avoid being held accountable for unsatisfactory outcomes. Trump's language was characterized by simplicity, which made him accessible and trustworthy to some audiences. However, the use of unreliable and changeable figures contributed to ambiguity. Additionally, Trump's emotional appeals were evident in the first debate of 2020, where his violation of rules and norms led to an unproductive debate for the American electorate [65, pp.7-27].

During the 2020 US presidential debate, one of the prominent strategies employed by Republican candidate Donald Trump was **the discrediting of his opponent**. This approach, combined with his highly emotional and disruptive behaviour, resulted in a counterproductive and deviant discussion that deviated from customary presidential debate norms and hindered democratic discourse. Jake Tapper, a CNN political commentator, referred to the debate as a "dumpster fire" and concluded, "we can talk about who won the debate and who lost the debate, but I can tell you one thing for sure, the American people lost tonight because that was just horrific." His colleague and CNN's chief political correspondent, Dana Bash, expressed her disbelief and was more direct in her evaluation, stating, "Well, you used some high-minded language, but I'm just going to say it like it is. That was a shit show. We're on cable, we can say

that, apologies for being maybe a little bit crude, but that is really the phrase that I am getting from people on both sides of the aisle on texts, and it's the only phrase I can think of to really describe it." [76, pp. 149-156].

Our analysis aims to showcase prominent instances of Donald Trump using the opponent discredit strategy against his rival, Joe Biden. One of the tactics that the Republican nominee employs is that of accusation or exposure. Interestingly, Trump often resorts to levelling accusations against his opponent while under attack himself. Rather than providing a constructive explanation to refute the allegations against him, he responds with counteraccusations: *Joe, you've had 308,000 military people dying because you couldn't provide them proper healthcare in the military. So don't tell me about this.* During a discussion regarding the impact of the coronavirus pandemic in the US, Donald Trump diverts from the topic at hand to accuse his Democratic opponent, Joe Biden. Trump often uses the abbreviated form of Biden's name during the discussion, which can be perceived as derogatory and disrespectful given their relationship. Additionally, Trump cites a number that could not be immediately fact-checked by the audience, which appears to be significantly higher than the number provided by Biden (200,000 deaths). Notably, the language used by Trump for discrediting his opponent consisted of negative connotations, such as "people dying" and "couldn't provide". Despite Joe Biden's attempts to stay on-topic, Trump demonstrated no interest in listening to his opponent or the moderator and instead continued with an emotional speech: *TRUMP: And if you were here, it wouldn't be 200, it would be two million people because you were very late on the draw. You didn't want me to ban China, which was heavily infected. You didn't want me to ban Europe.*

WALLACE: All right, gentlemen, Mr. President.

TRUMP: You would have been much later, Joe, much later.

WALLACE: Mr. President.

TRUMP: We're talking about two million people.

The moderator's attempts to engage in a traditional debate format are completely futile, as seen in the example mentioned earlier. This trend persists throughout the

entire debate. Trump disregards the opinions of others and instead openly attacks his opponent using hypothetical statements in the second conditional tense, specifically referencing the potential number of coronavirus-related deaths under a Biden administration. Additionally, he uses the idiom "you were very late on the draw" in the first sentence, which implies someone is slow to comprehend or respond to a question. The number Trump repeats twice, "two million people", lacks logical justification or supporting evidence; it appears to be an unfounded claim made to cast his opponent in a negative light. Trump's attempts to undermine Joe Biden appear irrational and illogical, and he continuously refers to him as "Joe" in an attempt to disrespect him or showcase his own self-assurance.

Another attention-grabbing instance of attacking the Democratic nominee and the implementation of the tactic of offence can be found in the following exchange:

BIDEN: I'm not going to listen to him. The fact of the matter is I beat Bernie Sanders.

TRUMP: Not by much.

BIDEN: I beat him by a whole hell of a lot.

TRUMP: Not by much.

BIDEN: I'm here standing facing you, old buddy.

TRUMP: If Pocahontas would have left two days early you would have lost every primary.

In a sudden move, Donald Trump insults Joe Biden by stating that the Democrat did not win the primaries by a large margin against Bernie Sanders. It is apparent that Trump struggles to stick to one topic, resulting in a chaotic and disorganized conversation. He repeatedly uses the phrase "not by much" in a childish manner to discredit his opponent in front of the audience. What is even more peculiar about this dialogue is Trump's final statement, in which he employs a racial slur. When he says "Pocahontas", he is referring to Elizabeth Warren, Biden's Democratic opponent at the time. This remark pertains to the controversy Warren faced in 2018, when she repeatedly claimed Native American ancestry. Trump publicly accused Warren of falsely claiming her Cherokee heritage, prompting Warren to take a DNA test to prove it. The results confirmed that the Massachusetts Democrat indeed has Native

American roots. After the DNA test revelation in 2018, Trump declared, "I can no longer call her Pocahontas because she has no Indian blood." This example highlights the incumbent president's unconventional image and aggressive communication style, as well as his inability to uphold the dignity of his position and title [40].

The next example of the offence or insult tactic can be observed in the following piece: *But you agree. Joe, you're the liar. You graduated last in your class not first in your class*. Again, an obviously off-topic insult is thrown by Donald Trump while the candidates were still arguing about the primaries. The language Trump employs in the extract is aggressive and accusatory. The use of the phrase "you're the liar" is an example of direct accusation and insult, which is often seen in confrontational communication styles. The use of the name "Joe" serves as an attention-getter and reinforces the accusatory tone. Furthermore, the quote uses contrasting language, emphasizing the distinction between the two claims - that Joe Biden graduated first in his class and that he graduated last in his class. The contrast between the two claims is meant to create a sense of opposition, with one being "true" and the other being a "lie." The language used in this quote is intended to be confrontational and adversarial, aiming to undermine Joe Biden's credibility by accusing him of lying about his academic achievements.

The tactic of offence is quite widespread in the rhetoric of Donald Trump, and it appears that the incumbent president wants to offend everyone who is not on his side, who is the opposition: *The only thing I haven't done a good job, and that's because of the fake news, no matter what you say to them, they give you a bad press on it. It's just fake news. They give you good press, they give me bad press because that's the way it is, unfortunately. But let me just say something. I don't care. I've gotten used to it. But I'll tell you, Joe, you could never have done the job that we did. You don't have it in your blood. You could've never done that, Joe.* In this passage, Donald Trump discusses his actions during the coronavirus pandemic while refuting accusations made by Joe Biden and claiming his own significant contribution. The initial portion of the paragraph pertains to Trump's "fake news" rhetoric, which has been a prominent theme in his discourse since 2016. He has consistently derided

mainstream media outlets using pejorative labels like "fake news" and "fake media," with the aim of dissuading the public from relying on their reporting, much of which has been critical of his presidency. Trump has positioned himself as the sole purveyor of truth. In this section, the speaker employs comparison and antithesis, contrasting media coverage of his own activity with that of his opponent. The antithesis "you good press - me bad press" seeks to evoke empathy towards Trump while promoting the idea that the public media disseminates misinformation. Finally, the Republican candidate attacks and insults Joe Biden by repeatedly referring to him as Joe and using the phrase "you could've never done that", which reinforces negative associations in the minds of the public. Trump is known for making personal attacks in political arguments, as exemplified by the sentence "You don't have it in your blood", in which he impugns the moral character of the Democrat [80, pp. 1-12].

We aim to examine further instances where Trump engages in personal attacks and divulges personal information during the debate: *China ate your lunch, Joe. And no wonder your son goes in and, wha—, he takes out billions of dollars. He takes out billions of dollars to manage. He makes millions of dollars. And also, while we're at it, why is it just out of curiosity, the mayor of Moscow's wife gave your son three and a half million dollars?* This paragraph focuses on the speaker's strategy of directing his aggression towards Biden's son in order to intensify the debate, as such references can provoke his opponent to respond in a confrontational and hostile manner. The first sentence uses a familiar, commonly used nickname for Biden, "Joe". However, the most notable aspect of this paragraph is the colloquial phrase "China ate your lunch." This expression generally implies that someone has been outcompeted or taken advantage of, often in the business context. This could be a reflection of Trump's past in the business world. As previously observed, Donald Trump has a tendency to repeat words, phrases, or entire sentences. This characteristic is evident in the excerpt, where he places significant emphasis on the alleged illegal sums of money made by Joe Biden's son. Trump's typical pattern of confusing or mentioning arbitrary numbers and figures is also present in this passage. He initially refers to "billions of dollars", then shifts to "millions of dollars", and subsequently "three and a

half million dollars". Although such figures can have a profound impact on the audience's perception, they may also raise questions about the accuracy and credibility of the information being presented. Additionally, it is noteworthy that Trump references China and Russia, both of which are perceived as external enemies by many Americans. Mentioning these countries can increase societal animosity towards Joe Biden and his family members. Finally, Trump poses a controversial question to his opponent, which is likely to be evaded. Upon further examination of the debate transcript, it is apparent that he repeats the same question three times.

The next act of blaming of the opponent can be found when the Republican nominee was posed a question regarding race issues and why he had to be trusted over his opponent: *You did a crime bill, 1994, where you called them super-predators. African-Americans are super-predators and they've never forgotten it. They've never forgotten it.* In accordance with his typical behaviour, Trump refrains from answering the question and instead shifts the blame onto Joe Biden. When analysing the rhetorical techniques used in this passage, we can identify the use of collocations with negative connotations, such as "a crime bill" or "African-Americans are super-predators". Additionally, the reference to a specific year is employed to enhance the credibility of the data presented, despite the possibility of inaccuracies. The assertion that "African-Americans are super-predators" represents an egregious racial slur that casts a negative light on the Democratic nominee and may impact the decisions of the black community. The repetition of the phrase "they've never forgotten it" serves to imbue the speech with greater emotional intensity and emphasis.

The last example we would like to analyse in the context of the strategy of opponent discredit implemented by Trump is the following: *During the Obama-Biden Administration, there was tremendous division. There was hatred. You look at, uh, Ferguson, you look at, or you go to very...many places. Look at Oakland. Look what happened in Oakland. Look what happened in Baltimore. Look what happened a . . . Frankly, it was more violent than what I'm even seeing now.* The primary topic of the excerpt is the issue of racial insensitivity and division within American society.

Trump employs a strategy of blame-shifting or scapegoating in response to Biden's comments on this problem. Instead of addressing the accusations constructively or salvaging his reputation, the speaker resorts to insulting the Obama-Biden Administration. The use of negatively connoted collocations and lexical items serves to augment the negative and aggressive tone of the statements. These statements are also characterized by lexical exaggeration. Furthermore, Trump references examples of negative events in specific locations, but provides no informative comments or details. Finally, he compares the current state of affairs regarding racial issues to those of the Obama-Biden Administration, using the comparative form of the adjective "violent" to confirm that the present situation under his administration is also tumultuous.

In conclusion, Donald Trump's implementation of the strategy of opponent discredit is a subject of widespread research and discussion. This strategy was the primary communication approach he employed during the 2020 presidential election. In terms of linguistic and rhetorical characteristics, Trump implemented the tactic of accusation, offence, blame, and direct insult. His communication style was emotional and colloquial, often referring to his opponent, Joe Biden, as if they were close friends conversing in a bar. Trump employed collocations with negative connotations and emotionally charged language, often using repetition unintentionally due to his emotional state. He also frequently used big figures and numbers that were inaccurate and could confuse the audience. While Trump's arguments did not hold up to fact-checking, many supporters considered him to be a "truth teller" due to his ability to craft speeches that signalled honesty, consistent with his background in reality TV and his success in inverting consensus meaning. Additionally, Trump's communication style during debates was marked by personal attacks and insults, demonstrating a lack of control over his language and lexicon. He tended to use negative scenarios to describe Biden's politics and directly attacked him, often becoming easily angry and confrontational. Overall, Trump's language projected a coercive power, reflecting his values and goals [70, pp. 149-156].

Currently, it is widely acknowledged that political discourse that is engaging and captivating has the ability to attract a larger audience than discourse lacking such qualities. Presidential candidates are aware that in the absence of an impactful performance, they face the possibility of losing the attention of potential voters. The Republican candidate has elevated the use of performative politics to new levels, and the ensuing paragraphs will examine Donald Trump's use of **the theatricality strategy** [61].

The employment of theatricality by Trump is evident in the middle of the debate and beyond, as his primary objective was to discredit his opponents. During a discussion about the COVID-19 vaccine, Trump was queried about the projected availability of the vaccine, and his reply was as follows: *Well, I've spoken to the companies and we can have it a lot sooner. It's a very political thing because people like this would rather make it political than save lives.* The provided example can be construed as an instance of the delimitation tactic, wherein the incumbent president endeavours to distinguish himself from the opposition and dissociate himself from politics. Trump's populist ideas are also discernible in this excerpt, particularly in the concluding sentence. When Trump refers to "people like this", he is alluding to the left-wing representatives, as he clarifies in a subsequent discussion. Additionally, he seeks to appeal to the common people and portray himself as an outsider who champions their interests, while distancing himself from the elite class. The final sentence could potentially elicit an emotional response from the audience.

Expanding on the subject of the coronavirus and the actions taken to combat the pandemic, it is notable how Donald Trump employs tactics of cooperation and warning: *And you look at what's going on with divorce, look at what's going on with alcoholism and drugs. It's a very, very sad thing. And he'll close down the whole country. This guy will close down the whole country and destroy our country. Our country is coming back incredibly well, setting records as it does it. We don't need somebody to come in and say, "Let's shut it down."* The speaker begins by referencing serious social issues such as divorce, alcoholism, and drug abuse to elicit an emotional response from the audience and generate a strong reaction. He

enumerates the problems caused by the lockdown, adding repetition for emphasis. Additionally, the incumbent president provides a strongly negative appraisal, intensifying the negatively connotative word "sad" by repeating the determiner "very" twice in a row. The speaker employs a warning tactic to alert the electorate to the hypothetical outcomes of Joe Biden's administration and presidential programmes, using verbs like "close down" and "destroy" to create unpleasant associations with the Democratic opponent among potential voters. A key approach is the use of commonality, such as "our country" and "we don't need", which is rare for Donald Trump to identify himself with the public and their values and concerns. Finally, it is evident that Trump continues to demonstrate disrespect towards Joe Biden by using colloquial and informal language, such as referring to him as "this guy". This is a far cry from diplomatic or formal language.

Observably, Donald Trump frequently employs the cooperative tactic to justify his actions in office, particularly when facing potential scrutiny from the electorate. An instance of this can be seen in the following example: *I ended it because it's racist. I ended it because a lot of people were complaining that they were asked to do things that were absolutely insane. That it was a radical revolution that was taking place in our military, in our schools, all over the place.* During a discussion with the moderator, the speaker was asked to clarify his decision to terminate racial sensitivity training. In order to justify his actions, the speaker appealed to the values of the people and expressed concerns about their attitudes towards this type of training. The use of the phrase "a lot of people" suggests that the speaker prioritizes the wishes of US citizens and values their opinions in making decisions that have a nationwide impact. This rhetorical strategy serves as a powerful means of engaging the audience, shifting their attention away from negative associations with the speaker and towards his apparent concern for their welfare.

It is noteworthy that Donald Trump frequently employs exaggerated expressions and pairs adjectives with negative connotations with intensifying adverbs, as evidenced by his use of "absolutely insane". Finally, the speaker employs the inclusive pronoun "our" in reference to the military and schools, potentially as a

means of presenting himself as relatable to ordinary US citizens. These tactics are consistent with a cooperative communication style.

The combination of the tactic of cooperation, the tactic of informing and promising can be found in Trump's answer to the question about his beliefs regarding the science of climate change: *I believe that we have to do everything we can to have immaculate air, immaculate water, and do whatever else we can that's good. You know, we're planting a billion trees—the Billion Tree Project—and it's very exciting for a lot of people.* It is widely acknowledged that the Republican prioritizes business over environmental concerns and often rolls back environmental policies established by previous administrations. Therefore, Donald Trump must justify his actions in the absence of strong evidence supporting his positive involvement in environmental initiatives. Rather than highlighting his achievements, he instead emphasizes what "has to be done" to demonstrate his concern for the environment, particularly in terms of clean air and water. However, the lack of specific details suggests a limited understanding of the issue at hand.

The only concrete example provided is the pledge to plant a billion trees, as a part of the Billion Tree Project, which may be perceived as insufficient given the current state of environmental affairs. To bolster his position, Trump references "a lot of people" who support his initiative, aiming to establish its recognition and value among the US population. While the rhetoric may appear positive, the absence of factual data and reliance on abstract commentary can lead to confusion and misinterpretation among citizens. As a result, a "guide" or "toolkit" may be necessary to help the public understand the use of rhetorical devices and approaches in politics. The point is that what appears natural is rarely thus in the realm of politics [61].

The tactics of prompting and warning are employed while speaking of the upcoming elections: *This is going to be a fraud like you've never seen. The other thing, it's nice. On November 3rd, you're watching, and you see who won the election. And I think we're going to do well because people are really happy with the job we've done.* One notable aspect that can be observed in this excerpt, as well as in some of the previous ones, is the use of the paranoid style. Richard Hofstadter

characterizes this style as involving heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy [65]. We can discern features of this style in Donald Trump's warnings to his supporters about fraudulent elections, which can be interpreted as a way of preparing his potential voters for his potential defeat in the election.

The speaker aims to convey the idea that if he does not emerge as the winner, the election is a fraud, in an effort to prompt his audience to remain loyal to him and support him regardless of the outcome. By urging his audience to watch the elections on November 3rd and spot any illegitimate proceedings, he seeks to encourage their engagement and vigilance.

The final sentence employs a combination of the tactics of cooperation and promising. Trump references "we," encompassing himself, the Republican Party, and his supporters. In rare cases such as this, when seeking the support of the electorate, the candidate may identify with the people to communicate the idea that his victory at the election would lead to prosperity for his voters.

Such paranoid features can also be observed in the discussion that follows: ...*Did you see what's going on? Take a look at West Virginia, mailman selling the ballots. They're being sold. They're being dumped in rivers. This is a horrible thing for our country.* The present extract deploys implicit warning and prompting tactics. By employing emotive words and phrases such as "horrible thing", Donald Trump aims to elicit an emotional response from his audience and alert them to potential negative consequences of the elections. The use of hyperbole, such as the claims that ballots being sold and dumped in rivers, is also evident, without being backed by specific evidence. Trump accuses West Virginia of voter fraud without offering any concrete details or evidence to substantiate his claims. Such a lack of specificity is a rhetorical device employed by the speaker to make sweeping claims without being held accountable for their factual accuracy.

In the 2020 presidential debate, Donald Trump uses the strategy of theatricality to a limited extent, mainly due to his emphasis on attacking his opponent, leaving little time for performative actions. However, he does occasionally employ tactics such as cooperation, warning, prompting, and promising within his theatricality strategy.

Notably, he frequently uses cooperation to seek support and justify his political actions, often by using inclusive pronouns like "we" and "our", which also serve to distinguish him from his Democratic opponent. Trump also employs the warning tactic, adopting a paranoid style and negative expressions to exaggerate potential negative outcomes of the election in order to attract the electorate's attention. When using the tactic of promising, the purpose is to alleviate concerns of the audience and demonstrate the speaker's willingness to address issues such as climate change, which may not align with his current interests.

In summary, Donald Trump's communication strategies during the 2020 presidential debate were characterized by a greater focus on discrediting his opponent than positive self-representation and theatricality. His style was highly emotional, occasionally aggressive, and disrespectful, with little effort to listen to questions or his opponent. Linguistically, Trump's language was overtly simple, informal, and colloquial, with many contractions and occasional use of idioms and repetitions.

Regarding self-representation, Trump tended to use "I" over "we" rhetoric to discuss positive accomplishments, while using "we" to explain unsatisfactory outcomes. He frequently used the adjectives "good" and "great" to self-congratulate and positioned himself as a rescuer for the nation. He emphasized his superiority over preceding administrations and political leaders.

Trump's opponent discredit strategy was characterized by direct insults and offensive language, often diverging from the topic to accuse or offend his opponent. He referred to Joe Biden as "Joe", sometimes adding to an unserious attitude towards his opponent, and criticized Biden's son personally to provoke opposition. He used figures and numbers to blame the Democratic opponent.

The theatricality strategy demonstrated Trump's populist views, appealing to the values of the American people to win support. He implemented a cooperation tactic but also used a warning tactic to create a paranoid mood and achieve a desired effect.

Overall, Trump's communication strategies were self-preoccupied and focused on his well-being rather than the needs of the electorate. His attacking and challenging

attitude towards his opponent may have cost him the reelection as President of the United States.

3.2. Joe Biden as a representative of the collaborative power during the first presidential debate 2020

Joe Biden, the Democratic nominee, embodies a distinct form of power, one that emphasizes collaboration, in contrast to his opponent. This form of power is intricately linked with his communication style. Biden's extensive political experience, spanning 36 years as a U.S. senator and 8 years as Vice President, sets him apart from Trump. Throughout his career, he has held positions such as chairing the Senate's Judiciary Committee and has contributed significantly to landmark legislation like the Violence Against Women Act. These experiences suggest that Biden views legitimate institutions as the most appropriate means of exercising power.

Moreover, biographical sources and media reports indicate that Biden's personality and demeanour align with collaborative power. He is known for his cooperative, conciliatory, and outgoing nature, prioritizing teamwork and seeking approval from others. He strives to be viewed as a friend and ally, further emphasizing his proclivity for collaborative power.

The aforementioned characteristics are indicative of Joe Biden's communication style and strategies during the 2020 US presidential campaign, especially evident in the presidential debate. This study will examine Biden's communication tactics and strategies, including rhetorical devices and linguistic means to express his collaborative power style. It is crucial to explore how Biden connected with the electorate on a personal level, and the differences in behaviour and conduct between Biden and his opponent, Trump, during the first presidential debate. Biden demonstrated discipline and restraint, desiring to be included in the national conversation without dominating it, remaining calm throughout the debate and adhering to the rules set by the moderator despite provocation from Trump [45].

The subsequent section will focus on Biden's usage of **positive self-representation, negative opponent-discredit, and theatricality strategies** during the 2020 presidential debate. This analysis will provide insights into the distinctive communication strategies employed by Biden compared to his opponent, demonstrating how these distinctions contributed to Biden's success as the Democratic nominee.

Even though Joe Biden is not an ardent fan of **the strategy of positive self-representation**, we will draw some instances of the strategy in the statements he made during the debate. In response to his opponent's attacks, the Democratic nominee employs the tactic of identification, aligning himself with the Democratic Party to refute these claims from the outset: *The party is me. Right now, I am the Democratic Party.* During the debate, Joe Biden artfully countered accusations from Donald Trump regarding differences between the Democratic nominee and the party. Biden emphasizes his association with the Democratic Party, stating that he embodies the party's values and beliefs. This message is reinforced through repetition, as Biden uses paraphrasing and changes the form of the personal pronoun "I" to emphasize his affiliation. The second clause, "Right now, I am the Democratic Party", underscores this point by emphasizing that Biden represents the party's values and beliefs in the present moment. Overall, this phrase conveys a strong sense of identity and affiliation with the Democratic Party.

There are numerous instances wherein Biden employs strategic techniques to repudiate his opponent's accusations and enhance his public image before the audience, despite being subjected to consistent insults and allegations from Trump: *BIDEN: I'm not going to listen to him. The fact of the matter is I beat Bernie Sanders.*
TRUMP: Not by much.

BIDEN: I beat him by a whole hell of a lot.

Joe Biden aims to restore his positive image in response to negative claims made by the opposition. He employs a commonly used phrase, "the fact of the matter is", to highlight factual information and convey to the audience that the Republican opposition is attempting to delegitimize him. It is noteworthy that, as intended by

Trump, Biden is provoked into an emotional response that is not typically characteristic of him. Biden also employs an informal phrase "I beat him by a whole hell of a lot" that demonstrates his frustration and disagreement with what is being said. The primary objective is to maintain his reputation and avoid disrespect from the electorate.

The tactics of positive image creation and distancing oneself from somebody can also be found in the discussion of the measures against coronavirus pandemic: *I laid out back in March, exactly what we should be doing. And I laid out again in July, what we should be doing. We should be providing all the protective gear possible. We should be providing the money the House has passed in order to be able to go out and get people the help they need to keep their businesses open.* Earlier, Biden asserted that Trump lacked a clear strategy for addressing the virus and its aftermath. In contrast, Biden seeks to differentiate himself from his opponent by highlighting that he has presented a plan on multiple occasions. To emphasize his readiness to handle the COVID crisis and its associated challenges, Biden uses repetition and anaphora. Notably, his use of the personal pronoun "I" is atypical for him. However, he subsequently shifts back to the inclusive pronoun "we", suggesting a collective approach to the issue. Biden's statements stand apart from Trump's in their emphasis on "the people" as a focal point.

The next instance of distancing himself from Donald Trump can be seen in the following piece: *Because he doesn't have a plan. If I were running it, I'd know what the plan is. You've got to provide these businesses the ability to have the money to be able to reopen with the PPE, as well as with the sanitation they need. You have to provide them classic-* In spite of being interrupted by his interlocutor, the speaker intends to highlight the contrast between himself and his opponent by asserting that the latter lacks a plan, while he himself would have one if in a similar position. He employs a second conditional structure to discuss an imaginary scenario, but then proceeds to provide concrete examples of what should be done in the current situation. To convey his thoughts on what is necessary for the president to do, he employs phrases with a modal meaning of necessity.

It can be noticeable when the Democrat uses the strategy of self-representation, he does not simply boast or self-congratulate himself and his campaign, but try to present some facts or explanations: *Well, just take a look at what is the analysis done by Wall Street firms, points out that my economic plan would create 7 million more jobs than his in four years, number one. And number two, it would create an additional \$1 trillion in economic growth, because it would be about buying American.* The speaker endeavours to establish a clear differentiation between his opponent and himself across various societal domains discussed during the debate. He employs the opposition of "my-his", where the former is intended to evoke positive associations relative to the latter. To augment credibility, he cites figures and references authority, specifically Wall Street firms. Notably, Biden employs a more conventional approach to delivering information to the public, which enhances its persuasiveness and trustworthiness. The final sentence appeals to American values and the feeling of nationalism, using the collocations "economic growth" and "buying American."

It clearly stands out that Joe Biden is hesitant to attribute certain achievements to oneself as it is exemplified in the following statement: ... *we inherited the worst recession, short of a depression in American history. I was asked to bring it back. We were able to have an economic recovery that created the jobs you're talking about. We handed him a booming economy, he blew it.* The quote contains all the three tactics of the positive self-representation strategy and discredits the opponent. Through the use of the identification tactic, Biden aligns himself with the Obama administration, using the inclusive pronoun "we" to draw a contrast between his team's accomplishments and his opponent's actions. At the same time, he emphasizes his own role in the economic recovery by switching to the first-person pronoun "I". The final sentence employs a contrasting structure, highlighting the phrase "booming economy" to convey the speaker's conviction that the economy was thriving prior to his opponent's tenure and was subsequently damaged under Trump's leadership.

It is quite customary for the Democratic nominee to dispute the allegations made by the opposition by providing supporting evidence that the latter is wrong as in the

instance that follows: He's absolutely wrong, number one. Number two, if in fact, when, during our Administration in the Recovery Act, I was able, was in charge, able to bring down the cost of renewable energy to cheaper than or as cheap as coal and gas and oil. In the cited excerpt, Joe Biden employs a combination of discrediting and positive self-representation tactics. He initiates the statement by discrediting his opponent, before offering specific instances where Trump has erred. Biden then uses the identification tactic, referencing his experience as a Vice President under the Obama Administration, as evidenced by the use of the possessive pronoun "our". While citing a concrete example, Biden shifts to the first-person pronoun "I", accompanied by positive lexical choices such as "cheap". The speaker usually numbers the points he wishes to make, that is a distinctive feature of his communication style.

The use of positive self-representation strategies in Joe Biden's statements is comparatively limited. Instead, he prioritizes establishing a connection with the public by appealing to their values and emotions. However, when faced with the need to maintain his positive image due to Donald Trump's accusations, he employs the pronoun "we" rather than "I" when referring to his accomplishments and aligns himself with the Obama administration or his team. Additionally, he distances himself from his opponent by providing specific examples of why he is superior. This type of statement, which references authority and figures, can be highly persuasive to the public. During debates, Joe Biden emphasizes the importance of the people rather than himself, which is in contrast to the tactics employed by his opponent.

Despite exhibiting a collaborative power and refraining from employing aggressive or emotionally charged communication during his electoral campaign, Joe Biden could not ignore direct insults hurled by his opponent during the first presidential debate, Donald Trump, and instead felt compelled to retaliate. Nonetheless, in comparison to Trump's preferred communication style during the debate, Biden's approach can be considered passive and insipid. On occasion, Biden even implored the moderator to intervene and put a stop to Trump's barrage of attacks and falsehoods, which may not appear to demonstrate a lack of assertiveness for a future

commander-in-chief. In our subsequent analysis, we will examine the most prominent instances of **the opponent discredit strategy** employed by the Democratic nominee and how they diverge in nature from the discrediting strategy mastered by Trump [54, pp. 3-139].

The tactic of accusation was recurrently employed by the speaker while commenting on the COVID crisis with which, in his opinion, Trump failed to deal: *And, by the way, the 200,000 people that have died on his watch, how many of those have survived? Well, there's seven million people that contracted COVID. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act?* The speaker aims to highlight the impact of Trump's opposition to the Affordable Care Act (ACA), a healthcare reform law passed in 2010, and how it will continue to affect people if the Act is repealed. Biden subtly uses a manipulative technique to sway the audience's opinion by referring to the coronavirus death toll during Trump's administration, evoking negative emotions. Additionally, Biden poses a rhetorical question to his opponent, implying that without the ACA, it will be harder for people to overcome the virus and survive, demonstrating his concern for the people.

It is noteworthy that Biden exhibits a proclivity towards numerical data while undermining his opponent, as evidenced by his usage of the accusation tactic on multiple occasions: *Because he, in fact, already has cost 10 million people their healthcare that they had from their employers because of his recession. Number one. Number two, there are 20 million people getting healthcare through Obamacare now that he wants to take it away. He won't ever look you in the eye and say that's what he wants to do. Take it away.* With regard to the use of numerical data, Biden employs references to bolster his credibility and garner favour from potential voters, as well as to draw their attention to the subject at hand. Biden must present himself as a compassionate and highly committed individual to the ordinary people, who constitute the largest proportion of the electorate. Additionally, he endeavours to depict Trump as unwilling to assume responsibility for his actions by asserting that "he won't ever look you in the eye". Notably, the speaker employs the third-person pronoun "he" exclusively, which lends a tone of coldness and disrespect towards the

opponent. To assign blame for the current dire economic state, Biden employs the phrase "his recession", indicting Trump as the sole individual responsible. The repetition of the phrasal verb "take it away" imbues the statement with emotional intensity and emphasis. Biden's communication style prominently features the enumeration of points, which facilitates the audience's comprehension of the information presented in an organized fashion.

The employment of accusation and humiliation tactics is discernible in Biden's rhetoric, as he asserts that Trump has no plan: *He's been promising a healthcare plan since he got elected. He has none, like almost everything else he talks about. He does not have a plan. He doesn't have a plan. And the fact is this man doesn't know what he's talking about.* The Democratic candidate employs an emotional and direct lexical style in the given context. Biden's statement "he does not have a plan" may be construed as having an underlying meaning, as he regards his opponent as untruthful and unreliable. The rhetorical device of repetition evident in the excerpt could be deemed a result of an emotional reaction rather than a deliberate technique. Notably, when speeches become impassioned, they tend to lack clarity and factual data, which is atypical for the Democratic nominee. Biden's approach differs from that of Trump, as he refers to the latter in the third person, rather than addressing the interlocutor directly, as preferred by Trump.

There are a lot of heated points during the debate where Joe Biden are being provoked by Donald Trump and almost loses his temper:

BIDEN: Will you shut up, man?

TRUMP: Listen, who is on your list, Joe? Who's on your list?

WALLACE: Gentlemen, I think we've ended this-

BIDEN: This is so un-Presidential.

TRUMP: He's going to pack the court. He is not going to give a list.

WALLACE: We have ended the segment. We're going to move on to the second segment.

BIDEN: That was really a productive segment, wasn't it? Keep yapping, man.

Joe Biden becomes frustrated with Donald Trump's persistent interruptions, leading

him to employ informal language by asking Trump to "shut up" and referring to him as "man". This request carries an implicit criticism of Trump's behaviour, which is viewed as disruptive and unproductive for the debate. Biden further delegitimizes Trump's conduct by characterizing it as "unpresidential", an uncommon adjective that emphasizes Trump's failure to meet the standards of a presidential candidate.

Throughout the exchange, both candidates engage in personal attacks and name-calling, using emotionally charged language to discredit their opponent. The moderator intervenes to restore order and bring the conversation back on track. Following this intervention, Biden makes an ironic remark using a question with a question tag, suggesting that the segment had been unproductive due to Trump's behaviour. He also uses the colloquial verb "to yap" to demonstrate his disapproval of Trump's conduct. The exchange lacks the civilized and rational discussion necessary for potential voters to make informed decisions. The use of informal language, personal attacks, and emotionally charged language detracts from the substance of the debate and may hinder voters' ability to evaluate the candidates' positions.

Another instance of a personal attack and the attack on the moral character of Donald Trump is the following: *Because here's the deal, here's the deal. The fact is that everything he's saying so far is simply a lie. I'm not here to call out his lies. Everybody knows he's a liar.* The Democratic nominee becomes visibly emotional when confronted with Donald Trump's claims that he did not win the primaries by a large margin. Biden makes a sweeping generalization by stating that everything Trump says is a lie, and that everyone is aware of this fact. He employs repetition of the word "lie" and its derivatives to amplify the negative connotations associated with this word and reinforce his point. Another noteworthy feature of Biden's communication style is his frequent use of the phrase "here's the deal", which he uses twice in the present instance and repeatedly throughout his subsequent remarks. Although this phrase is characteristic of Biden's speaking style, it sometimes appears out of context.

In the following extract, the tactic of accusation is also sprinkled with the ridicule: *Do you believe for a moment what he's telling you in light of all the lies he's told you*

about the whole issue relating to COVID? He still hasn't even acknowledged that he knew this was happening, knew how dangerous it was going to be back in February, and he didn't even tell you. He's on record as saying it. He panicked or he just looked at the stock market. One of the two. Because guess what? A lot of people died and a lot more are going to die unless he gets a lot smarter, a lot quicker-. In this discourse, it is imperative to note that Joe Biden employs a strategy of levying accusations against his opponent, Donald Trump, while simultaneously appealing to the public through the use of rhetorical questions. This approach does not appear to be a mere exchange of personal attacks but rather showcases Biden's dedication and commitment to the American nation. Furthermore, the use of the negatively connoted term "dangerous" serves to amplify the message being conveyed to the public. The speaker continues to reference Trump using the third-person singular pronoun "he", creating a sense of distance between the speaker and the subject of discussion. The allusion to the stock market is an ironic reference to Trump's business career, emphasizing his self-centred interests. Biden implements the structure "to be going to" to make a prediction, while also repeating the negatively connoted term "die" twice in the sentence. The extensive use of the adverbial phrase "a lot of" is employed for exaggeration purposes, contributing to a more eloquent tone in the discourse.

Another peculiar commentary with the aim to humiliate the opposition is made by Biden due to Trump's constant interruptions: *Well, it's hard to get any word in with this clown. Excuse me, this person*. The Democratic nominee, Joe Biden, exhibits a tendency towards using names and labels as a means of insulting or discrediting his opponent. The underlying reason for this aggressive behaviour may be attributed to the provocation of Donald Trump and Biden's inability to adequately articulate his campaign and policies. Specifically, the speaker refers to his opponent as a "clown", before purportedly retracting and substituting it with the term "person".

Through the analysis it is vivid that Joe Biden tends to appeal to the Republican directly exclusively in cases he asks him to stay calm however when he delegitimizes the opponent he sticks to speaking of him in the third person as though he talks to the people in the first place: *He doesn't want to calm things down. Instead of going in*

and talking to people and saying, "Let's get everybody together. Figure out how to deal with this." What's he do? He just pours gasoline in the fire. Constantly. At every single solitary time. In his discourse, Joe Biden critiques Donald Trump's failure to mitigate the riots and protests by appealing to the emotions and sentiments of the public, and presenting a hypothetical scenario in which Trump cooperates with the people. It is noteworthy that the question posed in the excerpt is grammatically incorrect, a common characteristic of Biden's oral communication characterized by slips of the tongue and verbal mistakes.

Furthermore, the former Vice President employs a metaphor in the excerpt, likening Trump's behaviour to "pouring gasoline in the fire", which serves to underscore his point that Trump is exacerbating an already tense situation.

Lastly, the phrase's extensive use of redundancy in the repetition of "single" and "solitary" after "every" functions as an intensification and emphatic construction that seeks to draw the audience's attention to the point being conveyed.

In summary, it can be inferred that Donald Trump is not the only candidate strategically implementing techniques aimed at discrediting opponents during the debate. Joe Biden also engages in such tactics by questioning Trump's credibility and suitability for the presidency. Biden, it appears, is drawn into a combative and confrontational dialogue by Trump. Throughout the debate, the former Vice President frequently resorts to accusation tactics, using demeaning language such as "clown" and "man" when referring to Trump, and directly addressing his opponent. Biden appears to be keenly aware of the audience and makes a concerted effort to discredit his opposition. He employs rhetorical questions, as well as numerical data and generalizations, to support his opponent discredit strategy. The primary focus of Biden's communication style is to suggest that Trump lacks a viable plan, and this theme persists throughout the debate.

The last communication strategy that we will scrutinize is **the theatricality strategy** that is prevalent in Biden's statements throughout the debate. This approach is primarily used to showcase the collaborative power and commitment of the politician towards the American nation. Biden uses this strategy to influence the

audience and evoke specific emotional responses from the electorate. His statements are characterized by a direct appeal to the people and are reminiscent of the language used by past presidents. Biden often makes references to past achievements and moral virtues, particularly those that are relevant to the in-group. Additionally, his language underscores the importance of solidarity and in-group virtue, which is consistent with the reliance on prestige as a pathway to power. In the ensuing discussion, we will provide examples that corroborate the aforementioned hypothesis [70, pp. 631-658].

The strategy of theatricality, namely the tactic of cooperation, is present almost in the first statements made by Joe Biden during the debate: *The American people have a right to have a say in who the Supreme Court nominee is and that say occurs when they vote for United States Senators and when they vote for the President of United States.* During the conversation, the topic of discussion was the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett to the court, a decision that President Biden disapproves of due to the presence of another nominee from the Democratic Party. However, instead of directly attempting to convince the audience of the superiority of the Democratic nominee, President Biden employs a communication tactic centred on cooperation, appealing to the values held by the American people by reminding them of their rights. This approach makes use of the powerful phrase "the American people have a right", which serves to portray the actions of President Trump as an attempt to deprive the public of their rights. Additionally, President Biden emphasizes the importance of voting, using the verb twice to underscore the significance of voting as a means of expressing one's wishes in a democratic society. This can also be seen as a prompting tactic, with President Biden urging the electorate to take part in the election unless they wish for Donald Trump to determine their fate.

Here is a more representative example of the prompting of tactic implemented by the former Vice President: *The issue is the American people should speak. You should go out and vote. You're voting now. Vote and let your Senators know how strongly you feel.* President Biden's rhetoric can be characterized as demotic, which places importance on the virtue of the common man without necessarily condemning the

elite. He urges the American people to exercise their right to vote as a means of expressing their feelings and desires, rather than remaining silent. The use of the modal verb "should" serves as a piece of advice and is not excessively demanding or radical in tone. Biden repeats the verb "vote" three times, using it as a mantra to emphasize its importance to the people. Furthermore, his rhetoric demonstrates an awareness of the current dynamics and mood of the nation [73].

The would-be president also strategically uses the tactic of informing while discussing the coronavirus pandemic and its aftermath: *200,000 dead. As you said, over seven million infected in the United States. We, in fact, have 4% of the world's population, 20% of the deaths. 40,000 people a day are contracting COVID. In addition to that, about between 750 and 1000 people a day are dying.* The presentation of a large concentration of figures within a single piece is likely to capture the audience's attention, even if potential voters do not immediately verify the data. However, the topic at hand is overtly sensitive and emotionally charged, as people are undoubtedly dying in the United States and around the world. While it may seem that Biden simply aims to provide the electorate with concrete data and keep them informed, it is important to note that this situation occurs during President Trump's tenure as a Commander-in-Chief.

One of the most impressive examples of the cooperation tactic is employed by Joe Biden while exploring the COVID topic: *How many of you got up this morning and had an empty chair at the kitchen table because someone died of COVID? How many of you are in a situation where you lost your mom or dad and you couldn't even speak to them, you had a nurse holding a phone up so you could in fact say goodbye?* The speaker employs rhetorical questions as a means of directly appealing to the public, utilizing anaphora to begin each question with the phrase "how many of you". Through the use of these questions, Biden seeks to elicit an emotional response from his audience and to demonstrate his empathy towards those affected by the pandemic. The questions are crafted in a manner that creates a sense of shared experience among many Americans, underscoring the widespread impact of COVID-19.

The strategic use of rhetorical questions serves to engage the audience emotionally and highlight the personal toll of the pandemic. This approach stands in contrast to the self-centred rhetoric of Biden's opponent and his tendency to avoid addressing pressing issues.

The features of populism can also be traced in some of the statements Joe Biden delivers: *The difference is millionaires and billionaires like him in the middle of the COVID crisis have done very well. Billionaires have made another \$300 billion because of his profligate tax proposal, and he only focused on the market. But you folks at home, you folks living in Scranton and Claymont and all the small towns and working class towns in America, how well are you doing?* In this excerpt, we can observe the employment of a delimitation tactic by Biden in order to establish a clear distinction between the elite, represented by Trump, and the working class, which Biden identifies with due to his roots. He reinforces this distinction by referencing his hometown of Scranton, Pennsylvania, a middle-class steel town, and thereby suggests that he is familiar with the struggles of common people.

By positioning himself as a man of the people who understands their pain, Biden employs a communication tactic that seeks to engender trust and empathy among the electorate. Additionally, he underscores the difference in values and goals between the two classes, linking his explanation to the theme of the coronavirus.

Biden concludes the statement with a rhetorical question directed towards the people, inquiring about their well-being and emphasizing the issue of inequality in the country. Overall, the use of a delimitation tactic and rhetorical devices in this excerpt serves to establish Biden's credibility and commitment to addressing the concerns of working-class Americans [73].

The tactic of promising is as well present as the representation of the theatricality strategy in Joe Biden's statements: *By the way, I'm going to eliminate a significant number of the taxes. I'm going to make the corporate tax 28%. It shouldn't be 21%.* The speaker employs the grammatical structure of "to be going to" to announce his intended plans and make a public promise, a common feature in political campaigns. In this extract, two promises are made by the speaker. The first promise may appear

ambiguous as the speaker does not specify the exact figure but instead employs the collocation "a significant number", which may be interpreted as an exaggeration. In contrast, the second promise is more precise as a specific percentage range is provided, i.e., from 28% to 21%. The use of promises serves as a rhetorical device to inspire hope among potential voters that the speaker is a capable candidate who will take tangible actions as a president.

To distract the audience from the discrediting comments of Donald Trump towards Biden's personality, he also turns to "the people" rhetoric as in the following instance: *This is not about my family or his family. It's about your family, the American people.* The Democratic candidate seeks to draw attention to President Trump's self-centred approach and lack of focus on the welfare of the American public. This strategic manoeuvre is employed to shift the discourse and portray the opponent as culpable, rather than the speaker. However, the efficacy of this tactic may be limited due to its overtly manipulative nature, which fails to demonstrate Vice President Biden's genuine concern for the matter and instead employs the public as a defensive mechanism.

Here is one more example of the usage of cooperation tactic where the main topic is equality: *In fact, we're all Americans. The only way we're gonna bring this country together is bring everybody together. There's nothing we cannot do, if we do it together. We can take this on, and we can defeat racism in America.* In contrast to President Trump's politically divisive approach, Biden's campaign emphasizes the importance of unity. He establishes a sense of shared identity with the American public in the opening sentence, reinforced by the recurrent use of the inclusive pronoun "we" throughout the text. Furthermore, the repeated usage of the word "together" strengthens the message, evoking a sense of collective solidarity and affiliation among the audience. Notably, the third sentence contains a double negation, which appears to be an inadvertent error on the part of the speaker. The use of the collocation "defeat racism" carries an emotional resonance, appealing to the democratic values and liberties that are intrinsic to the American nation.

The most prominent expression of the prompting tactic is used by Joe Biden in the closing note he makes at the end of the debate: *Show up and vote. You will determine the outcome of this election. Vote, vote, vote. If you're able to vote early in your state, vote early. If you're able to vote in person, vote in person. Vote whatever way is the best way for you. Because you will—he cannot stop you from being able to determine the outcome of this election.* The speaker adopts an explicit and direct approach in the form of an imperative voice throughout the text, repeatedly urging the audience to take action. The frequent use of the word "vote" may be perceived as emotionally charged, emphasizing the crucial role of citizens in determining both their own fate and that of their country, independent of the incumbent President Trump. By relying on the people as the cornerstone of the electoral process, Joe Biden underscores his appreciation for their agency, regardless of the ultimate outcome. This exhortation to action may inspire individuals to assume greater responsibility and engage in the voting process, even if they had previously been apathetic.

In conclusion, in his performance in the first presidential debate of 2020, Joe Biden employed a variety of tactics within the framework of theatricality. His primary focus was on the cooperation tactic, in which he frequently identified himself with ordinary people and appealed to their system of values. He used collocations and words such as "the American people", "the people" and "the folk" repeatedly in his statements, aiming to demonstrate that he is one of them, in contrast to Trump's detachment from the public.

Moreover, Biden employed the prompting tactic to call the nation to action using the imperative mood. He also used the delimitation tactic to highlight the differences in the views of the elite and the working class, which was evident in his use of rhetorical questions.

Although Biden provided a lot of specific figures during the debate, many of these could not be fact-checked at the time of speaking, and therefore the tactic of informing also had a manipulative nature. Despite Trump's interruptions, Biden implemented the tactic of promising to discuss his plans as president, giving more explicit details than his opponent.

Overall, the strategy of theatricality was one of the main rhetorical means used by Biden to capture the audience's attention and gain more support.

In analysing Joe Biden's communication strategies during the presidential debate with his Republican opponent, the following characteristics can be outlined. Within the strategy of positive self-representation, Biden did not frequently focus on his own personality, except in cases when he had to refute accusations made by his opponent and refute his image in front of the audience. His main focus was on identifying himself with the Democratic Party and the people of the United States, manifested with the inclusive pronoun "we". This strategy was also employed with the goal of distancing himself from his competitor, Donald Trump. However, it is worth noting that Biden avoided self-congratulating and self-praise during the debate. While referencing certain achievements, he usually identified them with the Obama administration and his team.

Regarding the opponent discredit strategy, it was quite extensively employed by the Democratic nominee. He frequently used the accusation tactic, especially when discussing the coronavirus pandemic and Donald Trump's inaction. While discrediting his opponent, Biden tended to use the third-person pronoun "he" rather than his name or title. In heated arguments, Biden occasionally lost his temper and made ironic comments to calm down the opposition. He did not hesitate to use personal insults to attack the moral character of Donald Trump. Notably, almost all of his statements were directed towards the audience and people, rather than Donald Trump directly. It was as if he was opening the audience's eyes regarding Trump's image by posing questions to the public.

The tactic of theatricality was the principal means employed by Joe Biden during the presidential debate to gain support from the audience and represent himself positively. The cooperation tactic was a recurrent device in Biden's statements, with a focus on the people and their welfare. He delivered the idea that the citizens of the United States had to define their fate and therefore voice their wishes. For a more efficient influence, he used the prompting tactic to call the public to action and make them realize the importance of their voice. To inform the audience, the tactics of

informing and promising were employed, even though they had a rhetorical nature rather than dialectic or argumentative.

Overall, Joe Biden's main perspective was to appeal to the American nation, calling them to unite and reconcile [1, pp. 9-15]. He aimed to convince the audience of his Democratic principles, the importance of democratic values for the country's development, and the power of the nation if united. In addition to the cooperative communication style of the politician, his language and lexical choices appeared to be conventional and presidential-like, which was evident in the organization of his statements when he tended to enumerate points made. By and large, Biden's communication style can be characterized as decent, compassionate, and cooperative, but sometimes unassertive when compared to his opponent [54, pp. 3-139].

Conclusion

To summarise the strategic analysis of the 2020 presidential debate between the Republican nominee, Donald Trump, and the Democratic nominee, Joe Biden, it is apparent that their communication styles greatly influenced their perceived images and voter appeal. Trump's communication style portrays him as an attacker who disparages U.S. democracy and institutions, often using incendiary and aggressive language. Despite the unorthodox nature of his communication strategies, Trump's inclination to condemn the elite and U.S. institutions and be the defender of ordinary people resonates with a wide audience.

During the debate, Trump primarily employed the opponent discredit strategy, frequently interrupting his opponent and insulting him personally. This approach failed to captivate the audience and neglected their well-being. Trump's self-representation and theatricality strategies were less prevalent, but he often used positive image creation tactics and self-praise techniques, highlighting his superiority over past administrations and political figures. He also employed notes of a paranoid mood, warning his supporters of an upcoming "rigged" election and calling them to be on guard.

In contrast, Joe Biden adopted a more respectful, well-mannered, and conventional approach to his opponent. His communication style emphasized democratic ethos and advocacy for unity and concord among Americans, and his extensive political experience and background set him apart from his opponent. Biden was viewed as feeble and unassertive at times, which was attributed to his advanced age, but his communication strategies were mainly focused on the theatricality strategy to gain support from the electorate.

Biden's self-representation strategy mostly relied on "we" rhetoric rather than "I", with the precedence of the identification tactic. Within the theatricality strategy, the cooperation tactic prevailed, emphasizing the people and their unity as the way to a prosperous America. Unlike Trump, Biden did not warn his voters of a "fake" election but encouraged them to participate and have their voice heard. Biden also employed the opponent discredit strategy by delegitimizing the opposition using the tactics of accusation and offence, but he used the third-person pronoun "he" to refer to Trump when Trump was throwing insults at him directly.

In times of crisis, Biden's compassionate and collaborative communication style instils more trust and hope than Trump's coercive and aggressive approach. Biden's stress on middle-class voters and sympathy with them, which Trump missed in his statements, helped him connect with the undecided fraction of the electorate. However, Trump's message had a different direction that may have influenced the election outcome.

SUMMARY

This study focuses on the implementation of communication strategies and tactics in political discourse within American politics.

We have defined the concept of political discourse. Since language is an inseparable constituent of the realm of politics and serves as a crucial element for expressing political ideas and exerting an influence on the public, it stipulates creating of a new communicative environment where political actors perform their political roles and struggle for political power, i.e. political discourse.

In our research, we have delineated the most prominent characteristics of political discourse, which is a multifaceted phenomenon. One of the defining features of political discourse is its extralinguistic nature, which is determined by the communicative activity, status, and role of participants, as well as their communicative goals. Interactivity is another key characteristic of political discourse due to the presence of an addressee. Furthermore, the selection of topics in political discourse is invariably linked to the political reality, as politicians seek to assert their interests, which is yet another feature of political discourse. Finally, political discourse is characterized by the use of emotionality and theatricality. These features may be subject to modification or adaptation based on the prevailing political circumstances.

As for the classification of political discourse, different approaches are presented, some of them consider form, function of an addresser, goal and sphere of functioning as the basis for the discourse typology. According to its form, the political discourse is divided into written and oral, with the latter including speech as a monologue form of its manifestation and debates as dialogue one.

In the study of political discourse, various genres have been identified, namely presentation and image, informative, ritual, agitation, and agonally-argued. It has been observed that agitation language genres are primarily intended to persuade voters to support a politician or a political entity, and are commonly employed during election campaigns. In addition, political electoral campaigns exhibit features of

agonally-argued language genres, which are characterized by heightened emotional expression. It has been determined that the televised presidential debate, a prominent feature of American political discourse, combines elements of both aforementioned genres. The genre of televised presidential debate is typified by structured arguments and impromptu commentary, with a focus on exerting direct influence on the audience, while providing information and facts as a secondary objective. The genre is characterized by persuasiveness and argumentation, as well as communicative rivalry and agony, which have become increasingly prevalent in recent decades.

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. It refers to a structured approach to speech acts designed to accomplish specific goals and intentions in a politician-audience communication scenario, whether in monologue or dialogue form. On the other hand, communication tactics represent the particular ways of applying a communication strategy, often manifested as local rhetorical devices and modes 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, namely during the presidential debate: the strategy of self-representation, the strategy of discredit and the strategy of theatricality. Every strategy entails a number of tactics which assist in their efficient implementation, but the current study does not adhere to a concrete selection of communication tactics since they vary substantially for every historical period and political actor. So, the detailed analysis of the unique linguistic techniques of political actors have been performed.

In terms of the distinct features of these communication strategies, the self-representation strategy serves the purpose of showcasing the strengths of a politician and positioning them at the same level as their audience. The opponent discredit strategy brings contrast by offering criticism or insults towards the opponent of a

political speaker. Additionally, the theatricality strategy, with its range of tactics, aims to create a public spectacle to maintain the audience's interest in the political performance. It has been noted that despite the fact that politicians use various communication strategies, there are always certain strategies that dominate their rhetoric.

The investigation of communication strategies used in two distinct political eras, namely 1960 and 2020, has revealed the political candidates' adherence to specific communication strategies and how the selection of such strategies has changed over a century. The 1960 presidential debate, featuring nominees Richard Nixon and John Kennedy, is a momentous event in the United States history, as it is the first televised debate, enabling ordinary citizens to view the debate. Through our analysis we have observed that Nixon, the Republican candidate, relies primarily on the strategy of opponent discredit to avoid falling behind Kennedy, his opponent. Nixon's opponent discredit statements are consistently supported by evidence and explanations. Conversely, Kennedy, the Democratic candidate, places his focus on the theatricality strategy to connect with the emotions of people and secure their support. Despite the predominance of the theatricality strategy, Kennedy is the attacker in the 1960 debate.

Our analysis of the 2020 presidential debate has revealed significant changes in the nature of political discourse over the past century. In contrast to the 1960 debate, the current nominees exhibit a disregard for established norms and rules, resulting in purely rhetorical speeches devoid of dialectic or substantive arguments. President Trump's communication strategies are particularly noteworthy in this regard, with his frequent use of the opponent discredit strategy. However, unlike Richard Nixon's 1960 employment of this strategy, Trump's version lacks grounding in reason or logic and relies heavily on emotionally charged personal attacks. Conversely, the Democratic nominee, Joe Biden, echoes John Kennedy's use of the theatricality strategy and emphasizes cooperation tactics to demonstrate his intention to unite the nation and connect with the audience.

The analysis of the two presidential debates from a strategic-tactic perspective offers a valuable insight into how the communication style of politicians in American

political discourse has shifted from positive to negative campaigning, and how the nature of debates has become less normative and informative over time. This study provides a comprehensive understanding of the linguistic personalities of Richard Nixon, John Kennedy, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden. The conducted research can serve as a source of information for further research on the linguistic personalities or idiostyles of the political figures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ананко Т. Стратегії аргументації в політичному дискурсі Джо Байдена / Т. Ананко. // Вісник КНЛУ. – 2021. – С. 9–15.
2. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М., 1990. С. 136—137.
3. Атьман О. В. Жанровая специфика президентского дискурса США // Альманах современной науки и образования. — Тамбов: Грамота, 2009. № 2 (21). — С.14–16
4. Баранов А. Н., Казакевич Е. Г. Парламентские дебаты: традиции и новации. М.: Знание, 1991.
5. Баталов Э. Политическая культура современного американского общества. – М., 1990.
6. Бахтин М. М. Проблема речевых жанров / М. М. Бахтин – М. : Русские словари, 1996. – Т. 5. – С. 159-206.
7. Бацевич Ф.С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики. – К.:ВЦ “Академія”, 2004. – 344 с.
8. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика / Эмиль Бенвенист. – Москва: “Прогресс”, 1974. – 407 с.
9. Білик О. До проблеми типології жанрів передвиборчого дискурсу / О. Білик. // Видавництво Національного університету «Острозька академія».. – 2013. – №38. – С. 152–155.
- 10.Бутова І. Політичний дискурс як об’єкт лінгвістичних досліджень. Вісник Львів. ун-ту. Серія: Іноземні мови. Львів, 2009. Вип. 16. С. 232–238.
- 11.ван Дейк Т. А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация / Т. А. ван Дейк. — М., 1989. – 312 с.
- 12.Винник О.Ю. Дискурс, функціональний стиль, жанр, текст: співвідношення понять / О.Ю. Винник // Філологічні студії. – Луцьк: Волинський академічний дім, 2004. - №2. – С. 50-55.

13. Голоднов А. В. Персуазивная стратегия текстообразования в риторическом метадискурсе / А. В. Голоднов. // «Вестник ЛГУ им. А.С. Пушкина». – 2007. – №2. – С. 113–125.
14. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. М., 2002. № 3. С. 32–43.
15. Дун Ц. Дослідження передумов виникнення політичного дискурсу в англomовних країнах / Ці Дун. // Молодий вчений. – 2021. – №6. – С. 30–32.
16. Ільченко М. Тактики ініціації говоріння в англomовному електоральному дискурсі / М. Ільченко. // Вісник ХНУ. – 2012. – №1003. – С. 34–40.
17. Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Изд. 3-е. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 284 с.
18. Карасик В. И. Структура институционального дискурса. / В. И. Карасик. // Саратовский национальный исследовательский государственный университет имени Н.Г. Чернышевского. – 2000. – С. 25–33.
19. Кобзева О. Особливості організації сучасного електорального дискурсу / О. Кобзева. // Видавничий дім "Гельветика". – 2019. – №9. – С. 93–97.
20. Коваль І.О. Президентський дискурс: сутність, структура, функції, цілі. Стратегічні пріоритети. 2012. № 3 (24). С. 158–163.
21. Ковальова О. Політичний дискурс: сучасні лінгвістичні інтерпретації. / О. Ковальова. – 2020. – С. 101–107.
22. Кондратенко Н. В. Типологія мовленнєвих жанрів українського політичного дискурсу. // Збірник наукових праць. – 2017. – №9.
23. Кондратенко Н. В. Український політичний дискурс: текстуалізація реальності : [монографія] / Н. В. Кондратенко. – Одеса : Чорномор'я, 2007. – 156 с.
24. Кукса І. Рольова організація мовленнєвого жанру теледебатів [Електронний ресурс] / І. Кукса. – 2011. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/5065/>.

- 25.Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса. - Москва: Гнозис, 2003. - 261 с.
- 26.Нагорна Л. П. Політична мова і мовна політика: діапазон можливостей політичної лінгвістики / Л. П. Нагорна. – К. : Світогляд, 2005. – 315 с.
- 27.Назаренко О. Вербальні засоби та прийоми реалізації гумористичного та комічного ефектів у американському політичному дискурсі / О. Назаренко. // Записки з романо-германської філології. – 2020. – №1. – С. 203–211.
- 28.Паршина О. Н. Стратегии и тактики речевого поведения современной политической элиты России : дис. докт. філ. наук : ВАК РФ / Паршина Ольга Николаевна, 2005. – 325 с.
- 29.Петренко В. В. Політична мова як засіб маніпулятивного впливу : автореф. дис. ... канд. політ. наук : спец. 23.00.02 / В. В. Петренко. – К., 2003. – 18 с.
- 30.Почепцов Г. Г. Побудова іміджу як комунікативне програмування / Г. Г. Почепцов // «Нова політика». – К., 1998. – № 5. – С. 41–43
- 31.Селіванова О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія / О.Селіванова. – Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2006. – 716 с.
- 32.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.
- 33.Слюсарева Н. А. Проблемы функционального синтаксиса современного английского языка (монография) / Н. А. Слюсарева., 1981. – 206 с.
- 34.Фролова І.Є. Регулятивний потенціал стратегії конфронтації в англomовному дискурсі : дис. ... д-ра філол. наук : 10.02.04. Харків, 2015. 508 с.
- 35.Хабермас Ю. Демократия. Разум. Нравственность. – М., 1992. – 224 с.
- 36.Шаховский В. Лингвистическая теория эмоций / В. Шаховский. // Гнозис. – 2008. – С. 39–44.

- 37.Шевчук Н. В. Особливості політичного дискурсу: зміст, функції, жанрове втілення. Вісник ДАКККиМ. Політологія. Вип. 1. 2013. С. 263–269.
- 38.Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса. - М.: ИТДГК “Гнозис”, 2004. - 326 с.
- 39.Al-Khatib M. Authorship verification of opinion articles in online newspapers using the idiolect of author: a comparative study. / M. Al-Khatib, J. Al-Qaoud. // Information Communication and Society. – 2020. – P. 1–19.
- 40.Allaire C. Yes, President Trump Really Dropped a Racial Slur on Live Television Tonight [Електронний ресурс] / Christian Allaire. – 2020. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://www.vogue.com/article/president-trump-debate-pocahontas-racial-slur>.
- 41.Beard A. The Language of Politics / Adrian Beard., 1999. – 132 p.
- 42.Borrecsa A. Political Dramaturgy: A Dramaturg's (Re)View [Електронний ресурс] / Art Borrecsa. – 1993. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://www.academia.edu/20647087/Political_Dramaturgy_A_Dramaturgs_Re_View.
- 43.Boyd M. Critical Discourse Analysis and Politics / M. Boyd, L. Llamas. // The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies. – 2018. – P. 312–327.
- 44.Buntz O. A comparative analysis of the ethos-based statements made by John Kennedy and Richard Nixon in their 1960 presidential campaign speeches [Електронний ресурс] / Oletta Buntz. – 1963. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33369964.pdf>.
- 45.Burns A. How Joe Biden Won the Presidency [Електронний ресурс] / A. Burns, J. Martin. – 2021. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/07/us/politics/joe-biden-president.htm>.
- 46.Charaudeau P. A quoi sert d’analyser le discours politique? [Електронний ресурс] / Patrick Charaudeau. – 2002. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://www.patrick-charaudeau.com/A-quoi-sert-d-analyse-le-discours,161.html>.

47. Chilton P. *Analysing Political Discourse* / P. Chilton. – London: Routledge, 2004.
48. Cislaru G. Emotions as a rhetorical tool in political discourse [Электронный ресурс] / Georgeta Cislaru. – 2012. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281108732_Emotions_as_a_rhetorical_tool_in_political_discourse.
49. Coleman S. *Debate on Television: The Spectacle of Deliberation* / Stephen Coleman. // *Television & New Media*. – 2012. – №1.
50. Dieckmann W. *Politische Sprache, politische Kommunikation Vorträge, Aufsätze, Entwürfe* / Walther Dieckmann. – Heidelberg, 1981. – 279 p.
51. Dowling C. *The Effects of Negative Advertising* [Электронный ресурс] / C. Dowling, Y. Krupnikov – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://oxfordre.com/politics/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-51>.
52. Edelman M. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics* / Murray Edelman. – Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1985. – 221 p.
53. Entman R. *Projections of Power* / Robert Entman., 2004. – 240 p.
54. *Europe Abhors Donald Trump: The Opinion on the 2020 U.S. Presidential Elections and Their Candidates in the European Newspapers* / M. Sintés-Olivella, P. Franch, E. Yeste-Piquer, K. Zilles. // SAGE Publications. – 2022. – P. 3–139.
55. Evans J. *Who Doesn't Trust Fauci? The Public's Belief in the Expertise and Shared Values of Scientists in the COVID-19 Pandemic* / J. Evans, E. Hargittai. // *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*. – 2020.
56. Fairclough N. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* / Norman Fairclough., 2003.
57. Fairclough N. *Genres in political discourse*. // *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* / – Boston: Elsevier, 2006. – (5). – P. 32–38.
58. Fairclough N. *Language and Power* // *Language in Society*, 1991. – P. 265–269.

59. Faris R. Polarization and the Pandemic: American Political Discourse [Электронный ресурс] / R. Faris, J. Clark. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://cyber.harvard.edu/publication/2020/polarization-and-pandemic-american-political-discourse>.
60. Feldman O. Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere / O. Feldman, C. de Landtsheer., 1998. – 212 p.
61. Fitzduff M. Why Irrational Politics Appeals: Understanding the Allure of Trump / Mari Fitzduff., 2017.
62. Goffman E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life / Erving Goffman. – Edinburgh, 1956.
63. Griffin E. A first look at communication theory. McGraw-Hill Education / E. Griffin., 2018.
64. Haaland C. Political Success and the Media / Connor J. Haaland. // The Journal of Undergraduate Research. – 2017.
65. Hart R. Why Trump Lost and How? A Rhetorical Explanation / Roderick P. Hart. // American Behavioral Scientist. – 2021. – №1. – P. 7–27.
66. Hyland K. Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis / Ken Hyland., 2011. – 448 p.
67. Ivanova J. Persuasion Strategies in US Presidential Debates / Ivanova Julia, 2003.
68. Kapur S. Deconstructing Dialectic & Rhetoric in American Political Debate: How did American political debate devolve from a dialectical endeavor to a strictly rhetorical one? [Электронный ресурс] / Sumit Kapur. – 2021. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/27344/Final_Thesis-KapurS.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y.
69. Khalatian A. Election Discourse// Political Linguistics. – Ekaterinburh, 2012. – Iss. 2(36). – P. 180–187

70. Körner R. How the Linguistic Styles of Donald Trump and Joe Biden Reflect Different Forms of Power / R. Körner, J. Overbeck. // *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. – 2022. – P. 631–658.
71. Lakoff G. *Don't Think of an Elephant!* / George Lakoff, 2004.
72. Leeuwen T. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis* / Theo van Leeuwen., 2008.
73. Lindsay R. *Is Joe Biden a Populist? An Analysis of Biden's Campaign Speeches* / R. Lindsay, A. Galán., 2021.
74. Marin-Arrese J. Epistemic legitimisation and inter/subjectivity in the discourse of parliamentary and public inquiries / J. Marin-Arrese. // *Critical Discourse Studies*. – 2015. – P. 261–278.
75. Mayer W. In Defense of Negative Campaigning / William G. Mayer. // *Political Science Quarterly*. – 1996. – P. 437–455.
76. McKinney M. Presidential campaign debates in the 2020 elections: debate scholarship and the future of presidential debates / Mitchell S. McKinney. // *Argumentation And Advocacy*. – 2021. – P. 149–156.
77. Minow N. Inside the Presidential Debates Their Improbable Past and Promising Future [Электронный ресурс] / N. Minow, C. LaMay – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/530413_intro.html.
78. Mouffe C. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* / C. Mouffe, L. Ernesto., 1985. – 228 p.
79. O'Brien L. Liking and Listening: Impression Formation and Information Processing in Presidential Debates / O'Brien Lauren Haviland, 2020. – 104 p.
80. Ross A. Discursive Deflection: Accusation of “Fake News” and the Spread of Mis- and Disinformation in the Tweets of President Trump / A. Ross, D. Rivers. // *Social Media + Society*. – 2018. – P. 1–12.
81. Rzepecka M. Richard Nixon's Campaign Rhetoric of Anti-Communism [Электронный ресурс] / Marta Rzepecka – Режим доступа до ресурсу:

- https://depot.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/123456789/8745/05_pjas6.pdf?sequence=1.
82. Sartika T. Critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's and Joe Biden's language in use in the 2020 United States presidential debates [Электронный ресурс] / Tini Sartika. – 2021. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://jurnal.unsur.ac.id/cp/article/view/1379>.
83. Schneiker A. Populist Leadership: The Superhero Donald Trump as Savior in Times of Crisis / Andrea Schneiker. // *Political Studies*. – 2020. – №4.
84. Schroeder A. Watching between the Lines: Presidential Debates as Television / Alan Schroeder. // *The International Journal of Press/Politics*. – 1996. – №4.
85. Sintes-Olivella M. Europe Abhors Donald Trump: The Opinion on the 2020 U.S. Presidential Elections and Their Candidates in the European Newspapers / Marçal Sintes-Olivella. // *American Behavioral Scientist*. – 2021.
86. Tannen D. *Gender and Discourse* / D. Tannen. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. – 203 p.
87. Tannen D. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* / D. Tannen, H. Heidi E., S. Deborah., 2015. – (2nd).
88. Turkenburg E. Televised Election Debates in a Deliberative System The Role of Framing and Emotions / Emma Turkenburg. // *Democratic Theory*. – 2022. – №1.
89. V. Friedenberg R. *Rhetorical Studies of National Political Debates, 1960-1992* / Robert V. Friedenberg., 1994.
90. van Dijk T. *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse* / Teun van Dijk // *Politics of Teaching*, 2006.
91. van Dijk T. *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis* // *Discourse & Society*, 1993. – P. 249–283.
92. van Dijk T. What is political discourse analysis? / T.van Dijk. // *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. – 1997. – №11. – P. 11–52.

93. Vidich A. American Democracy in the Late Twentieth Century: Political Rhetorics and Mass Media / Arthur J. Vidich. // International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society. – 1990. – №1. – P. 5–29.
94. Visser J. Argumentation in the 2016 US presidential elections: annotated corpora of television debates and social media reaction [Электронный ресурс] / J. Visser, B. Konat, R. Duthie. – 2019. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10579-019-09446-8>.
95. Winans T. Divisive Rhetoric and Adverse Language in American Political Discourse [Электронный ресурс] / Trevor Winans. – 2019. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://open.bu.edu/handle/2144/39612>.
96. Wodak R. Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology [Электронный ресурс] / R. Wodak, M. Meyer. – 2009. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265678850_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_History_Agenda_Theory_and_Methodology_1.
97. Wodak R. Feminist critical discourse analysis: new perspectives for interdisciplinary gender studies [Электронный ресурс] / Ruth Wodak. – 2005. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://nanopdf.com/download/ruth-wodak-professor-in-discourse-studies_pdf.
98. Wodak R. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis / R. Wodak, M. Meyer., 2001.
99. Wodak R. The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) [Электронный ресурс] / R. Wodak, M. Reisigl. – 2017. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251636976_The_Discourse-Historical_Approach_DHA.

The First Kennedy-Nixon Presidential Debate

HOWARD K. SMITH, MODERATOR: Good evening. The television and radio stations of the United States and their affiliated stations are proud to provide facilities for a discussion of issues in the current political campaign by the two major candidates for the presidency. The candidates need no introduction. The Republican candidate, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and the Democratic candidate, Senator John F. Kennedy. According to rules set by the candidates themselves, each man shall make an opening statement of approximately eight minutes' duration and a closing statement of approximately three minutes' duration. In between the candidates will answer, or comment upon answers to questions put by a panel of correspondents. In this, the first discussion in a series of four uh – joint appearances, the subject-matter has been agreed, will be restricted to internal or domestic American matters. And now for the first opening statement by Senator John F. Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Mr. Smith, Mr. Nixon. In the election of 1860, Abraham Lincoln said the question was whether this nation could exist half-slave or half-free. In the election of 1960, and with the world around us, the question is whether the world will exist half-slave or half-free, whether it will move in the direction of freedom, in the direction of the road that we are taking, or whether it will move in the direction of slavery. I think it will depend in great measure upon what we do here in the United States, on the kind of society that we build, on the kind of strength that we maintain. We discuss tonight domestic issues, but I would not want that to be any implication to be given that this does not involve directly our struggle with Mr. Khrushchev for survival. Mr. Khrushchev is in New York, and he maintains the Communist offensive throughout the world because of the productive power of the Soviet Union itself. The Chinese Communists have always had a large population.

But they are important and dangerous now because they are mounting a major effort within their own country. The kind of country we have here, the kind of society we have, the kind of strength we build in the United States will be the defense of freedom. If we do well here, if we meet our obligations, if we're moving ahead, then I think freedom will be secure around the world. If we fail, then freedom fails. Therefore, I think the question before the American people is: Are we doing as much as we can do? Are we as strong as we should be? Are we as strong as we must be if we're going to maintain our independence, and if we're going to maintain and hold out the hand of friendship to those who look to us for assistance, to those who look to us for survival? I should make it very clear that I do not think we're doing enough, that I am not satisfied as an American with the progress that we're making. This is a great country, but I think it could be a greater country; and this is a powerful country, but I think it could be a more powerful country. I'm not satisfied to have fifty percent of our steel-mill capacity unused. I'm not satisfied when the United States had last year the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrialized society in the world. Because economic growth means strength and vitality; it means we're able to sustain our defenses; it means we're able to meet our commitments abroad. I'm not satisfied when we have over nine billion dollars worth of food – some of it rotting – even though there is a hungry world, and even though four million Americans wait every month for a food package from the government, which averages five cents a day per individual. I saw cases in West Virginia, here in the United States, where children took home part of their school lunch in order to feed their families because I don't think we're meeting our obligations toward these Americans. I'm not satisfied when the Soviet Union is turning out twice as many scientists and engineers as we are. I'm not satisfied when many of our teachers are inadequately paid, or when our children go to school part-time shifts. I think we should have an educational system second to none. I'm not satisfied when I see men like Jimmy Hoffa – in charge of the largest union in the United States – still free. I'm not satisfied when we are failing to develop the natural resources of the United States to the fullest. Here in the United States, which developed the Tennessee Valley and which built the Grand Coulee and

the other dams in the Northwest United States at the present rate of hydropower production – and that is the hallmark of an industrialized society – the Soviet Union by 1975 will be producing more power than we are. These are all the things, I think, in this country that can make our society strong, or can mean that it stands still. I'm not satisfied until every American enjoys his full constitutional rights. If a Negro baby is born – and this is true also of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans in some of our cities – he has about one-half as much chance to get through high school as a white baby. He has one-third as much chance to get through college as a white student. He has about a third as much chance to be a professional man, about half as much chance to own a house. He has about uh – four times as much chance that he'll be out of work in his life as the white baby. I think we can do better. I don't want the talents of any American to go to waste. I know that there are those who want to turn everything over to the government. I don't at all. I want the individuals to meet their responsibilities. And I want the states to meet their responsibilities. But I think there is also a national responsibility. The argument has been used against every piece of social legislation in the last twenty-five years. The people of the United States individually could not have developed the Tennessee Valley; collectively they could have. A cotton farmer in Georgia or a peanut farmer or a dairy farmer in Wisconsin and Minnesota, he cannot protect himself against the forces of supply and demand in the market place; but working together in effective governmental programs he can do so. Seventeen million Americans, who live over sixty-five on an average Social Security check of about seventy-eight dollars a month, they're not able to sustain themselves individually, but they can sustain themselves through the social security system. I don't believe in big government, but I believe in effective governmental action. And I think that's the only way that the United States is going to maintain its freedom. It's the only way that we're going to move ahead. I think we can do a better job. I think we're going to have to do a better job if we are going to meet the responsibilities which time and events have placed upon us. We cannot turn the job over to anyone else. If the United States fails, then the whole cause of freedom fails. And I think it depends in great measure on what we do here in this country. The

reason Franklin Roosevelt was a good neighbor in Latin America was because he was a good neighbor in the United States. Because they felt that the American society was moving again. I want us to recapture that image. I want people in Latin America and Africa and Asia to start to look to America; to see how we're doing things; to wonder what the resident of the United States is doing; and not to look at Khrushchev, or look at the Chinese Communists. That is the obligation upon our generation. In 1933, Franklin Roosevelt said in his inaugural that this generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation of Americans has the same rendezvous. The question now is: Can freedom be maintained under the most severe tack – attack it has ever known? I think it can be. And I think in the final analysis it depends upon what we do here. I think it's time America started moving again.

MR. SMITH: And now the opening statement by Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Smith, Senator Kennedy. The things that Senator Kennedy has said many of us can agree with. There is no question but that we cannot discuss our internal affairs in the United States without recognizing that they have a tremendous bearing on our international position. There is no question but that this nation cannot stand still; because we are in a deadly competition, a competition not only with the men in the Kremlin, but the men in Peking. We're ahead in this competition, as Senator Kennedy, I think, has implied. But when you're in a race, the only way to stay ahead is to move ahead. And I subscribe completely to the spirit that Senator Kennedy has expressed tonight, the spirit that the United States should move ahead. Where, then, do we disagree? I think we disagree on the implication of his remarks tonight and on the statements that he has made on many occasions during his campaign to the effect that the United States has been standing still. We heard tonight, for example, the statement made that our growth in national product last year was the lowest of any industrial nation in the world. Now last year, of course, was 1958. That happened to be a recession year. But when we look at the growth of

G.N.P. this year, a year of recovery, we find that it's six and nine-tenths per cent and one of the highest in the world today. More about that later. Looking then to this problem of how the United States should move ahead and where the United States is moving, I think it is well that we take the advice of a very famous campaigner: Let's look at the record. Is the United States standing still? Is it true that this Administration, as Senator Kennedy has charged, has been an Administration of retreat, of defeat, of stagnation? Is it true that, as far as this country is concerned, in the field of electric power, in all of the fields that he has mentioned, we have not been moving ahead. Well, we have a comparison that we can make. We have the record of the Truman Administration of seven and a half years and the seven and a half years of the Eisenhower Administration. When we compare these two records in the areas that Senator Kennedy has – has discussed tonight, I think we find that America has been moving ahead. Let's take schools. We have built more schools in these last seven and a half years than we built in the previous seven and a half, for that matter in the previous twenty years. Let's take hydroelectric power. We have developed more hydroelectric power in these seven and a half years than was developed in any previous administration in history. Let us take hospitals. We find that more have been built in this Administration than in the previous Administration. The same is true of highways. Let's put it in terms that all of us can understand. We often hear gross national product discussed and in that respect may I say that when we compare the growth in this Administration with that of the previous Administration that then there was a total growth of eleven percent over seven years; in this Administration there has been a total growth of nineteen per cent over seven years. That shows that there's been more growth in this Administration than in its predecessor. But let's not put it there; let's put it in terms of the average family. What has happened to you? We find that your wages have gone up five times as much in the Eisenhower Administration as they did in the Truman Administration. What about the prices you pay? We find that the prices you pay went up five times as much in the Truman Administration as they did in the Eisenhower Administration. What's the net result of this? This means that the average family income went up fifteen per cent in the Eisenhower years as

against two per cent in the Truman years. Now, this is not standing still. But, good as this record is, may I emphasize it isn't enough. A record is never something to stand on. It's something to build on. And in building on this record, I believe that we have the secret for progress, we know the way to progress. And I think, first of all, our own record proves that we know the way. Senator Kennedy has suggested that he believes he knows the way. I respect the sincerity which he makes that suggestion. But on the other hand, when we look at the various programs that he offers, they do not seem to be new. They seem to be simply retreads of the programs of the Truman Administration which preceded it. And I would suggest that during the course of the evening he might indicate those areas in which his programs are new, where they will mean more progress than we had then. What kind of programs are we for? We are for programs that will expand educational opportunities, that will give to all Americans their equal chance for education, for all of the things which are necessary and dear to the hearts of our people. We are for programs, in addition, which will see that our medical care for the aged are – is – are much – is much better handled than it is at the present time. Here again, may I indicate that Senator Kennedy and I are not in disagreement as to the aims. We both want to help the old people. We want to see that they do have adequate medical care. The question is the means. I think that the means that I advocate will reach that goal better than the means that he advocates. I could give better examples, but for – for whatever it is, whether it's in the field of housing, or health, or medical care, or schools, or the development of electric power, we have programs which we believe will move America, move her forward and build on the wonderful record that we have made over these past seven and a half years. Now, when we look at these programs, might I suggest that in evaluating them we often have a tendency to say that the test of a program is how much you're spending. I will concede that in all the areas to which I have referred Senator Kennedy would have the federal government spend more than I would have it spend. I costed out the cost of the Democratic platform. It runs a minimum of thirteen and two-tenths billions dollars a year more than we are presently spending to a maximum of eighteen billion dollars a year more than we're presently

spending. Now the Republican platform will cost more too. It will cost a minimum of four billion dollars a year more, a maximum of four and nine-tenths billion dollar a year more than we're presently spending. Now, does this mean that his program is better than ours? Not at all. Because it isn't a question of how much the federal government spends; it isn't a question of which government does the most. It is a question of which administration does the right thing. And in our case, I do believe that our programs will stimulate the creative energies of a hundred and eighty million free Americans. I believe the programs that Senator Kennedy advocates will have a tendency to stifle those creative energies, I believe in other words, that his program would lead to the stagnation of the motive power that we need in this country to get progress. The final point that I would like to make is this: Senator Kennedy has suggested in his speeches that we lack compassion for the poor, for the old, and for others that are unfortunate. Let us understand throughout this campaign that his motives and mine are sincere. I know what it means to be poor. I know what it means to see people who are unemployed. I know Senator Kennedy feels as deeply about these problems as I do, but our disagreement is not about the goals for America but only about the means to reach those goals.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Nixon. That completes the opening statements, and now the candidates will answer questions or comment upon one another's answers to questions, put by correspondents of the networks. The correspondents: [introducing themselves: "I'm Sander Vanocur, NBC News;" "I'm Charles Warren, Mutual News;" "I'm Stuart Novins, CBS News;" "Bob Fleming, ABC News."] The first question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Senator, the Vice President in his campaign has said that you were naive and at times immature. He has raised the question of leadership. On this issue, why do you think people should vote for you rather than the Vice President?

MR. KENNEDY: Well, the Vice President and I came to the Congress together 1946; we both served in the Labor Committee. I've been there now for fourteen years, the same period of time that he has, so that our experience in uh – government is comparable. Secondly, I think the question is uh – what are the programs that we advocate, what is the party record that we lead? I come out of the Democratic party, which in this century has produced Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, and which supported and sustained these programs which I've discussed tonight. Mr. Nixon comes out of the Republican party. He was nominated by it. And it is a fact that through most of these last twenty-five years the Republican leadership has opposed federal aid for education, medical care for the aged, development of the Tennessee Valley, development of our natural resources. I think Mr. Nixon is an effective leader of his party. I hope he would grant me the same. The question before us is: which point of view and which party do we want to lead the United States?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, would you like to comment on that statement?

Mr. NIXON: I have no comment.

Mr. SMITH: The next question: Mr. Novins.

MR. NOVINS: Mr. Vice President, your campaign stresses the value of your eight year experience, and the question arises as to whether that experience was as an observer or as a participant or as an initiator of policy-making. Would you tell us please specifically what major proposals you have made in the last eight years that have been adopted by the Administration?

MR. NIXON: It would be rather difficult to cover them in eight and- in two and a half minutes. I would suggest that these proposals could be mentioned. First, after each of my foreign trips I have made recommendations that have been adopted. For

example, after my first trip abroad – abroad, I strongly recommended that we increase our exchange programs particularly as they related to exchange of persons of leaders in the labor field and in the information field. After my trip to South America, I made recommendations that a separate inter-American lending agency be set up which the South American nations would like much better than a lend- than to participate in the lending agencies which treated all the countries of the world the same. Uh – I have made other recommendations after each of the other trips; for example, after my trip abroad to Hungary I made some recommendations with regard to the Hungarian refugee situation which were adopted, not only by the President but some of them were enacted into law by the Congress. Within the Administration, as a chairman of the President's Committee on Price Stability and Economic Growth, I have had the opportunity to make recommendations which have been adopted within the Administration and which I think have been reasonably effective. I know Senator Kennedy suggested in his speech at Cleveland yesterday that that committee had not been particularly effective. I would only suggest that while we do not take the credit for it – I would not presume to – that since that committee has been formed the price line has been held very well within the United States.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I would say in the latter that the – and that's what I found uh – somewhat unsatisfactory about the figures uh – Mr. Nixon, that you used in your previous speech, when you talked about the Truman Administration. You – Mr. Truman came to office in nineteen uh – forty-four and at the end of the war, and uh – difficulties that were facing the United States during that period of transition – 1946 when price controls were lifted – so it's rather difficult to use an overall figure taking those seven and a half years and comparing them to the last eight years. I prefer to take the overall percentage record of the last twenty years of the Democrats and the eight years of the Republicans to show an overall period of growth. In regard to uh – price stability uh – I'm not aware that that committee did produce recommendations that ever were certainly before the Congress from the point of view of legislation in regard to controlling prices. In regard to the exchange of students and labor unions, I

am chairman of the subcommittee on Africa and I think that one of the most unfortunate phases of our policy towards that country was the very minute number of exchanges that we had. I think it's true of Latin America also. We did come forward with a program of students for the Congo of over three hundred which was more than the federal government had for all of Africa the previous year, so that I don't think that uh – we have moved at least in those two areas with sufficient vigor.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Warren.

MR. WARREN: Uh – Senator Kennedy, during your brief speech a few minutes ago you mentioned farm surpluses.

MR. KENNEDY: That's correct.

MR. WARREN: I'd like to ask this: It's a fact, I think, that presidential candidates traditionally make promises to farmers. Lots of people, I think, don't understand why the government pays farmers for not producing certain crops or paying farmers if they overproduce for that matter. Now, let me ask, sir, why can't the farmer operate like the business man who operates a factory? If an auto company overproduces a certain model car Uncle Sam doesn't step in and buy up the surplus. Why this constant courting of the farmer?

MR. KENNEDY: Well, because I think that if the federal government moved out of the program and withdrew its supports uh – then I think you would have complete uh – economic chaos. The farmer plants in the spring and harvests in the fall. There are hundreds of thousands of them. They really don't – they're not able to control their market very well. They bring their crops in or their livestock in, many of them about the same time. They have only a few purchasers that buy their milk or their hogs – a few large companies in many cases – and therefore the farmer is not in a position to bargain very effectively in the market place. I think the experience of the

twenties has shown what a free market could do to agriculture. And if the agricultural economy collapses, then the economy of the rest of the United States sooner or later will collapse. The farmers are the number one market for the automobile industry of the United States. The automobile industry is the number one market for steel. So if the farmers' economy continues to decline as sharply as it has in recent years, then I think you would have a recession in the rest of the country. So I think the case for the government intervention is a good one. Secondly, my objection to present farm policy is that there are no effective controls to bring supply and demand into better balance. The dropping of the support price in order to limit production does not work, and we now have the highest uh – surpluses – nine billion dollars worth. We've had a uh – higher tax load from the Treasury for the farmer in the last few years with the lowest farm income in many years. I think that this farm policy has failed. In my judgment the only policy that will work will be for effective supply and demand to be in balance. And that can only be done through governmental action. I therefore suggest that in those basic commodities which are supported, that the federal government, after endorsement by the farmers in that commodity, attempt to bring supply and demand into balance – attempt effective production controls – so that we won't have that five or six per cent surplus which breaks the price fifteen or twenty per cent. I think Mr. Benson's program has failed. And I must say, after reading the Vice President's speech before the farmers, as he read mine, I don't believe that it's very much different from Mr. Benson's. I don't think it provides effective governmental controls. I think the support prices are tied to the average market price of the last three years, which was Mr. Benson's theory. I therefore do not believe that this is a sharp enough breach with the past to give us any hope of success for the future.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment?

MR. NIXON; I of course disagree with Senator Kennedy insofar as his suggestions as to what should be done uh – with re- on the farm program. He has made the suggestion that what we need is to move in the direction of more government

controls, a suggestion that would also mean raising prices uh – that the consumers pay for products and im- and imposing upon the farmers uh – controls on acreage even far more than they have today. I think this is the wrong direction. I don't think this has worked in the past; I do not think it will work in the future. The program that I have advocated is one which departs from the present program that we have in this respect. It recognizes that the government has a responsibility to get the farmer out of the trouble he presently is in because the government got him into it. And that's the fundamental reason why we can't let the farmer go by himself at the present time. The farmer produced these surpluses because the government asked him to through legislation during the war. Now that we have these surpluses, it's our responsibility to indemnify the farmer during that period that we get rid of the farmer uh – the surpluses. Until we get the surpluses off the farmer's back, however, we should have a program such as I announced, which will see that farm income holds up. But I would propose holding that income up not through a type of program that Senator Kennedy has suggested that would raise prices, but one that would indemnify the farmer, pay the farmer in kind uh – from the products which are in surplus.

Mr. SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Vanocur.

MR. VANOCUR: Uh – Mr. Vice President, since the question of executive leadership is a very important campaign issue, I'd like to follow Mr. Novins' question. Now, Republican campaign slogans – you'll see them on signs around the country as you did last week – say it's experience that counts – that's over a picture of yourself; sir uh – implying that you've had more governmental executive decision-making uh – experience than uh – your opponent. Now, in his news conference on August twenty-fourth, President Eisenhower was asked to give one example of a major idea of yours that he adopted. His reply was, and I'm quoting; “If you give me a week I might think of one. I don't remember.” Now that was a month ago, sir, and the President hasn't brought it up since, and I'm wondering, sir, if you can clarify

which version is correct – the one put out by Republican campaign leaders or the one put out by President Eisenhower?

MR. NIXON: Well, I would suggest, Mr. Vanocur, that uh – if you know the President, that was probably a facetious remark. Uh – I would also suggest that insofar as his statement is concerned, that I think it would be improper for the President of the United States to disclose uh – the instances in which members of his official family had made recommendations, as I have made them through the years to him, which he has accepted or rejected. The President has always maintained and very properly so that he is entitled to get what advice he wants from his cabinet and from his other advisers without disclosing that to anybody – including as a matter of fact the Congress. Now, I can only say this. Through the years I have sat in the National Security Council. I have been in the cabinet. I have met with the legislative leaders. I have met with the President when he made the great decisions with regard to Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, other matters. The President has asked for my advice. I have given it. Sometimes my advice has been taken. Sometimes it has not. I do not say that I have made the decisions. And I would say that no president should ever allow anybody else to make the major decisions, The president only makes the decisions. All that his advisers do is to give counsel when he asks for it. As far as what experience counts and whether that is experience that counts, that isn't for me to say. Uh – I can only say that my experience is there for the people to consider; Senator Kennedy's is there for the people to consider. As he pointed out, we came to the Congress in the same year. His experience has been different from mine. Mine has been in the executive branch. His has been in the legislative branch. I would say that the people now have the opportunity to evaluate his as against mine and I think both he and I are going to abide by whatever the people decide.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Well, I'll just say that the question is of experience and the question also is uh – what our judgment is of the future, and what our goals are for the United States, and what ability we have to implement those goals. Abraham Lincoln came to the presidency in 1860 after a rather little known uh – session in the House of Representatives and after being defeated for the Senate in fifty-eight and was a distinguished president. There's no certain road to the presidency. There are no guarantees that uh – if you take uh – one road or another that you will be a successful president. I have been in the Congress for fourteen years. I have voted in the last uh – eight years uh – and the Vice President was uh – presiding over the Senate and meeting his other responsibilities. I have met met uh – decisions over eight hundred times on matters which affect not only the domestic security of the United States, but as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The question really is: which candidate and which party can meet the problems that the United States is going to face in the sixties?

MR. SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Novins.

MR. NOVINS: Senator Kennedy, in connection with these problems of the future that you speak of, and the program that you enunciated earlier in your direct talk, you call for expanding some of the welfare programs for schools, for teacher salaries, medical care, and so forth; but you also call for reducing the federal debt. And I'm wondering how you, if you're president in January, would go about paying the bill for all this. Does this mean that you?

MR. KENNEDY: I didn't indicate. I did not advocate reducing the federal debt because I don't believe that you're going to be able to reduce the federal debt very much in nineteen sixty-one, two, or three. I think you have heavy obligations which affect our security, which we're going to have to meet. And therefore I've never suggested we should uh – be able to retire the debt substantially, or even at all in nineteen sixty-one or two.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, I believe in – in one of your speeches –

MR. KENNEDY: No, never.

MR. NOVINS: – you suggested that reducing the interest rate would help toward –

MR. KENNEDY: No. No. Not reducing the interest –

MR. NOVINS: – a reduction of the Federal debt.

MR. KENNEDY: – reducing the interest rate. In my judgment, the hard money, tight money policy, fiscal policy of this Administration has contributed to the slow-down in our economy, which helped bring the recession of fifty-four; which made the recession of fifty-eight rather intense, and which has slowed, somewhat, our economic activity in 1960. What I have talked about, however, the kind of programs that I've talked about, in my judgment, are uh – fiscally sound. Medical care for the aged, I would put under social security. The Vice President and I disagree on this. The program – the Javits-Nixon or the Nixon-Javits program – would have cost, if fully used uh – six hundred million dollars by the government per year, and six hundred million dollars by the state. The program which I advocated, which failed by five votes in the United States Senate, would have put medical care for the aged in Social Security, and would have been paid for through the Social Security System and the Social Security tax. Secondly, I support federal aid to education and federal aid for teachers' salaries. I think that's a good investment. I think we're going to have to do it. And I think to heap the burden further on the property tax, which is already strained in many of our communities, will provide, will make sh- insure, in my opinion, that many of our children will not be adequately educated, and many of our teachers not adequately compensated. There is no greater return to an economy or to a society than an educational system second to none. On the question of the

development of natural resources, I would pay as you go in the sense that they would be balanced and the power revenues would bring back sufficient money to finance the projects, in the same way as the Tennessee Valley. I believe in the balanced budget. And the only conditions under which I would unbalance the budget would be if there was a grave national emergency or a serious recession. Otherwise, with a steady rate of economic growth – and Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller, in their meeting, said a five per cent economic growth would bring by 1962 ten billion dollars extra in tax revenues. Whatever is brought in, I think that we can finance essential programs within a balanced budget, if business remains orderly.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, your comment?

MR. NIXON: Yes. I think what Mr. Novins was referring to was not one of Senator Kennedy's speeches, but the Democratic platform, which did mention cutting the national debt. I think, too, that it should be pointed out that of course it is not possible, particularly under the proposals that Senator Kennedy has advocated, either to cut the national debt or to reduce taxes. As a matter of fact it will be necessary to raise taxes. As Senator Kennedy points out that as far as his one proposal is concerned – the one for medical care for the aged – that that would be financed out of Social Security. That, however, is raising taxes for those who pay Social Security. He points out that he would make pay-as-you-go be the basis for our natural resources development. Where our natural resources development – which I also support, incidentally, however – whenever you uh – uh – in – in – uh – appropriates money for one of these projects, you have to pay now and appropriate the money and the eh- while they eventually do pay out, it doesn't mean that you – the government doesn't have to put out the money this year. And so I would say that in all of these proposals Senator Kennedy has made, they will result in one of two things: either he has to raise taxes or he has to unbalance the budget. If he unbalances the budget, that means you have inflation, and that will be, of course, a very cruel blow to the very people – the older people – that we've been talking about. As far as aid for school construction is

concerned, I favor that, as Senator Kennedy did, in January of this year, when he said he favored that rather than aid to s- teacher salaries. I favor that because I believe that's the best way to aid our schools without running any risk whatever of the federal government telling our teachers what to teach.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Warren.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Vice President you mentioned schools and it was just yesterday I think you asked for a crash program to raise education standards, and this evening you talked about advances in education. Mr. Vice President, you said – it was back in 1957 – that salaries paid to school teachers were nothing short of a national disgrace. Higher salaries for teachers, you added, were important and if the situation wasn't corrected it could lead to a national disaster. And yet, you refused to vote in the Senate in order to break a tie vote when that single vote, if it had been yes, would have granted salary increases to teachers. I wonder if you could explain that, sir.

MR. NIXON: I'm awfully glad you ge- got that question because as you know I got into it at the last of my other question and wasn't able to complete the argument. Uh – I think that the reason that I voted against having the federal government uh – pay teachers' salaries was probably the very reason that concerned Senator Kennedy when in January of this year, in his kick-off press conference, he said that he favored aid for school construction, but at that time did not feel that there should be aid for teachers' salaries – at least that's the way I read his remarks. Now, why should there be any question about the federal government aiding s- teachers' salaries? Why did Senator Kennedy take that position then? Why do I take it now? We both took it then, and I take it now, for this reason: we want higher teachers' salaries. We need higher teachers' salaries. But we also want our education to be free of federal control. When the federal government gets the power to pay teachers, inevitably in my opinion, it will acquire the power to set standards and to tell the teachers what to teach. I think

this would be bad for the country; I think it would be bad for the teaching profession. There is another point that should be made. I favor higher salaries for teachers. But, as Senator Kennedy said in January of this year in this same press conference, the way that you get higher salaries for teachers is to support school construction, which means that all of the local school districts in the various states then have money which is freed to raise the standards for teachers' salaries. I should also point out this; once you put the responsibility on the federal government for paying a portion of teachers' salaries, your local communities and your states are not going to meet the responsibility as much as they should. I believe, in other words, that we have seen the local communities and the state assuming more of that responsibility. Teachers' salaries very fortunately have gone up fifty percent in the last eight years as against only a thirty-four percent rise for other salaries. This is not enough; it should be more. But I do not believe that the way to get more salaries for teachers is to have the federal government get in with a massive program. My objection here is not the cost in dollars. My objection here is the potential cost in controls and eventual freedom for the American people by giving the federal government power over education, and that is the greatest power a government can have.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy's comment?

MR. KENNEDY: When uh – the Vice President quotes me in January, sixty, I do not believe the federal government should pay directly teachers' salaries, but that was not the issue before the Senate in February. The issue before the Senate was that the money would be given to the state. The state then could determine whether the money would be spent for school construction or teacher salaries. On that question the Vice President and I disagreed. I voted in favor of that proposal and supported it strongly, because I think that that provided assistance to our teachers for their salaries without any chance of federal control and it is on that vote that th- Mr. Nixon and I disagreed, and his tie vote uh – defeated his breaking the tie defeated the proposal. I don't want the federal government paying teachers' salaries directly. But if the

money will go to the states and the states can then determine whether it shall go for school construction or for teachers' salaries, in my opinion you protect the local authority over the school board and the school committee. And therefore I think that was a sound proposal and that is why I supported it and I regret that it did not pass. Secondly, there have been statements made that uh – the Democratic platform would cost a good deal of money and that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error, and it is a fact that in the last eight years the Democratic Congress has reduced the appropri- the requests for the appropriations by over ten billion dollars. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly on the record. My view is that you can do these programs – and they should be carefully drawn – within a balanced budget if our economy is moving ahead.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Vanocur.

MR. VANOCUR: Senator, you've been promising the voters that if you are elected president you'll try and push through Congress bills on medical aid to the aged, a comprehensive minimum hourly wage bill, federal aid to education. Now, in the August post-convention session of the Congress, when you at least held up the possibility you could one day be president and when you had overwhelming majorities, especially in the Senate, you could not get action on these bills. Now how do you feel that you'll be able to get them in January –

MR. KENNEDY: Well as you take the bills –

MR. VANOCUR: – if you weren't able to get them in August?

MR. KENNEDY: If I may take the bills, we did pass in the Senate a bill uh – to provide a dollar twenty-five cent minimum wage. It failed because the House did not pass it and the House failed by eleven votes. And I might say that two-thirds of the Republicans in the House voted against a dollar twenty-five cent minimum wage and

a majority of the Democrats sustained it – nearly two-thirds of them voted for the dollar twenty-five. We were threatened by a veto if we passed a dollar and a quarter – it's extremely difficult with the great power that the president does to pass any bill when the president is opposed to it. All the president needs to sustain his veto of any bill is one-third plus one in either the House or the Senate. Secondly, we passed a federal aid to education bill in the Senate. It failed to come to the floor of the House of Representatives. It was killed in the Rules Committee. And it is a fact in the August session that the four members of the Rules Committee who were Republicans joining with two Democrats voted against sending the aid to education bill to the floor of the House. Four Democrats voted for it. Every Republican on the Rules Committee voted against sending that bill to be considered by the members of the House of Representatives. Thirdly, on medical care for the aged, this is the same fight that's been going on for twenty-five years in Social Security. We wanted to tie it to Social Security. We offered an amendment to do so. Forty-four Democrats voted for it, one Republican voted for it. And we were informed at the time it came to a vote that if it was adopted the President of the United States would veto it. In my judgment, a vigorous Democratic president supported by a Democratic majority in the House and Senate can win the support for these programs. But if you send a Republican president and a Democratic majority and the threat of a veto hangs over the Congress, in my judgment you will continue what happened in the August session, which is a clash of parties and inaction.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment?

MR. NIXON: Well obviously my views are a little different. First of all, I don't see how it's possible for a one-third of a body, such as the Republicans have in the House and the Senate to stop two-thirds, if the two-thirds are adequately led. I would say, too, that when Senator Kennedy refers to the action of the House Rules Committee, there are eight Democrats on that committee and four Republicans. It would seem to me again that it is very difficult to blame the four Republicans for the eight

Democrats' not getting a something through that particular committee. I would say further that to blame the President in his veto power for the inability of the Senator and his colleagues to get action in this special session uh – misses the mark. When the president exercises his veto power, he has to have the people up- behind him, not just a third of the Congress. Because let's consider it. If the majority of the members of the Congress felt that these particular proposals were good issues – the majority of those who were Democrats – why didn't they pass them and send to the President and get a veto and have an issue? The reason why these particular bills in these various fields that have been mentioned were not passed was not because the President was against them; it was because the people were against them. It was because they were too extreme. And I am convinced that the alternate proposals that I have, that the Republicans have in the field of health, in the field of education, in the field of welfare, because they are not extreme, because they will accomplish the end uh – without too great cost in dollars or in freedom, that they could get through the next Congress.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon fa- from Mr. Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Mr. Vice President, do I take it then you believe that you can work better with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate than Senator Kennedy could work with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate?

MR. NIXON; I would say this: that we, of course, expect to pick up some seats in both in the House and the Senate. Uh – We would hope to control the House, to get a majority in the House uh – in this election. We cannot, of course, control the Senate. I would say that a president will be able to lead – a president will be able to get his program through – to the effect that he has the support of the country, the support of the people. Sometimes we – we get the opinion that in getting programs through the House or the Senate it's purely a question of legislative finagling and all that sort of thing. It isn't really that. Whenever a majority of the people are for a program, the

House and the Senate responds to it. And whether this House and Senate, in the next session is Democratic or Republican, if the country will have voted for the candidate for the presidency and for the proposals that he has made, I believe that you will find that the president, if it were a Republican, as it would be in my case, would be able to get his program through that Congress. Now, I also say that as far as Senator Kennedy's proposals are concerned, that, again, the question is not simply one of uh – a presidential veto stopping programs. You must always remember that a president can't stop anything unless he has the people behind him. And the reason President Eisenhower's vetoes have been sustained – the reason the Congress does not send up bills to him which they think will be vetoed – is because the people and the Congress, the majority of them, know the country is behind the President.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, now let's look at these bills that the Vice President suggests were too extreme. One was a bill for a dollar twenty-five cents an hour for anyone who works in a store or company that has a million dollars a year business. I don't think that's extreme at all; and yet nearly two-thirds to three-fourths of the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted against that proposal. Secondly was the federal aid to education bill. It – it was a very uh – because of the defeat of teacher salaries, it was not a bill that uh – met in my opinion the need. The fact of the matter is it was a bill that was less than you recommended, Mr. Nixon, this morning in your proposal. It was not an extreme bill and yet we could not get one Republican to join, at least I think four of the eight Democrats voted to send it to the floor of the House – not one Republican – and they joined with those Democrats who were opposed to it. I don't say the Democrats are united in their support of the program. But I do say a majority are. And I say a majority of the Republicans are opposed to it. The third is medical care for the aged which is tied to Social Security, which is financed out of Social Security funds. It does not put a deficit on the Treasury. The proposal advanced by you and by Mr. Javits would have cost six hundred millions of

dollars – Mr. Rockefeller rejected it in New York, said he didn't agree with the financing at all, said it ought to be on Social Security. So these are three programs which are quite moderate. I think it shows the difference between the two parties. One party is ready to move in these programs. The other party gives them lip service.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Warren's question for Senator Kennedy.

MR. WARREN: Senator Kennedy, on another subject, Communism is so often described as an ideology or a belief that exists somewhere other than in the United States. Let me ask you, sir: just how serious a threat to our national security are these Communist subversive activities in the United States today?

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I think they're serious. I think it's a matter that we should continue to uh – give uh – great care and attention to. We should support uh – the laws which the United States has passed in order to protect us from uh – those who would destroy us from within. We should sustain uh – the Department of Justice in its efforts and the F.B.I., and we should be continually alert. I think if the United States is maintaining a strong society here in the United States, I think that we can meet any internal threat. The major threat is external and will continue.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment?

MR. NIXON: I agree with Senator Kennedy's appraisal generally in this respect. The question of Communism within the United States has been one that has worried us in the past. It is one that will continue to be a problem for years to come. We have to remember that the cold war that Mr. Khrushchev is waging and his colleagues are waging, is waged all over the world and it's waged right here in the United States. That's why we have to continue to be alert. It is also essential in being alert that we be fair; fair because by being fair we uphold the very freedoms that the Communists would destroy. We uphold the standards of conduct which they would never follow.

And, in this connection, I think that uh – we must look to the future having in mind the fact that we fight Communism at home not only by our laws to deal with Communists uh – the few who do become Communists and the few who do become tra- fellow travelers, but we also fight Communism at home by moving against those various injustices which exist in our society which the Communists feed upon. And in that connection I again would say that while Senator Kennedy says we are for the status quo, I do believe that he uh – would agree that I am just as sincere in believing that my proposals for federal aid to education, my proposals for health care are just as sincerely held as his. The question again is not one of goals – we’re for those goals – it’s one of means.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Vanocur’s question for Vice President Nixon.

MR. VANOCUR: Mr. Vice President uh – in one of your earlier statements you said we’ve moved ahead, we’ve built more schools, we’ve built more hospitals. Now, sir, isn’t it true that the building of more schools is a local matter for financing? Uh – Were you claiming that the Eisenhower Administration was responsible for the building of these schools, or is it the local school districts that provide for it?

MR. NIXON: Not at all. As a matter of fact your question brings out a point that I am very glad to make. Too often in appraising whether we are moving ahead or not we think only of what the federal government is doing. Now that isn’t the test of whether America moves. The test of whether America moves is whether the federal government, plus the state government, plus the local government, plus the biggest segment of all – individual enterprise – moves. We have for example a gross national product of approximately five hundred billion dollars. Roughly a hundred billion to a hundred and a quarter billion of that is the result of government activity. Four hundred billion, approximately, is a result of what individuals do. Now, the reason the Eisenhower Administration has moved, the reason that we’ve had the funds, for example, locally to build the schools, and the hospitals, and the highways, to make

the progress that we have, is because this Administration has encouraged individual enterprise; and it has resulted in the greatest expansion of the private sector of the economy that has ever been witnessed in an eight-year period. And that is growth. That is the growth that we are looking for; it is the growth that this Administration has supported and that its policies have stimulated.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I must say that the reason that the schools have been constructed is because the local school districts were willing to increase the property taxes to a tremendously high figure – in my opinion, almost to the point of diminishing returns in order to sustain these schools. Secondly, I think we have a rich uh – country. And I think we have a powerful country. I think what we have to do, however, is have the president and the leadership set before our country exactly what we must do in the next decade, if we're going to maintain our security in education, in economic growth, in development of natural resources. The Soviet Union is making great gains. It isn't enough to compare what might have been done eight years ago, or ten years ago, or fifteen years ago, or twenty years ago. I want to compare what we're doing with what our adversaries are doing, so that by the year 1970 the United States is ahead in education, in health, in building, in homes, in economic strength. I think that's the big assignment, the big task, the big function of the federal government.

MR. SMITH: Can I have the summation time please? We've completed our questions and our comments, and in just a moment, we'll have the summation time.

VOICE: This will allow three minutes and twenty seconds for the summation by each candidate.

MR. SMITH: Three minutes and twenty seconds for each candidate. Vice President Nixon, will you make the first summation?

MR. NIXON: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Senator Kennedy. First of all, I think it is well to put in perspective where we really do stand with regard to the Soviet Union in this whole matter of growth. The Soviet Union has been moving faster than we have. But the reason for that is obvious. They start from a much lower base. Although they have been moving faster in growth than we have, we find, for example, today that their total gross national product is only forty-four per cent of our total gross national product. That's the same percentage that it was twenty years ago. And as far as the absolute gap is concerned, we find that the United States is even further ahead than it was twenty years ago. Is this any reason for complacency? Not at all. Because these are determined men. They are fanatical men. And we have to get the very most of uh – out uh – out of our economy. I agree with Senator Kennedy completely on that score. Where we disagree is in the means that we would use to get the most out of our economy. I respectfully submit that Senator Kennedy too often would rely too much on the federal government, on what it would do to solve our problems, to stimulate growth. I believe that when we examine the Democratic platform, when we examine the proposals that he has discussed tonight, when we compare them with the proposals that I have made, that these proposals that he makes would not result in greater growth for this country than would be the case if we followed the programs that I have advocated. There are many of the points that he has made that I would like to comment upon. The one in the field of health is worth mentioning. Our health program – the one that Senator Javits and other Republican Senators, as well as I supported – is one that provides for all people over sixty-five who want health insurance, the opportunity to have it if they want it. It provides a choice of having either government insurance or private insurance. But it compels nobody to have insurance who does not want it. His program under Social Security, would require everybody who had Social Security to take government health insurance whether he wanted it or not. And it would not cover several million people who are not covered

by Social Security at all. Here is one place where I think that our program does a better job than his. The other point that I would make is this: this downgrading of how much things cost I think many of our people will understand better when they look at what happened when – during the Truman Administration when the government was spending more than it took in – we found savings over a lifetime eaten up by inflation. We found the people who could least afford it – people on retired incomes uh – people on fixed incomes – we found them unable to meet their bills at the end of the month. It is essential that a man who's president of this country certainly stand for every program that will mean for growth. And I stand for programs that will mean growth and progress. But it is also essential that he not allow a dollar spent that could be better spent by the people themselves.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy, your conclusion.

MR. KENNEDY: The point was made by Mr. Nixon that the Soviet production is only forty-four percent of ours. I must say that forty-four percent and that Soviet country is causing us a good deal of trouble tonight. I want to make sure that it stays in that relationship. I don't want to see the day when it's sixty percent of ours, and seventy and seventy-five and eighty and ninety percent of ours, with all the force and power that it could bring to bear in order to cause our destruction. Secondly, the Vice President mentioned medical care for the aged. Our program was an amendment to the Kerr bill. The Kerr bill provided assistance to all those who were not on Social Security. I think it's a very clear contrast. In 1935, when the Social Security Act was written, ninety-four out of ninety-five Republicans voted against it. Mr. Landon ran in 1936 to repeal it. In August of 1960, when we tried to get it again, but this time for medical care, we received the support of one Republican in the Senate on this occasion. Thirdly, I think the question before the American people is: as they look at this country and as they look at the world around them, the goals are the same for all Americans. The means are at question. The means are at issue. If you feel that everything that is being done now is satisfactory, that the relative power and prestige

and strength of the United States is increasing in relation to that of the Communists; that we've b- gaining more security, that we are achieving everything as a nation that we should achieve, that we are achieving a better life for our citizens and greater strength, then I agree. I think you should vote for Mr. Nixon. But if you feel that we have to move again in the sixties, that the function of the president is to set before the people the unfinished business of our society as Franklin Roosevelt did in the thirties, the agenda for our people – what we must do as a society to meet our needs in this country and protect our security and help the cause of freedom. As I said at the beginning, the question before us all, that faces all Republicans and all Democrats, is: can freedom in the next generation conquer, or are the Communists going to be successful? That's the great issue. And if we meet our responsibilities I think freedom will conquer. If we fail, if we fail to move ahead, if we fail to develop sufficient military and economic and social strength here in this country, then I think that uh – the tide could begin to run against us. And I don't want historians, ten years from now, to say, these were the years when the tide ran out for the United States. I want them to say these were the years when the tide came in; these were the years when the United States started to move again. That's the question before the American people, and only you can decide what you want, what you want this country to be, what you want to do with the future. I think we're ready to move. And it is to that great task, if we're successful, that we will address ourselves.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much, gentlemen. This hour has gone by all too quickly. Thank you very much for permitting us to present the next president of the United States on this unique program. I've been asked by the candidates to thank the American networks and the affiliated stations for providing time and facilities for this joint appearance. Other debates in this series will be announced later and will be on different subjects. This is Howard K. Smith. Good night from Chicago.

**Presidential Debate at Case Western Reserve University and Cleveland Clinic
in Cleveland, Ohio**

WALLACE: Good evening from the Health Education Campus of Case Western Reserve University and the Cleveland Clinic. I'm Chris Wallace of Fox News and I welcome you to the first of the 2020 presidential debates between President Donald J. Trump and former Vice President Joe Biden. This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. The Commission has designed the format, six roughly 15-minute segments with two-minute answers from each candidate to the first question, then open discussion for the rest of each segment. Both campaigns have agreed to these rules. For the record, I decided the topics and the questions in each topic. I can assure you none of the questions has been shared with the Commission or the two candidates.

This debate is being conducted under health and safety protocols designed by the Cleveland Clinic, which is serving as the health security advisor to the Commission for all four debates. As a precaution, both campaigns have agreed the candidates will not shake hands at the beginning of tonight's debate. The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, no boos, or other interruptions so we, and more importantly you, can focus on what the candidates have to say. No noise except right now, as we welcome the Republican nominee, President Trump, and the Democratic nominee Vice President Biden.

BIDEN: How you doing, man?

TRUMP: How are you doing?

BIDEN: I'm well.

WALLACE: Gentlemen, a lot of people have been waiting for this night, so let's get going. Our first subject is the Supreme Court. President Trump, you nominated Amy Coney Barrett over the weekend to succeed the late Ruth Bader Ginsburg on the Court. You say the Constitution is clear about your obligation and the Senate's to consider a nominee to the Court. Vice President Biden, you say that this is an effort by the President and Republicans to jam through on an appointment in what you call an abuse of power. My first question to both of you tonight, why are you right in the argument you make and your opponent wrong? And where do you think a Justice Barrett would take the court? President Trump, in this first segment, you go first. Two minutes.

TRUMP: Thank you very much, Chris. I will tell you very simply. We won the election. Elections have consequences. We have the Senate, we have the White House, and we have a phenomenal nominee respected by all. Top, top academic, good in every way. Good in every way. In fact, some of her biggest endorsers are very liberal people from Notre Dame and other places. So I think she's going to be fantastic. We have plenty of time. Even if we did it after the election itself. I have a lot of time after the election, as you know. So I think that she will be outstanding. She's going to be as good as anybody that has served on that court. We really feel that. We have a professor at Notre Dame, highly respected by all, said she's the single greatest student he's ever had. He's been a professor for a long time at a great school.

And we won the election and therefore we have the right to choose her, and very few people knowingly would say otherwise. And by the way, the Democrats, they wouldn't even think about not doing it. The only difference is they'd try and do it faster. There's no way they would give it up. They had Merrick Garland, but the problem is they didn't have the election so they were stopped. And probably that

would happen in reverse, also. Definitely would happen in reverse. So we won the election and we have the right to do it, Chris.

WALLACE: President Trump, thank you. Same question to you, Vice President Biden. You have two minutes.

BIDEN: Well, first of all, thank you for doing this and looking forward to this, Mr. President.

TRUMP: Thank you, Joe.

BIDEN: The American people have a right to have a say in who the Supreme Court nominee is and that say occurs when they vote for United States Senators and when they vote for the President of United States. They're not going to get that chance now because we're in the middle of an election already. The election has already started. Tens of thousands of people already voted and so the thing that should happen is we should wait. We should wait and see what the outcome of this election is because that's the only way the American people get to express their view is by who they elect as President and who they elect as Vice President.

Now, what's at stake here is the President's made it clear, he wants to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. He's been running on that, he ran on that and he's been governing on that. He's in the Supreme Court right now trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, which will strip 20 million people from having health insurance now, if it goes into court. And the justice, I'm not opposed to the justice, she seems like a very fine person. But she's written, before she went in the bench, which is her right, that she thinks that the Affordable Care Act is not Constitutional. The other thing that's on the court, and if it's struck down, what happens? Women's rights are fundamentally changed. Once again, a woman could pay more money because she

has a pre-existing condition of pregnancy. They're able to charge women more for the same exact procedure a man gets.

And that ended when we, in fact, passed the Affordable Care Act, and there's a hundred million people who have pre-existing conditions and they'll be taken away as well. Those pre-existing conditions, insurance companies are going to love this. And so it's just not appropriate to do this before this election. If he wins the election and the Senate is Republican, then he goes forward. If not, we should wait until February.

TRUMP: There aren't a hundred million people with pre-existing conditions. As far as a say is concerned, the people already had their say. Okay, Justice Ginsburg said very powerfully, very strongly, at some point 10 years ago or so, she said a President and the Senate is elected for a period of time, but a President is elected for four years. We're not elected for three years. I'm not elected for three years. So we have the Senate, we have a President-

BIDEN: He's elected to the next election.

TRUMP: During that period of time, during that period of time, we have an opening. I'm not elected for three years. I'm elected for four years. Joe, the hundred million people is totally wrong. I don't know where you got that number. The bigger problem that you have is that you're going to extinguish 180 million people with their private health care, that they're very happy with.

BIDEN: That's simply not true.

TRUMP: Well, you're certainly going to socialist. You're going to socialist medicine-

WALLACE: Gentlemen, we're now into open discussion.

BIDEN: Open discussion.

WALLACE: Open discussion, yes, I agree. Go ahead, Vice President.

BIDEN: Number one, he knows what I proposed. What I proposed is that we expand Obamacare and we increase it. We do not wipe any. And one of the big debates we had with 23 of my colleagues trying to win the nomination that I won, were saying that Biden wanted to allow people to have private insurance still. They can. They do. They will under my proposal.

TRUMP: That's not what you've said and it's not what your party is saying.

BIDEN: That is simply a lie.

TRUMP: Your party doesn't say it. Your party wants to go socialist medicine and socialist healthcare.

BIDEN: The party is me. Right now, I am the Democratic Party.

TRUMP: And they're going to dominate you, Joe. You know that.

BIDEN: I am the Democratic Party right now.

TRUMP: Not according to Harris.

BIDEN: The platform of the Democratic Party is what I, in fact, approved of, what I approved of. Now, here's the deal. The deal is that it's going to wipe out pre-existing conditions. And, by the way, the 200,000 people that have died on his watch,

how many of those have survived? Well, there's seven million people that contracted COVID. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act?

TRUMP: Joe, you've had 308,000 military people dying because you couldn't provide them proper healthcare in the military. So don't tell me about this.

BIDEN: I'm happy to talk about this.

TRUMP: And if you were here, it wouldn't be 200, it would be two million people because you were very late on the draw. You didn't want me to ban China, which was heavily infected. You didn't want me to ban Europe.

WALLACE: All right, gentlemen, Mr. President.

TRUMP: You would have been much later, Joe, much later.

WALLACE: Mr. President.

TRUMP: We're talking about two million people.

BIDEN: You're not going to be able to shut him up.

WALLACE: Mr. President, as the moderator, we are going to talk about COVID in the next segment. But go ahead.

BIDEN: Let me finish. The point is that the President also is opposed to Roe V. Wade. That's on the ballot as well and the court, in the court, and so that's also at stake right now. And so the election is all-

TRUMP: You don't know what's on the ballot. Why is it on the ballot? Why is it on the ballot? It's not on the ballot.

BIDEN: It's on the ballot in the court.

TRUMP: I don't think so.

BIDEN: In the court.

TRUMP: There's nothing happening there.

BIDEN: Donald would you just be quiet for a minute.

TRUMP: You don't know her view on Roe V. Wade? You don't know her view.

WALLACE: Well, all right. All right. Let's talk. We've got a lot to unpack here, gentlemen. We've got a lot of time. On healthcare, and then we'll come back to Roe V. Wade.

BIDEN: All right.

WALLACE: Mr. President, the Supreme Court will hear a case a week after the election in which the Trump Administration, along with 18 state Attorney Generals are seeking to overturn Obamacare, to end Obamacare.

TRUMP: That's right.

WALLACE: You have spent the last week-

TRUMP: Because they want to give good healthcare.

WALLACE: If I may ask my question, sir.

BIDEN: Good healthcare.

WALLACE: Over the last four years, you have promised to repeal and replace Obamacare, but you have never in these four years come up with a plan, a comprehensive plan, to replace Obamacare.

TRUMP: Yes, I have. Of course, I have. The individual mandate.

WALLACE: [crosstalk] when I finish I'm going to give an opportunity-

TRUMP: Excuse me. I got rid of the individual mandate, which was a big chunk of Obamacare.

WALLACE: That's not a comprehensive place.

TRUMP: That is absolutely a big thing. That was the worst part of Obamacare.

WALLACE: I didn't ask, sir.

TRUMP: Chris, that was the worst part of Obamacare.

WALLACE: You're debating him not me. Let me ask my question.

TRUMP: Well, I'll ask Joe. The individual mandate was the most unpopular aspect of Obamacare.

WALLACE: Mr. President.

TRUMP: I got rid of it. And we will protect people.

WALLACE: Mr. President, I'm the moderator of this debate and I would like you to let me ask my question and then you can answer.

TRUMP: Go ahead.

WALLACE: You, in the course of these four years, have never come up with a comprehensive plan to replace Obamacare, and just this last Thursday you signed a largely symbolic Executive Order to protect people with pre-existing conditions five days before this debate. So my question, sir, is what is the Trump healthcare plan?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, I guess I'm debating you, not him, but that's okay. I'm not surprised. Let me just tell you something. There's nothing symbolic. I'm cutting drug prices. I'm going with Favored Nations, which no President has the courage to do because you're going against big pharma. Drug prices will be coming down 80 or 90%. You could have done it during your 47-year period in government, but you didn't do it. Nobody's done it. So we're cutting healthcare.

WALLACE: What about pre-existing conditions?

TRUMP: All of the things that we've done.

BIDEN: He has not done healthcare.

TRUMP: I'll give you an example. Insulin, it was destroying families, destroying people, the cost. I'm getting it for so cheap it's like water, you want to know the truth. So cheap. Take a look at all of the drugs that what we're doing. Prescription

drug prices, we're going to allow our Governors now to go to other countries to buy drugs because when they paid just a tiny fraction of what we do.

WALLACE: Okay, like I say, this is open discussion.

TRUMP: This is big stuff.

WALLACE: Sir, you'll be happy. I'm about to pick up on one of your points to ask the Vice President, which is, he points out that you would like to add a public option to Obamacare.

BIDEN: Yes.

WALLACE: And the argument that he makes and other Republicans make is that that is going to end private insurance.

BIDEN: It is not.

WALLACE: If I start asking the question.

TRUMP: That's not what your party says, by the way.

WALLACE: And it will end private insurance and create a government takeover of healthcare.

BIDEN: It does not. It's only for those people who are so poor they qualify for Medicaid they can get that free in most States, except Governors who want to deny people who are poor Medicaid. Anyone who qualifies for Medicaid would automatically be enrolled in the public option. The vast majority of the American people would still not be in that option. Number one. Number two.

TRUMP: Joe, you agreed with Bernie Sanders, who's far left, on the manifesto, we call it. And that gives you socialized medicine.

BIDEN: Look, hey.

TRUMP: Are you saying you didn't agree?

BIDEN: I'm not going to listen to him. The fact of the matter is I beat Bernie Sanders.

TRUMP: Not by much.

BIDEN: I beat him by a whole hell of a lot.

TRUMP: Not by much.

BIDEN: I'm here standing facing you, old buddy.

TRUMP: If Pocahontas would have left two days early you would have lost every primary.

BIDEN: All he knows how to do-

TRUMP: On Super Tuesday, you got very lucky.

BIDEN: Look he's the deal. I got very lucky. I'm going to get very lucky tonight as well.

TRUMP: With what?

BIDEN: And tonight I'm going to make sure.

TRUMP: With what?

BIDEN: Because here's the deal, here's the deal. The fact is that everything he's saying so far is simply a lie. I'm not here to call out his lies. Everybody knows he's a liar.

TRUMP: But you agree. Joe, you're the liar. You graduated last in your class not first in your class.

BIDEN: God, I want to make sure-

WALLACE: Mr. President, can you let him finish, sir?

BIDEN: No, he doesn't know how to do that.

TRUMP: You'd be surprised. You'd be surprised. Go ahead, Joe.

BIDEN: The wrong guy, the wrong night, at the wrong time.

TRUMP: Listen, you agreed with Bernie Sanders and the manifesto.

BIDEN: There is no manifesto, number one.

WALLACE: Please let him speak, Mr. President.

BIDEN: Number two.

TRUMP: He just lost the left.

BIDEN: Number two.

TRUMP: You just lost the left. You agreed with Bernie Sanders on a plan that you absolutely agreed to and under that plan [crosstalk], they call it socialized medicine.

WALLACE: Mr. President.

BIDEN: I'll tell you what, he is not for any help for people needing healthcare.

TRUMP: Who is, Bernie?

BIDEN: Because he, in fact, already has cost 10 million people their healthcare that they had from their employers because of his recession. Number one. Number two, there are 20 million people getting healthcare through Obamacare now that he wants to take it away. He won't ever look you in the eye and say that's what he wants to do. Take it away.

TRUMP: No, I want to give them better healthcare at a much lower price, because Obamacare is no good.

BIDEN: He doesn't know how. He doesn't know how to do that.

TRUMP: I've already fixed it.

BIDEN: He has never offered a plan.

TRUMP: We've already fixed it to an extent. Obamacare, as you might know but probably don't, Obamacare is no good.

WALLACE: Gentlemen, you realize if you're both speaking at the same time. Let the President. Go ahead, sir.

TRUMP: Obamacare is no good. We made it better and I had a choice to make very early on. We took away the individual mandate. We guaranteed pre-existing conditions, but took away the individual mandate. Listen, this is the way it is. And that destroyed ... They shouldn't even call it Obamacare, then I had a choice to make, do I let my people run it really well or badly? If I run it badly, they'll probably blame him, but they'll blame me. But more importantly, I want to help people. Okay. I said, "You've got to run it so well." And I just had a meeting with them. They said the problem is, no matter how well you run Obamacare, it's a disaster. It's too expensive. Premiums are too high, that it doesn't work. So we do want to get rid of it. Chris, we want to get rid of that and give something that's cheaper and better.

WALLACE: I understand that, sir. But I have to give you roughly equal time.

TRUMP: Go ahead.

WALLACE: Please let the Vice President talk, sir.

TRUMP: Good.

BIDEN: He has no plan for healthcare.

TRUMP: Of course, we do.

WALLACE: Please.

BIDEN: He sends out wishful thinking. He has Executive Orders that have no power. He hasn't lowered drug costs for anybody. He's been promising a healthcare plan since he got elected. He has none, like almost everything else he talks about. He does not have a plan. He doesn't have a plan. And the fact is this man doesn't know what he's talking about.

WALLACE: All right, I have one final question for you.

BIDEN: Sure.

WALLACE: Mr. Vice President, if Senate Republicans, we were talking originally about the Supreme Court here, if Senate Republicans go ahead and confirm Justice Barrett there has been talk about ending the filibuster or even packing the court, adding to the nine justices there. You call this a distraction by the President. But, in fact, it wasn't brought up by the President. It was brought up by some of your Democratic colleagues in the Congress. So my question to you is, you have refused in the past to talk about it, are you willing to tell the American people tonight whether or not you will support either ending the filibuster or packing the court?

BIDEN: Whatever position I take on that, that'll become the issue. The issue is the American people should speak. You should go out and vote. You're voting now. Vote and let your Senators know how strongly you feel.

TRUMP: Are you going to pack the court?

BIDEN: Vote now.

TRUMP: Are you going to pack the court?

BIDEN: Make sure you, in fact, let people know, your Senators.

TRUMP: He doesn't want to answer the question.

BIDEN: I'm not going to answer the question.

TRUMP: Why wouldn't you answer that question? You want to put a lot of new Supreme Court Justices. Radical left.

BIDEN: Will you shut up, man?

TRUMP: Listen, who is on your list, Joe? Who's on your list?

WALLACE: Gentlemen, I think we've ended this-

BIDEN: This is so un-Presidential.

TRUMP: He's going to pack the court. He is not going to give a list.

WALLACE: We have ended the segment. We're going to move on to the second segment.

BIDEN: That was really a productive segment, wasn't it? Keep yapping, man.

TRUMP: The people understand, Joe.

BIDEN: They sure do.

TRUMP: 47 years, you've done nothing. They understand.

WALLACE: All right, the second subject is COVID-19, which is an awfully serious subject. So let's try to be serious about it. We have had more than seven million cases of coronavirus in the United States and more than 200,000 people have died. Even after we produce a vaccine, experts say that it could be months or even years before we come back to anything approaching normal. My question for both of you is, based on what you have said and done so far, and what you have said you would do starting in 2021, why should the American people trust you more than your opponent to deal with this public health crisis going forward? In this case, the question goes to you first, sir. Two minutes, uninterrupted.

BIDEN: Good luck. 200,000 dead. As you said, over seven million infected in the United States. We, in fact, have 4% of the world's population, 20% of the deaths. 40,000 people a day are contracting COVID. In addition to that, about between 750 and 1000 people a day are dying. When he was presented with that number, he said, "It is what it is." Well, it is what it is because you are who you are. That's why it is. The President has no plan. He hasn't laid out anything. He knew all the way back in February how serious this crisis was. He knew it was a deadly disease. What did he do? He's on tape as acknowledging he knew it. He said he didn't tell us or give people a warning of it because he didn't want to panic the American people. You don't panic. He panicked. In addition to that, what did he do?

BIDEN: He went in and we were insisting that the people we had in the ground in China should be able to go to Wuhan and determine for themselves how dangerous this was. He did not even ask Xi to do that.

TRUMP: Wrong.

BIDEN: He told us what a great job Xi was doing. He said we owe him a debt of gratitude for being so transparent with us. And what did he do then? He then did nothing. He waited and waited and waited. He still doesn't have a plan.

TRUMP: Wrong.

WALLACE: Sir, it's his two minutes.

TRUMP: It's so wrong.

BIDEN: I laid out back in March, exactly what we should be doing. And I laid out again in July, what we should be doing. We should be providing all the protective gear possible. We should be providing the money the House has passed in order to be able to go out and get people the help they need to keep their businesses open. Open schools cost a lot of money. You should get out of your bunker and get out of the sand trap in your golf course and go in the Oval Office and bring together the Democrats and Republicans and fund what needs to be done now to save lives.

TRUMP: So, if we would have listened to you.

WALLACE: Wait, wait. You have two minutes, sir.

TRUMP: If we would've listened to you, the country would have been left wide open, millions of people would have died, not 200,000. And one person is too much. It's China's fault. It should have never happened. They stopped it from going in, but it was China's fault. And, by the way, when you talk about numbers, you don't know how many people died in China. You don't know how many people died in Russia. You don't know how many people died in India. They don't exactly give you a straight count, just so you understand. But if you look at what we've done, I closed it and you said, "He's xenophobic. He's a racist and he's xenophobic," because you didn't think I should have closed our country. Wait a minute.

WALLACE: Sir, it's his two minutes.

TRUMP: You didn't think we should have closed our country because you thought it was terrible. You wouldn't have closed it for another two months. By my doing it early, in fact, Dr. Fauci said, "President Trump saved thousands of lives." Many of your Democrat Governors said, "President Trump did a phenomenal job." We worked with the Governor. Oh really, go take a look. The Governors said I did a phenomenal job. Most of them said that. In fact, people that would not be necessarily on my side said that, "President Trump did a phenomenal job." We did. We got the gowns. We got the masks. We made the ventilators. You wouldn't have made ventilators. And now we're weeks away from a vaccine. We're doing therapeutics already. Fewer people are dying when they get sick. Far fewer people are dying. We've done a great job.

TRUMP: The only thing I haven't done a good job, and that's because of the fake news, no matter what you say to them, they give you a bad press on it. It's just fake news. They give you good press, they give me bad press because that's the way it is, unfortunately. But let me just say something. I don't care. I've gotten used to it. But I'll tell you, Joe, you could never have done the job that we did. You don't have it in your blood. You could've never done that, Joe.

BIDEN: I know how to do the job. I know how to get the job done.

TRUMP: Well, you didn't do very well in Swine Flu. H1-N1, you were a disaster. Your own Chief of Staff said you were a disaster.

BIDEN: 14,000 people died, not 200,000.

TRUMP: A far less lethal disease, by the way.

WALLACE: Sir, you made a point. Let him answer it.

BIDEN: And there was no one ... We didn't shut down the economy. This is his economy he shut down. The reason it's shut down is because, look, you folks at home. How many of you got up this morning and had an empty chair at the kitchen table because someone died of COVID? How many of you are in a situation where you lost your mom or dad and you couldn't even speak to them, you had a nurse holding a phone up so you could in fact say goodbye?

TRUMP: We would have lost far more people, far more people. You would have been months late. You're months behind me, Joe.

BIDEN: His own CDC Director says we could lose as many as another 200,000 people between now and the end of the year. And he said, if we just wear a mask, we can save half those numbers. Just a mask. And by the way, in terms of the whole notion of a vaccine, we're for a vaccine, but I don't trust him at all. Nor do you. I know you don't. What we trust is a scientist.

TRUMP: You don't trust Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer?

WALLACE: Okay, gentlemen, gentlemen. Let me move on to questions about the future because you both have touched on two of the questions I'm going to ask. Focusing on the future first, President Trump, you have repeatedly either contradicted or been at odds with some of your governments own top scientists. The week before last, the Head of the Centers for Disease Control, Dr. Redfield said it would be summer before the vaccine would become generally available to the public. You said that he was confused and mistaken. Those were your two words. But Dr. Slaoui, the head of your Operation Warp Speed, has said exactly the same thing. Are they both wrong?

TRUMP: Well, I've spoken to the companies and we can have it a lot sooner. It's a very political thing because people like this would rather make it political than save lives.

BIDEN: God.

TRUMP: It is a very political thing. I've spoken to Pfizer, I've spoken to all of the people that you have to speak to, Moderna, Johnson & Johnson, and others. They can go faster than that by a lot. It's become very political because the left... Or I don't know if I call them left, I don't know what I call them.

WALLACE: So you're suggesting that the head of your Operation Warp Speed, Dr. Slaoui-

TRUMP: I disagree with him. No, I disagree with both of them. And he didn't say that. He said it could be there, but it could also be much sooner. I had him in my office two days ago.

WALLACE: He talked about the summer, sir, before it's generally available, just like Dr. Redfield.

TRUMP: Because he said it's a possibility that we'll have the answer before November 1st. It could also be after that.

WALLACE: I'm talking about when it's generally available, not-

TRUMP: Well, we're going to deliver it right away. We have the military all set up. Logistically, they're all set up. We have our military that delivers soldiers and they can do 200,000 a day. They're going to be delivering-

BIDEN: This is the same man who told you-

TRUMP: It's all set up.

BIDEN: ... by Easter, this would be gone away. By the warm weather, it'd be gone. Miraculous, like a miracle. And by the way, maybe you could inject some bleach in your arm, and that would take care of it. This is the same man.

TRUMP: That was said sarcastically, and you know that. That was said sarcastically.

BIDEN: So here's the deal. This man is talking about a vaccine. Every serious company is talking about maybe having a vaccine done by the end of the year, but the distribution of that vaccine will not occur until sometime beginning of the middle of next year to get it out, if we get the vaccine. And pray God we will. Pray God we will.

WALLACE: Mr. Vice President, I want to pick up-

TRUMP: You'll have the vaccine sooner than that.

WALLACE: I want to pick up on this question though. You say the public can trust the scientists, but they can't trust President Trump. In fact, you said that again tonight. Your running mate, Senator Harris, goes further, saying that public health experts quote, "Will be muzzled, will be suppressed." Given the fact that polls already show that people are concerned about the vaccine and are reluctant to take it, are you and your running mate, Senator Harris, contributing to that fear?

BIDEN: No more than the question you just asked him. You pointed out he puts pressure and disagrees with his own scientists.

WALLACE: But you're saying you can't-

BIDEN: Everybody knows-

WALLACE: Or Senator Harris is saying you can't trust the scientist.

BIDEN: Well, no, no. You can trust the scientist. She didn't say that. You can trust the-

WALLACE: She said that public health experts quote, "Will be muzzled, will be suppressed."

BIDEN: Yes. Well, that's what he's going to try to do, but there's thousands of scientists out there, like here at this great hospital that don't work for him. Their job doesn't depend on him. They're the people... And by the way-

TRUMP: We spoke to the scientists that are in charge-

BIDEN: By the way-

TRUMP: ... they will have the vaccine very soon.

WALLACE: Let him finish.

BIDEN: Do you believe for a moment what he's telling you in light of all the lies he's told you about the whole issue relating to COVID? He still hasn't even acknowledged that he knew this was happening, knew how dangerous it was going to be back in February, and he didn't even tell you. He's on record as saying it. He panicked or he just looked at the stock market. One of the two. Because guess what?

A lot of people died and a lot more are going to die unless he gets a lot smarter, a lot quicker-

WALLACE: Mr. President?

TRUMP: Did you use the word smart? So you said you went to Delaware State, but you forgot the name of your college. You didn't go to Delaware State. You graduated either the lowest or almost the lowest in your class. Don't ever use the word smart with me. Don't ever use that word.

BIDEN: Oh, give me a break.

TRUMP: Because you know what? There's nothing smart about you, Joe. 47 years you've done nothing.

BIDEN: Well, let's have this debate-

TRUMP: Let me just tell you something, Joe. If you would have had the charge of what I was put through, I had to close the greatest economy in the history of our country. And by the way, now it's being built again and it's going up fast.

WALLACE: We'll get to the economy in the next segment, sir.

TRUMP: It's going up fast. I look forward to talking about it.

WALLACE: Okay. When it comes to how the virus has been handled so far, the two of you have taken very different approaches, and this is going to affect how the virus is handled going forward by whichever of you ends up becoming the next president. I want to quickly go through several of those. Reopenings. Vice President

Biden, you have been much more reluctant than President Trump about reopening the economy and schools. Why, sir?

BIDEN: Because he doesn't have a plan. If I were running it, I'd know what the plan is. You've got to provide these businesses the ability to have the money to be able to reopen with the PPE, as well as with the sanitation they need. You have to provide them classic-

TRUMP: Tell that to Nancy Pelosi.

BIDEN: Will he just shush for a minute?

TRUMP: Tell that to Nancy Pelosi, and Schumer [crosstalk] Chuck.

BIDEN: Nancy Pelosi and Schumer, they have a plan. He won't even meet with them. The Republicans won't meet in the Senate. He sits in his golf course. Well, I mean, literally, think about it. Think about it.

TRUMP: You probably play more than I do, Joe.

WALLACE: What about this question of reopenings and the fact-

TRUMP: Well, he wants to shut down this country and I want to keep it open, and we did a great thing by shutting it down-

BIDEN: You just admitted you'd shut it down.

TRUMP: Wait a minute, Joe. Let me shut you down for a second, Joe, just for one second. He wants to shut down the country. We just went through it. We had to, because we didn't know anything about the disease. Now we've found that elderly

people with heart problems and diabetes and different problems are very, very vulnerable. We learned a lot. Young children aren't, even younger people aren't. We've learned a lot, but he wants to shut it down. More people will be hurt by continuing. If you look at Pennsylvania, if you look at certain states that have been shut down, they have Democrat governors, all, one of the reasons they shut down is because they want to keep it shut down until after the election on November 3rd.

WALLACE: All right. I want to move onto another-

TRUMP: Because it's a political thing.

WALLACE: I want to move onto another subject.

BIDEN: I got to respond to that.

WALLACE: I want to move-

TRUMP: But those states-

WALLACE: Gentlemen, I want to move onto another subject.

TRUMP: Those states are not doing well that are shut down right now.

BIDEN: I got to respond to that.

TRUMP: He wants to shut down the whole country.

WALLACE: President Trump, you have begun to increasingly question the effectiveness of masks as a disease preventer. And in fact, recently you have cited the

issue of waiters touching their masks and touching plates. Are you questioning the efficacy of masks?

TRUMP: No, I think masks are okay. You have to understand, if you look... I mean, I have a mask right here. I put a mask on when I think I need it. Tonight, as an example, everybody's had a test and you've had social distancing and all of the things that you have to, but I wear masks-

BIDEN: Just like your rally.

TRUMP: ... when needed. When needed, I wear masks.

WALLACE: Okay. Let me ask-

TRUMP: I don't wear a mask like him. Every time you see him, he's got a mask. He could be speaking 200 feet away from him and he shows up with the biggest mask I've ever seen. I will say this-

WALLACE: Vice President Biden, go ahead, sir.

BIDEN: Look, the way to open businesses is give them the wherewithal to be able to open. We provided money, the-

WALLACE: But I was asking you, sir, about masks.

BIDEN: Well, masks make a big difference. His own head of the CDC said if we just wore masks between now, if everybody wore a mask and social distanced between now and January, we'd probably save up to 100,000 lives. It matters. It matters.

TRUMP: And they've also said the opposite. They've also said-

BIDEN: No serious person has said the opposite. No serious person.

WALLACE: Okay. I want to ask you-

TRUMP: Dr. Fauci. Dr. Fauci said the opposite.

BIDEN: He did not say the opposite.

WALLACE: I want to ask you, we've got a little more than a minute left in this segment.

TRUMP: He said very strongly, "Masks are not good." Then he changed his mind. He said, "Masks are good."

WALLACE: I want to ask-

TRUMP: I'm okay with masks. I'm not fighting masks.

WALLACE: I want to ask you both about one last subject because your different approaches has even affected the way that you have campaigned. President Trump, you're holding large rallies with crowds packed together, thousands of people.

TRUMP: Outside.

WALLACE: Outside. Yes, sir. Agreed. Vice President Biden, you are holding much smaller events with-

TRUMP: Because nobody will show up.

WALLACE: ... people with masks.

TRUMP: Well, it's true. Nobody shows up to his rallies.

WALLACE: All right. In any case, why you holding the big rallies? Why you not? You go first, sir.

TRUMP: Because people want to hear what I have to say. I mean-

WALLACE: But are not worried about us spreading disease?

TRUMP: ... I've done a great job as a president, and I'll have 25, 35,000 people show up at airports. We use airports and hangers and we have a lot of people-

WALLACE: Are you not worried about the disease issues, sir?

TRUMP: Well, so far we have had no problem whatsoever. It's outside. That's a big difference according to the experts. We do them outside, we have tremendous crowds, as you see, and literally on 24 hours notice. And Joe does the circles and has three people someplace.

BIDEN: By the way, did you see one of the last big rallies he had? A reporter came up to him to ask him a question, he said, "No, no, no. Stand back, put on your mask, put on a mask. Have you been tested? I'm way far away from those other people." That's what he said, "I'm going to be okay." He's not worried about you. He's not worried about the people out there [crosstalk].

TRUMP: We've had no negative effect.

BIDEN: No negative effect. Come on.

TRUMP: We've had no negative effect, and we've had 35, 40,000 people at these rallies.

WALLACE: All right. Do you want to just quickly finish up? Because I want to move on to our next-

BIDEN: Yes, I would. He's been totally irresponsible the way in which he has handled the social distancing and people wearing masks, basically encouraged them not to. He's a fool on this.

TRUMP: If you could get the crowds, you would have done the same thing. But you can't. Nobody cares.

WALLACE: Gentlemen, can we move on to the-

TRUMP: Nobody cares.

WALLACE: Gentlemen, can we move on to the economy?

TRUMP: Yes.

WALLACE: The economy is, I think it's fair to say, recovering faster than expected from the shutdown-

TRUMP: Much faster.

WALLACE: ... in the second quarter. The unemployment rate fell to 8.4% last month. The Federal Reserve says the hit to growth, which is going to be there, is not

going to be nearly as big as they had expected. President Trump, you say we are in a V-shaped recovery. Vice President Biden, you say it's more of a K-shape. What difference does that mean to the American people in terms of the economy? President Trump, in this segment you go first.

TRUMP: So we built the greatest economy in history. We closed it down because of the China plague. When the plague came in, we closed it down, which was very hard psychologically to do. He didn't think we should close it down and he was wrong. Again, two million people would be dead now instead of... Still, 204,000 people is too much. One person is too much. Should have never happened from China. But what happened is we closed it down and now we're reopening and we're doing record business. We had 10.4 million people in a four-month period that we've put back into the workforce. That's a record the likes of which nobody's ever seen before. And he wants to close down the... He will shut it down again. He will destroy this country.

TRUMP: A lot of people, between drugs and alcohol and depression, when you start shutting it down, you take a look at what's happening at some of your Democrat-run states where they have these tough shutdowns. And I'm telling you it's because they don't want to open it. One of them came out last week, you saw that, "Oh, we're going to open up on November 9th." Why November 9th? Because it's after the election. They think they're hurting us by keeping them closed. They're hurting people. People know what to do. They can social distance. They can wash their hands, they can wear masks. They can do whatever they want, but they got to open these states up.

TRUMP: When you look at North Carolina, when you look, and these governors are under siege, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and a couple of others, you got to open these states up. It's not fair. You're talking about almost it's like being in prison. And you look at what's going on with divorce, look at what's going on with alcoholism

and drugs. It's a very, very sad thing. And he'll close down the whole country. This guy will close down the whole country and destroy our country. Our country is coming back incredibly well, setting records as it does it. We don't need somebody to come in and say, "Let's shut it down."

WALLACE: All right. Your two minutes, sir. We're now moved to you. As I said, posing the question, the president says it's a V-shape recovery, you say it's a K-shaped recovery. What's the difference?

BIDEN: The difference is millionaires and billionaires like him in the middle of the COVID crisis have done very well. Billionaires have made another \$300 billion because of his profligate tax proposal, and he only focused on the market. But you folks at home, you folks living in Scranton and Claymont and all the small towns and working class towns in America, how well are you doing? This guy paid a total of \$750 in taxes.

TRUMP: That's wrong.

WALLACE: Sir, wait. No. Sir-

TRUMP: [crosstalk].

WALLACE: Yeah, I understand. You've agreed to the two minutes, so please let him have it.

BIDEN: Do I get my time back? The fact is that he has in fact, worked on this in a way that he's going to be the first president of the United States to leave office, having fewer jobs in his administration than when he became president. Fewer jobs than when he became president. First one in American history.

BIDEN: Secondly, the people who have lost their jobs are those people who have been on the front lines. Those people who have been saving our lives, those people who have been out there dying. People who've been putting themselves in the way to make sure that we could all try to make it. And the idea that he is insisting that we go forward and open when you have almost half the states in America with a significant increase in COVID deaths and COVID cases in the United States of America, and he wants to open it up more. Why is he want to open it up? Why doesn't he take care of the... You can't fix the economy until you fix the COVID crisis. And he has no intention of doing anything about making it better for you all at home in terms of your health and your safety.

BIDEN: Schools. Why aren't schools open? Because it costs a lot of money to open them safely. They were going to give, his Administration going to give the teachers and school students masks, and then they decided no, couldn't do that because it's not a national emergency. Not a national emergency. They've done nothing to help small businesses. Nothing. They're closing. One in six is now gone. He ought to get on the job and take care of the needs of the American people so we can open safely.

WALLACE: All right. Your time is up, sir. We are going to get to-

TRUMP: I have to respond to that.

WALLACE: Well, you both had two minutes, sir.

TRUMP: Excuse me, he made a statement.

WALLACE: And so did you.

TRUMP: No, people want their schools open. They don't want to be shut down. They don't want their state shut down. They want their restaurants. I look at New York. It's so sad what's happening in New York. It's almost like a ghost town, and I'm not sure it can ever recover what they've done to New York. People want their places open. They want to get back to their lives.

BIDEN: People want to be safe.

TRUMP: They'll be careful, but they want their schools open.

BIDEN: People want to be safe.

TRUMP: I'm the one that brought back football. By the way, I brought back Big Ten football. It was me and I'm very happy to do it-

WALLACE: All right. Let's-

TRUMP: ... and people of Ohio are very proud of me. And you know how I found out? When [crosstalk].

WALLACE: Gentlemen, we're going to get to your economic plans going forward in a moment, but first, Mr. President, as you well know, there's a new report that in 2016, the year you were elected president, and 2017, your first year as president, that you paid \$750 a year in federal income tax each of those years. I know that you pay a lot of other taxes, but I'm asking you this specific question. Is it true that you paid \$750 in federal income taxes each of those two years?

TRUMP: I paid millions of dollars in taxes, millions of dollars of income tax. And let me just tell you, there was a story in one of the papers that paid-

BIDEN: Show us your tax returns.

TRUMP: I paid \$38 million one year, I paid \$27 million one year.

BIDEN: Show us your tax returns.

TRUMP: You'll see it as soon as it's finished, you'll see it. You know, if you wanted to, go to the Board of Elections. There's 118 page or so report that says everything I have, every bank I have, I'm totally under leveraged because the assets are extremely good, and I built a great company.

WALLACE: Sir, I'm asking you a specific question, which is-

TRUMP: But let me tell you-

WALLACE: I understand all of that.

BIDEN: Release your tax return.

WALLACE: I understand all of that-

TRUMP: Let me-

WALLACE: No, Mr. President, I'm asking you a question. Will you tell us how much you paid in federal income taxes in 2016 and 2017?

TRUMP: Millions of dollars.

WALLACE: You paid millions of dollars in-

TRUMP: Millions of dollars, yes.

WALLACE: So not 750?

TRUMP: Millions of dollars. And you'll get to see it. And you'll get to see it.

BIDEN: When?

TRUMP: But let me just tell you-

BIDEN: In [crosstalk]?

TRUMP: Chris, let me just say something, that it was the tax laws. I don't want to pay tax. Before I came here, I was a private developer, I was a private business people. Like every other private person, unless they're stupid, they go through the laws, and that's what it is. He passed a tax bill that gave us all these privileges for depreciation and for tax credits. We built the building and we get tax credits, like the hotel on Pennsylvania Avenue. Which by the way, was given to me by the Obama Administration, if you can believe that. Now the man got fired right after that happened, but that's-

WALLACE: Vice President Biden, you want to respond?

BIDEN: Yeah, I do want to respond. Look, the tax code that put him in a position that he pays less tax than on the money a school teacher makes is because of him... He says he's smart because he can take advantage of the tax code. And he does take advantage of the tax code. That's why I'm going to eliminate the Trump tax cuts. And I'm going to eliminate those tax cuts.

TRUMP: That's okay.

BIDEN: And make sure that we invest in the people who in fact need the help. People out there need help.

TRUMP: But why didn't you do it over the last 25 years?

BIDEN: Because you weren't president-

TRUMP: Why didn't you do it over the last 25 years?

BIDEN: Because you weren't president and screwing things up.

TRUMP: You were a Senator and [crosstalk]-

BIDEN: You're the worst president America has ever had. Come on.

TRUMP: Hey, Joe, let me just tell you, Joe. In 47 months, I've done more than you've done in 47 years, Joe. We've done things that you never even thought of doing.

WALLACE: Okay. Gentlemen?

TRUMP: Including fixing the broken military that you gave me, including taking care of your debts.

WALLACE: Mr. President, we're talking about the economy. I'd like to ask you about your plans going forward because Mr. Vice President, your economic plan-

TRUMP: He has none.

WALLACE: ... if you were to be elected president focuses a lot on big government, big taxes, big spending. I want to focus first on the taxes. You propose more than \$4 trillion over a decade in new taxes on individuals making more than \$400,000 a year.

WALLACE: ... and on corporations. President Trump says that that kind of an increase in taxes is going to hurt the economy as it's just coming out of a recession.

BIDEN: Well, just take a look at what is the analysis done by Wall Street firms, points out that my economic plan would create 7 million more jobs than his in four years, number one. And number two, it would create an additional \$1 trillion in economic growth, because it would be about buying American. The federal government spends \$600 billion a year on everything from ships, to steel, to buildings and the like. And under my proposal, we're going to make sure that every penny of that has to be made by a company-

WALLACE: But respectfully, sir, I'm talking about taxes, not spending.

BIDEN: By the way, I'm going to eliminate a significant number of the taxes. I'm going to make the corporate tax 28%. It shouldn't be 21%. You have 91 companies federal, I mean, the fortune 500, who don't pay a single penny in tax making billions of dollars.

TRUMP: Why didn't you do it before, when you were Vice-President with Obama?

BIDEN: Because you in fact passed that, that was your tax proposal.

TRUMP: I got it done. And you know what happened?

BIDEN: Yeah, you got it done-

TRUMP: Our economy boomed like it's never boomed before.

BIDEN: The economy-

WALLACE: Mr. President-

BIDEN: Let me finish.

WALLACE: Mr. President, let me pick up on that. You would continue your free market approach, lower taxes, more deregulation, correct?

BIDEN: Not lower tax for the American people.

WALLACE: But let me-

TRUMP: Excuse me.

WALLACE: You talk about the economy booming. It turns out that in Obama's final three years as president more jobs were created, a million and a half more jobs, than in the first three years of your presidency.

TRUMP: They had the slowest economic recovery since 1929. It was the slowest recovery. Also, they took over something that was down here. All you had to do is turn on the lights and you pick up a lot. But they had the slowest economic recovery since 1929, and let me tell you about the stock market. When the stock market goes up, that means jobs. It also means 401ks. If you got in, if you ever became president with your ideas, you want to terminate my taxes. I'll tell you what, you'll lose. Half of the companies that have poured in here will leave. And plenty of companies that

are already here, they'll leave for other places. [crosstalk] They will leave and you will have a depression, the likes of which you've never seen.

BIDEN: Look-

WALLACE: Mr. Vice President.

BIDEN: ... we inherited the worst recession, short of a depression in American history. I was asked to bring it back. We were able to have an economic recovery that created the jobs you're talking about. We handed him a booming economy, he blew it.

TRUMP: It wasn't booming.

BIDEN: He blew it.

TRUMP: It wasn't booming. It was the weakest recovery since 1929.

WALLACE: Wait, wait, is it fair to say he blew it when, in fact-

TRUMP: When COVID came along.

WALLACE: ... when there was record low unemployment before COVID.

BIDEN: Yeah, because what he did, even before COVID, manufacturing went in the hole. Manufacturing went in a hole-

TRUMP: Excuse me, Chris, wait.

BIDEN: ... number one. Number two-

TRUMP: Chris.

BIDEN: Number three.

TRUMP: They said it would take... No, you're on number two.

BIDEN: No.

TRUMP: Chris, Chris. They said it would take-

BIDEN: This guy-

TRUMP: ... a miracle to bring back manufacturing. I brought back 700,000 jobs. They brought back nothing. They gave up on manufacturing.

BIDEN: We did not. [crosstalk]

TRUMP: ... standard fare.

BIDEN: I'm the guy that brought back the automobile industry.

TRUMP: He totally gave up on manufacturing.

WALLACE: All right, let him-

BIDEN: I was asked to bring back Chrysler and General Motors. We brought them back right here in the state of Ohio and Michigan. He blew it. They're gone. He blew it. And in fact, they're gone-

TRUMP: Ohio had the best year it's ever had last year. Michigan had the best year they've ever had.

BIDEN: That is not true.

TRUMP: Many car companies came in from Germany, from Japan, went to Michigan, went to Ohio and they didn't come in with you. [crosstalk].

WALLACE: Mr. Vice President, go ahead.

BIDEN: And so you take a look at what he's actually done. He's done very little. His trade deals are the same way. He talks about these great trade deals. He talks about the art of the deal. China's perfected the art of the steal. We have a higher deficit with China now than we did before. We have the highest trade deficit-

TRUMP: China ate your lunch- [crosstalk].

BIDEN: ... with Mexico.

TRUMP: China ate your lunch, Joe. And no wonder your son goes in and, wha-, he takes out billions of dollars. He takes out billions of dollars to manage. He makes millions of dollars. And also, while we're at it, why is it just out of curiosity, the mayor of Moscow's wife gave your son three and a half million dollars?

BIDEN: That is not true.

TRUMP: What did he do to deserve it? What did he do with Burisma-

BIDEN: None of that is true.

TRUMP: ... to deserve \$183,000?

WALLACE: Sir, you've asked him a question, let him answer it.

BIDEN: None of that is true.

TRUMP: Oh really, he didn't get three and a half million?

WALLACE: Mr. President-

BIDEN: Is totally-

WALLACE: Mr. President, please. You've asked a question- [crosstalk]

BIDEN: Totally discredited. Totally discredited. And by the way-

TRUMP: Well wait, he didn't get three and a half million dollars, Joe?

BIDEN: Mr. Vice-

TRUMP: He got three and a half million dollars-

WALLACE: Mr. President.

TRUMP: ... dollars.

BIDEN: That is not true.

TRUMP: Oh, really?

WALLACE: Mr. President, it's an open discussion. Please- [crosstalk]

TRUMP: It's a fact.

BIDEN: It is not a fact.

WALLACE: Well, you have raised an issue, let the Vice President answer.

BIDEN: It's been totally discredited.

TRUMP: Did Burisma pay him 183 thousand a month, with no experience in energy?

WALLACE: Mr. President-

BIDEN: My son did nothing wrong at Burisma-

TRUMP: I think he did.

BIDEN: The only guy that. . .

WALLACE: Mr. President, let him answer. [crosstalk].

BIDEN: He doesn't want to let me answer, because he knows I have the truth. His position has been totally thoroughly discredited. . .

TRUMP: By who?

BIDEN: And you can-

TRUMP: The media.

BIDEN: by everybody. Well, by the media, by our allies.

TRUMP: By the media, because they refuse to talk about it-

BIDEN: By the World Bank-

TRUMP: ... because they're embarrassed.

BIDEN: By everyone, as discredited. And matter of fact [crosstalk] Matter of fact-

WALLACE: Mr. President, please stop.

BIDEN: Even the people who testified under oath-

TRUMP: So let me ask you this, Joe- [crosstalk].

WALLACE: No, no. Go ahead, Mr.— I'm listening to you.

BIDEN: Even the people under-

TRUMP: He got three and a half million dollars from Moscow.

BIDEN: ... testified, he testified under oath in his Administration said I did my job and I did it very well.

TRUMP: Oh, really?

BIDEN: I did it honorably.

TRUMP: I'd like to know who they are.

BIDEN: Well, I'll give you the list of the people who-

TRUMP: I'll fire them.

WALLACE: No, no. Go ahead, sir.

BIDEN: I'm sure that you've already fired most of them, because they did a good job.

TRUMP: Some people don't do a good job.

BIDEN: Well, here's the- [crosstalk]

WALLACE: Go ahead. You get the- [crosstalk] Wait a minute. You get the final word, Mr.-

BIDEN: Well, it's hard to get any word in with this clown. Excuse me, this person.

TRUMP: Hey, hey, let me just say, that

BIDEN: No, no. Mr. President- [crosstalk]

TRUMP: Three and a half million, Joe.

BIDEN: That is simply not true.

TRUMP: Why did he deserve three and a half million from Moscow?

BIDEN: Look, here's the deal. We want to talk about families and ethics. I don't want to do that. I mean, his family, we could talk about all night. His family's already-

TRUMP: My family-

WALLACE: No, no- [crosstalk].

TRUMP: My family lost a fortune by coming down and helping us with government.

BIDEN: And that's such a- [crosstalk]

WALLACE: Mr. President-

TRUMP: Every single one of them lost a fortune by coming down and helping us with government.

BIDEN: This is not about my family or his family. It's about your family, the American people. [crosstalk]

TRUMP: And he got three and a half million dollars for nothing.

BIDEN: That's not true. It doesn't want to talk about what you need. You, the American people. It's about you. That's what we're talking about here. [crosstalk]

WALLACE: That's the end of the segment. We're moving on.

BIDEN: He didn't take that.

WALLACE: Vice President-

TRUMP: Chris, can I be honest? It's a very important question-

BIDEN: Try to be honest.

WALLACE: No.

TRUMP: He stood up-

WALLACE: The answer to the question is no.

TRUMP: ... and he threatened Ukraine-

WALLACE: Sir-

TRUMP: ... with a billion dollars-

BIDEN: That is absolutely not true.

WALLACE: Stop. [crosstalk] Gentlemen, I hate to raise my voice, but I-
[crosstalk] Why should I be different than the two of you? So here's the deal.

BIDEN: That's a good point.

WALLACE: We have six segments. We have ended that segment. We're going to go to the next segment. In that segment, you each are going to have two uninterrupted moments. In those two uninterrupted minutes, Mr. President, you can say anything you want. I'm going to ask a question about race, but if you want to answer about

something else, go ahead. But we, I, I think that the country would be better served, if we allowed both people to speak with fewer interruptions. I'm appealing to you, sir, to do that.

TRUMP: Well, and him too.

WALLACE: Well, frankly, you've been doing more interrupting than he has.

TRUMP: Well, that's all right, but he does plenty.

WALLACE: Well, sir, less than-

TRUMP: He does plenty.

WALLACE: No, less than you have. Let's please continue on. The issue of race. Vice-President Biden, you say that President Trump's response to the violence in Charlottesville three years ago, when he talked about very fine people on both sides, was what directly led you to launch this run for president.

TRUMP: Oh yeah, sure.

WALLACE: President Trump, you have often said that you believe you will have done more for Black Americans than any president with the possible exception of Abraham Lincoln.

TRUMP: That's true.

WALLACE: My question for the two of you, is why should voters trust you rather than your opponent to deal with the race issues facing this country over the next four years? Vice President Biden, you go first.

BIDEN: It's about equity and equality. It's about decency. It's about the Constitution. And we have never walked away from trying to require, acquire equity for everyone, equality for the whole of America. But we've never accomplished it, but we've never walked away from it like he has done. It is true, the reason I got in the race is when those people. . . Close your eyes, remember what those people look like coming out of the fields, carrying torches, their veins bulging, spewing—just spewing anti-Semitic bile and accompanied by the Ku Klux Klan. A young woman got killed, and they asked the president what he thought. He said, “There were very fine people on both sides.” No president's ever said anything like that. [crosstalk].

WALLACE: It is his-

BIDEN: Now-

WALLACE: ... two minutes sir.

BIDEN: ... second point I'd make to you, is that when Floyd was killed, when Mr. Floyd was killed, there was a peaceful protest in front of the White House. What did he do? He came out of his bunker, had the military use tear gas on them so he could walk across to a church and hold up a Bible. And then what happened after that? The Bishop of that very church said that it was a disgrace. The general who was with him said “All he ever wants to do is divide people, not unite people at all.” This is a president who has used everything as a dog whistle, to try to generate racist hatred, racist division.

This is a man who, in fact, you talk about helping African-Americans, one in 1000 African Americans has been killed because of the coronavirus. And if he doesn't do something quickly, by the end of the year, one in 500 will have been killed. One in 500 African Americans. This man, this man is a savior of African-Americans? This

man cares at all? This man's done virtually nothing. Look, the fact is that you have to look at what he's talks about. You have to look at what he did. And what he did has been disastrous for the African-American community.

TRUMP: So-

WALLACE: President Trump, you have two minutes. Why should Americans trust you over your opponent to deal with race issues?

TRUMP: You did a crime bill, 1994, where you called them super-predators. African-Americans are super-predators and they've never forgotten it. They've never forgotten it.

BIDEN: I've never said-

WALLACE: No, no, sir. It's his two minutes.

TRUMP: So you did that, and they call you super-predator and I'm letting people out of jail now, that you have treated the African-American population community, you have treated the black community about as bad as anybody in this country. You did the 1990—and that's why, if you look at the polls, I'm doing better than any Republican has done in a long time, because they saw what you did. You call them super-predators, and you've called them worse than that. Because you look back at your testimony over the years, you've called them a lot worse than that. As far as the church is concerned, and as far as the generals are concerned, we just got the support of 200–250 military leaders and generals, total support. Law enforcement, almost every law enforcement group in the United States. I have Florida. I have Texas. I have Ohio. I have every... Excuse me, Portland, the sheriff just came out today and he said, "I support President Trump."

I don't think you have any law enforcement. You can't even say the word law enforcement. Because if you say those words, you're going to lose all of your radical left supporters. And why aren't you saying those words, Joe? Why don't you say the words law enforcement? Because you know what? If they called us in Portland, we would put out that fire in a half an hour. But they won't do it, because they're run by radical left Democrats. If you look at Chicago, if you look at any place you want to look, Seattle, they heard we were coming in the following day and they put up their hands and we got back Seattle. Minneapolis, we got it back, Joe, because we believe in law and order, but you don't. The top 10 cities and just about the top 40 cities are run by Democrats, and in many cases radical left. And they've got you wrapped around their finger, Joe, to a point where you don't want to say anything about law and order. And I'll tell you what, the people of this country want and demand law and order and you're afraid to even say it.

WALLACE: All right. I want to return to the question of race. Vice President Biden, after the grand jury in the Breonna Taylor case decided not to charge any of the police with homicide, you said it raises the question, "Whether justice could be equally applied in America." Do you believe that there is a separate but unequal system of justice for Blacks in this country?

BIDEN: Yes, there is. There's systemic injustice in this country, in education and work and in law enforcement and the way in which it's enforced. But look, the vast majority of police officers are good, decent, honorable men and women. They risk their lives every day to take care of us. But there are some bad apples. And when they occur, when they find them, they have to be sorted out. They have to be held accountable. They have to be held accountable. And what I'm going to do as President of the United States is call a, a, together an entire group of people at the White House, everything from the civil rights groups, to the police officers, to the police chiefs, and we're going to work this out.

We're going to work this out. So we change the way in which we have more transparency, in when these things happen. These cops aren't happy to see what happened to George Floyd. These cops aren't happy to see what happened to Breonna Taylor. Most don't like it, but we have to have a system where people are held accountable when—and by the way, violence in response is never appropriate, never appropriate. Peaceful protest is, violence is never appropriate.

WALLACE: All right, Mr.-

TRUMP: What is peaceful protest? When they run through the middle of the town-

WALLACE: President Trump-

TRUMP: ... and burn down your stores and kill people all over the place-
[crosstalk].

BIDEN: That is not peaceful protest.

TRUMP: No it's not, but you say it is.

BIDEN: I did not say it is.

WALLACE: President Trump, I'd like to continue with the issue of race. I promise we're going to get to the issue of law and order in a moment.

TRUMP: Fine.

WALLACE: This month, your Administration, uh, directed federal agencies to end racial sensitivity training that addresses white privilege or critical race theory. Why

did you decide to do that, to end racial sensitivity training? And do you believe that there is systemic racism in this country, sir?

TRUMP: I ended it because it's racist. I ended it because a lot of people were complaining that they were asked to do things that were absolutely insane. That it was a radical revolution that was taking place in our military, in our schools, all over the place. And you know it, and so does everybody else. And he would know it, oh it's totally racial. [crosstalk]

WALLACE: What is radical about racial sensitivity training?

TRUMP: If you were a certain person, you had no status in life. It was sort of a reversal. And if you look at the people, we would pay people hundreds of thousands of dollars to teach very bad ideas and frankly, very sick ideas. And, and really, they were teaching people to hate our country. And I'm not going to do that. I'm not going to allow that to happen. We have to go back to the core values of this country. They were teaching people that our country is a horrible place. It's a racist place. And they were teaching people to hate our country. And I'm not going to allow that to happen.

BIDEN: Nobody's doing that.

WALLACE: Vice President Biden.

BIDEN: Nobody's doing that. He's the racist.

TRUMP: You just don't know.

BIDEN: Here's the deal. I know a lot more about this- [crosstalk].

TRUMP: You don't know.

WALLACE: Let him finish.

BIDEN: The fact is that there is racial insensitivity. People have to be made aware of what other people feel like, uh, what insults them, what is demeaning to them. It's important that people know. Many people don't want to hurt other people's feelings. But it's amazing, it makes a big difference. It makes a gigantic difference in the way a child is able to grow up and have a self-sense, a sense of self-esteem. It's a little bit like how this guy and, and his friends look down on so many people. They look down their nose on people like Irish Catholics, like me, and grew up in Scranton. They look down on people who don't have money. They look down on people who are of a different faith. They look down on people who are a different color. In fact, we're all Americans. The only way we're gonna bring this country together is bring everybody together. There's nothing we cannot do, if we do it together. We can take this on, and we can defeat racism in America.

WALLACE: Vice President... I mean, President Trump, sir.

TRUMP: During the Obama-Biden Administration, there was tremendous division. There was hatred. You look at, uh, Ferguson, you look at, or you go to very...many places. Look at Oakland. Look what happened in Oakland. Look what happened in Baltimore. Look what happened a . . . Frankly, it was more violent than what I'm even seeing now.

BIDEN: Oh my Lord.

TRUMP: But the reason-

BIDEN: This is ridiculous.

TRUMP: ... is that the Democrats that run these cities-

BIDEN: Absolutely ridiculous.

TRUMP: ... don't want to talk, like you, about law and order.

BIDEN: Violent crime. . .

TRUMP: And you still haven't mentioned.

BIDEN: Violent crime. . .

TRUMP: Are you in favor of law and order?

BIDEN: I'm in favor of law. You follow a little bit of order- [crosstalk].

TRUMP: Are you in favor of law and order? [crosstalk]

BIDEN: Yes I'm in favor of. . .

WALLACE: You asked a question, let him finish. [crosstalk] Let him answer.

BIDEN: Law and order with justice, where people get treated fairly.

TRUMP: Okay.

BIDEN: And the fact of the matter is, violent crime went down 17 percent, 15 percent in our Administration. It's gone up on his watch.

WALLACE: Okay.

TRUMP: It went down much more in ours.

WALLACE: All right, we're done- [crosstalk] Mr. President, you're going to be very happy because we're now going to talk about law and order.

TRUMP: The places we had trouble were Democratic-run cities. . .

WALLACE: That's exactly my question. There has been a dramatic increase in homicides in America this summer particularly, and you often blame that on Democratic mayors and Democratic governors. But in fact, there have been equivalent spikes in Republican-led cities, like Tulsa and Fort Worth. So the question is, is this really a party issue?

TRUMP: I think it's a party issue. You can bring in a couple of examples but if you look at Chicago, what's going on in Chicago where, uh, 53 people were shot and eight died. Shot. If you look at New York where it's going up, like nobody's ever seen anything. The numbers are going up a 100, 150, 200 percent, uh, crime, it is crazy what's going on . . .

BIDEN: Republican cities, republican cities.

TRUMP: . . . and he doesn't want to say law and order because he can't because he'll lose his radical left supporters and once he does that, it's over with. But if he ever got to run this country, and they ran it the way he would want to run it, we would have. . .

BIDEN: By the way. . .

TRUMP: . . . our suburbs would be gone. By the way, our suburbs would be gone. And you would see problems like you've never seen before.

BIDEN: He wouldn't know a suburb unless you took a wrong turn. He was, he was. . .

TRUMP: Oh, I know suburbs so much better than you.

WALLACE: Gentlemen wait a minute.

BIDEN: I was raised in the suburbs. This is not 1950. All these dog whistles and racism don't work anymore. Suburbs are by and large integrated. There's as many people today driving their kids to soccer practice and/or black and white and Hispanic in the same car as there have been any time in the past. What's, what really is a threat to the suburbs and their safety is his failure to deal with COVID. They're dying in the suburbs. His failure to deal with the environment, they're being flooded, they're being burned out because his refusal to do anything. That's why the suburbs are in trouble.

WALLACE: I do want to talk about this issue of law and order though. And in the joint recommendation that came from the Biden-Bernie Sanders task force, you talked about quote re-imagining policing. First of all, what does re-imagining policing mean and do you support?

BIDEN: It means. . .

WALLACE: . . . If I might finish the question, what does re-imagining policing mean and do you support the Black Lives Matter call uh, for uh, community control of policing?

BIDEN: Look, what I support is the police having the opportunity to deal with the problems they face and I'm totally opposed to defunding the police offices. As a matter of fact police, local police, the only one defunding, in his budget calls for a \$400 million cut in local law enforcement assistance. They need more assistance. They need when they show up for a 9-11 call to have someone with them as a psychologist or psychiatrist to keep them from having to use force and be able to talk people down. We have to have community policing like we had before, where the officers get to know the people in the communities. That's when crime went down, it didn't go up. It went down. And so we have to be engaged with . . .

TRUMP: That's not what they are talking about, Chris. That's not what it . . . He's talking about defunding the police.

BIDEN: That's exactly. . . that is not true.

TRUMP: He doesn't have any law support. He has no law enforcement support.

TRUMP: Almost nothing.

BIDEN: That's not true. That's not. . . Oh, look. . .

TRUMP: Oh, really, who do you have? Name one group that supports you. Name one group that came out and supported you. Go ahead. Think. We have time.

BIDEN: We don't have time to do anything except . . .

TRUMP: No, no. Think about it. Name one law enforcement group that came out in support of you.

BIDEN: Folks, folks. . .

WALLACE: Now, gentleman. I think I'm going to take back the moderator's role.

..

TRUMP: There aren't any. I don't think there are any.

WALLACE: . . . and I want to get to another subject, which is the issue of protests in many cities that have turned violent. In Portland, Oregon, especially we had a, more than a hundred straight days of protests, which I think you would agree, you talk about peaceful protests. Many of those turned into riots. Mr. Vice-President you say that people who commit crimes should be held accountable. The question I have, though, is as the Democratic nominee, and earlier tonight, you said that you are the Democratic Party right now, have you ever called the Democratic Mayor of Portland or the Democratic Governor of Oregon and said, "Hey, you gotta stop this, bring in the National Guard, do whatever it takes, but you'd stop the days and months of violence in Portland."

BIDEN: I don't hold public office, now. I am a former Vice-President. I've made it clear. I've made it clear in my public statements that the violence should be prosecuted. It should be prosecuted, and anyone who commits it should be prosecuted.

WALLACE: But you've never called for the people...

TRUMP: He's never done that.

WALLACE: Excuse me, sir. You had never called for the leaders in Portland and in Oregon to call and bring in the National Guard and knock off a 100 days of riots.

BIDEN: They can in fact take care of it if he'd just stay out of the way.

TRUMP: Oh really? Oh really?

WALLACE: Let, let's just. . .

TRUMP: I sent in the US Marshals. . .

BIDEN: Here, here's the thing. . .

WALLACE: I asked a question. . .

TRUMP: . . .to get the killer of a young man in the middle of the street, they shot him. For three days Portland didn't do anything.

WALLACE: President Trump. President Trump. President Trump. . . I interrupted. President Trump.

TRUMP: I sent in the US Marshals they took care of business.

WALLACE: Go ahead sir.

BIDEN: And by the way his own former spokesperson said, you know, "Riots and chaos and violence help his cause." That's what this is all about.

TRUMP: I don't know who said that.

BIDEN: I do.

TRUMP: Who?

BIDEN: I think it–Kellyanne Conway.

TRUMP: I don't think she said that.

BIDEN: She said that.

TRUMP: I don't think so.

BIDEN: And so here, here's the point. The point is that, that's what he is keep trying to rile everything up. He doesn't want to calm things down. Instead of going in and talking to people and saying, "Let's get everybody together. Figure out how to deal with this." What's he do? He just pours gasoline in the fire. Constantly. At every single solitary time.

WALLACE: Okay. And, and, and to end this, button up this segment, I'm going to give you a minute to answer, sir. You have repeatedly...

TRUMP: You mean, I have to answer his stuff?

WALLACE: You have repeatedly...

TRUMP: His statement?

WALLACE: You have repeatedly. . . No. . .

TRUMP: Wait a second, you made a statement.

WALLACE: No, you've been talking back and forth. I'm asking you.

TRUMP: I would love to end it. I would love to end it.

WALLACE: I would love to know sir. . . You know sir if you want to switch seats

TRUMP: . . . we could, very quickly

WALLACE: . . . we can do that.

TRUMP: I'll send in the National Guard, it would be over. That'd be no problem. But they don't want to accept the National Guard.

WALLACE: You have repeatedly criticized the Vice-President for not specifically calling out Antifa and other left-wing extremist groups. But are you willing, tonight, to condemn white supremacists and militia groups and to say that they need to stand down and not add to the violence in a number of these cities as we saw in Kenosha and as we've seen in Portland.

TRUMP: Sure, I'm willing to do that.

WALLACE: Are you prepared specifically to do it. Well go ahead, sir.

TRUMP: I would say almost everything I see is from the left-wing not from the right wing.

WALLACE: So what are you, what are you saying?

TRUMP: I'm willing to do anything. I want to see peace.

WALLACE: Well, do it, sir.

BIDEN: Say it. Do it. Say it.

TRUMP: You want to call them? What do you want to call them? Give me a name, give me a name, go ahead who would you like me to condemn.

WALLACE: White supremacists and racists.

BIDEN: Proud Boys.

WALLACE: White supremacists and white militias.

BIDEN: Proud Boys.

TRUMP: Proud Boys, stand back and stand by. But I'll tell you what, I'll tell you what: somebody's got to do something about Antifa and the left because this is not a right wing problem this is a left-wing. This is a left-wing problem. . .

BIDEN: He's own FBI Director said unlike white supremacists. . .

TRUMP: This is a left-wing problem.

BIDEN: Antifa is an idea not an organization. . .

TRUMP: Oh you gotta be kidding.

BIDEN: ... not a militia. That's what his FBI Director said.

TRUMP: Well, then you know what, he's wrong.

WALLACE: Gentlemen, gentlemen. No, no, no, we're done, sir. Moving onto the next... [crosstalk]

TRUMP: . . . when a bat hits you over the head, that's not an idea. Antifa is bad.

BIDEN: Everybody in your Administration. . .

TRUMP: Antifa is bad.

BIDEN: Everybody in your Administration tells you the truth, has a bad idea. You have no idea

TRUMP: You know what, Antifa is a dangerous radical group.

WALLACE: All right, gentlemen we're now moving onto the Trump and Biden records.

TRUMP: And you ought to be careful of them, they'll overthrow you.

WALLACE: I'm going to ask a question. When the president seeks a second term, it is generally a referendum on his record but Vice-President Biden, you like to quote one of your dad's sayings, which is don't compare me to the almighty, compare me to the alternative. And in this case sir you are the alternative. Looking at both of your records, I'm going to ask each of you. Why should voters elect you president over your opponent? In this segment, President Trump you'll go first, two minutes.

TRUMP: Because there has never been an administration or president who has done more than I've done in a period of three and a half years. And that's despite the impeachment hoax and you saw what happened today with Hillary Clinton, where it was a whole big con job. But despite going through all of these things where I had to fight, both flanks and behind me and above, there has never been an administration that's done what I've done. The greatest, before COVID came in, the greatest

economy in history, lowest employ–unemployment numbers, everything was good. Everything was going.

And by the way, there was unity going to happen. People were calling me for the first time in years, they were calling, and they were saying it's time maybe and then what happened? We got hit. But now we're building it back up again. A rebuilding of the military, including Space Force and all of the other things. A fixing of the VA which was a mess under him. Three hundred and eight thousand people died because they didn't have proper health care. It was a mess. And we now got a 91% approval rating at the VA, our vets. We take care of our vets. But we've rebuilt our military.

The job that we've done. . . and, and I'll tell you something, some people say maybe the most important. By the end of the first term, I'll have approximately 300 Federal judges and Court of Appeals judges, 300, and hopefully three great Supreme Court judges, justices. That is a record the likes of which very few people. . . and you know, one of the reasons I'll have so many judges? Because President Obama and him left me 128 judges to fill.

When you leave office, you don't leave any judges. That's like, you just don't do that. They left 128 openings, and if I were a member of his party, because they have a little different philosophy, I'd say, if you left us 128 openings you can't be a good president. You can't be a good Vice President but I want to thank you because it gives us almost, it'll probably be above that number. By the end of this term, 300 judges. It's a record.

WALLACE: Looking at both of your records. Why should voters elect you President as opposed to President Trump, you have two minutes uninterrupted.

BIDEN: Under this President, we become weaker, sicker, poorer, more divided and more violent. When I was Vice President, we inherited a recession. I was asked to fix

it. I did. We left him a booming economy, and he caused the recession. With regard to being weaker, the fact is that I've gone head to head with Putin and made it clear to him we're not going to take any of his stuff. He's Putin's puppy. He still refuses to even say anything to Putin about the bounty on the heads of American soldiers.

TRUMP: Your son got three and a half million dollars.

WALLACE: No, no, no!

BIDEN: By the way, my son...

WALLACE: Wait a minute. Mr. President, your campaign agreed to both sides would get two-minute answers, uninterrupted. Well, your, your side agreed to it, and why don't you observe what your campaign agreed to as a ground rule. Okay, sir?

BIDEN: He never keeps his word.

TRUMP: Can I answer. . .

WALLACE: No! That was a rhetorical question.

BIDEN: Can you add back 30 seconds?

WALLACE: Yes. You may have,

BIDEN: All right.

WALLACE: go ahead.

BIDEN: So thirdly, we're poor. The billionaires have gotten much more wealthy by a tune of over three to four hundred billion dollars more just since COVID. You in the home, you got less. You're in more trouble than you were before. In terms of being more violent. When we were in office there were 15% less violence in America than there is today. He's President of the United States. It's on his watch. And with regard to more divided, the nation, it can't stay divided. We can't be this way. And speaking of my son, the way you talk about the military, the way you talk about them being losers and being, and, and, and just being suckers. My son was in Iraq. He spent a year there. He got, he got the Bronze Star. He got the Conspicuous Service Medal. He was not a loser. He was a patriot and the people left behind, there, were heroes.

TRUMP: Really?

BIDEN: And I resent-

TRUMP: Are you talking Hunter, are you talking about Hunter.

BIDEN: I'm talking about my son, Beau Biden, you're talking about Hunter?

TRUMP: I don't know Beau. I know Hunter. Hunter got thrown out of the military. He was thrown out dishonorably discharged. . .

BIDEN: That's not true he wasn't dishonorably discharged.

TRUMP: . . .for cocaine use. And he didn't have a job until you became Vice-President. Once you became Vice-President

BIDEN: None of that is true.

TRUMP: . . . he made a fortune in Ukraine, in China, in Moscow and various other places.

BIDEN: That is simply not true.

TRUMP: He made a fortune. . .

BIDEN: My son. . . my son. . .

TRUMP: . . . and he didn't have a job.

BIDEN: My son. . . like a lot of people. Like a lot of people we know at home had a drug problem. He's overtaken it. He's, he's fixed it. He's worked on it. And I'm proud of him. I'm proud of my son.

TRUMP: But why was he given tens of millions of dollars?

WALLACE: Alright. . .

BIDEN: He wasn't given tens of millions of dollars. [crosstalk]

TRUMP: He was given tens of millions of dollars?

BIDEN: That was totally discredited.

WALLACE: President Trump. President Trump. We've already been through this.

BIDEN: Totally discredited.

WALLACE: We've bo. . . already been through this. I think the American people would rather hear about more substantial subjects.

BIDEN: So do I.

TRUMP: [unintelligible]

WALLACE: Well, as the moderator, sir, I'm going to make a judgment call here.

TRUMP: I know but when somebody gets three and a half million dollars from the Mayor of Moscow.

BIDEN: That is not true. That report is totally discredited.

TRUMP: Why did he get it?

BIDEN: Mitt Romney on that committee said it wasn't worth taxpayer's money. That report was written for political reason.

WALLACE: I'd like to talk about climate change.

BIDEN: So would I.

WALLACE: Okay. The forest fires in the West are raging now. They have burned millions of acres. They have displaced hundreds of thousands of people. When state officials there blamed the fires on climate change, Mr. President, you said, "I don't think the science knows." Over your four years, you have pulled the US out of the Paris Climate Accord. You have rolled back a number of Obama Environmental records, what do you believe about the science of climate change, and what will you do in the next four years to confront it?

TRUMP: I want crystal clean water and air. I want beautiful clean air. We have now the lowest carbon. If you look at our numbers right now, we are doing phenomenally. But I haven't destroyed our businesses. Our businesses aren't put out of commission. If you look at the Paris Accord, it was a disaster from our standpoint. And people are actually very happy about what's going on, because our businesses are doing well. As far as the fires are concerned, you need forest management. In addition to everything else, the forest floors are loaded up with trees, dead trees that are years old and they're like tinder and leaves and everything else. You drop a cigarette in there the whole forest burns down. You've got to have forest management.

WALLACE: What do you believe about the science of climate change, sir?

TRUMP: I believe that we have to do everything we can to have immaculate air, immaculate water, and do whatever else we can that's good. You know, we're planting a billion trees—the Billion Tree Project—and it's very exciting for a lot of people.

WALLACE: You believe that human pollution, gas, greenhouse gas emissions contributes to the global warming of this planet?

TRUMP: I think a lot of things do, but I think to an extent, yes. I think to an extent, yes. But I also think we have to do better management of our forests. Every year I get the call. California's burning, California's burning. If that was cleaned, if that were, if you had forest management, good forest management, you wouldn't be getting those calls. You know, in Europe, they live their forest cities. They call forest cities. They maintain their forest. They manage their forest. I was with the head of a major country, it's a forest city. He said, "Sir, we have trees that are far more, they ignite much easier than California. There shouldn't be that problem." I spoke with the

Governor about it. I'm getting along very well with the governor. But I said, "At some point you can't every year have hundreds of thousands of acres of land just burned to the ground."

WALLACE: But sir. . .

TRUMP: That's burning down because of a lack of management.

WALLACE: But sir, if you believe in the science of climate change, why have you rolled back the Obama Clean Power Plan which limited carbon emissions in power plants? Why have you relaxed...?

TRUMP: Because it was driving energy prices through the sky.

WALLACE: Why have you relaxed fuel economy standards that are going to create more pollution from cars and trucks?

TRUMP: Well, not really because what's happening is the car is much less expensive, and it's a much safer car, and you're talking about a tiny difference. And then what would happen because of the cost of the car you would have at least double and triple the number of cars purchased. We have the old slugs out there that are 10, 12 years old. If you did that, the car would be safer. It would be much cheaper by \$3,500.

WALLACE: But in the case of California they have simply ignored your rollback.

TRUMP: No, but you would take a lot of cars off the market because people would be able to afford a car. Now, so, and by the way, we're going to see how that turns out. But a lot of people agree with me, many people. The car has gotten so expensive because they have computers all over the place for an extra little bit of gasoline.

WALLACE: OK. . .

TRUMP: And I'm okay with electric cars too. I think I'm all for electric cars. I've given big incentives for electric cars but what they've done in California is just crazy.

WALLACE: All right, Vice President Biden. I'd like you to respond to the president's climate change record, but I also want to ask you about a concern. You propose \$2 trillion in green jobs. You talk about new limits, not abolishing, but new limits on fracking. Ending the use of fossil fuels to generate electricity by 2035, and zero net emission of greenhouse gases by 2050. The president says a lot of these things would tank the economy and cost millions of jobs.

BIDEN: He's absolutely wrong, number one. Number two, if in fact, when, during our Administration in the Recovery Act, I was able, was in charge, able to bring down the cost of renewable energy to cheaper than or as cheap as coal and gas and oil. Nobody's gonna build another, uh, coal fired plant in America. No one's going to build another oil fire plant in America. They're going to move to renewable energy, number one,

Number two, we're going to make sure that we are able to take the federal fleet and turn it into a fleet that's run on, that're electric vehicles. Making sure that we can do that, we're going to put 500,000 charging stations and all of the highways that we're going to be building in the future. We're going to build a economy that in fact is going to provide for the ability us to take 4 million buildings and make sure that they in fact are weatherized in a way that in fact will –they'll emit significantly less gas and oil because the heat will not be going out.

There's so many things that we can do now to create thousands and thousands of jobs. We can get to net zero, in terms of energy production, by 2035. Not only not

costing people jobs, creating jobs. Creating millions of good-paying jobs. Not 15 bucks an hour, but prevailing wage, by having a new infrastructure that in fact, is green.

And the first thing I will do, I will rejoin the Paris Accord. I will join the Paris Accord because with us out of it, look what's happening. It's all falling apart. And talk about someone who has no, no relationship to, with foreign policy. Brazil, the rainforests of Brazil are being torn down, are being ripped down. More, more carbon is absorbed in that rainforest than every bit of carbon that's emitted in the United States. Instead of doing something about that, I would be gathering up and making sure we had the comp—countries of the world coming up with 20 billion dollars, and say, "Here's \$20 billion. Stop, stop tearing, tearing down the forest. And if you don't, then you're going to have significant economic consequences."

WALLACE: What about, what about the argument that President Trump basically says, that you have to balance environmental interests and economic interests? And he's drawn his line.

BIDEN: Well, he hadn't drawn a line. He still, for example, makes sure that we, he wants to make sure that methane's not a problem. We can, you, you can now emit more methane without it being a problem. Methane. This is a guy who says that you don't have to have mileage standards for automobiles that exist now. This is the guy who says that, well the fact is. . .

TRUMP: Not true. Not true.

BIDEN: It's all true. And here's the deal. . .

TRUMP: He's talking about the Green New Deal. And it's not 2 billion or 20 billion, as you said. It's 100 trillion dollars.

BIDEN: I'm . . . I'm . . . I'm talking about the Biden plan. . .

TRUMP: Where they want to rip down buildings. . .

WALLACE: [to Biden] Let him go for a minute, and then you can go.

TRUMP: And rebuild the building.

BIDEN: No.

TRUMP: It's the dumbest-

BIDEN: That is not, that is not. . .

TRUMP: . . . most ridiculous. . . Where airplanes are out of business. Where two car systems are out. . .

BIDEN: Not true. . .

TRUMP: . . . where they want to take out the cows too.

BIDEN: Not true.

TRUMP: You know, that's not true either, right?

BIDEN: Not true.

TRUMP: This is, this is a 100 trillion. . .

BIDEN: Simply. . . Look-

TRUMP: That's more money than our country could make in a hundred years if it were. . .

BIDEN: That is simply not the case. . .

TRUMP: It would destroy our country.

WALLACE: All right. Let me. Wait a minute, sir. I actually have studied your plan, and it includes upgrading 4 million buildings, weatherizing 2 million homes over four years, building one and a half million energy efficient homes. So the question becomes, some, the president is saying, I think, some people who support the president would say, that sounds like it's going to cost a lot of money and hurt the economy.

BIDEN: What it's going to do, it's going to create thousands and millions of jobs. Good paying jobs.

TRUMP: Hundred trillion dollars.

WALLACE: Let him finish, sir.

BIDEN: He doesn't know how to do that.

TRUMP: 100 trillion dollars.

BIDEN: The fact is, it's going to create millions of good-paying jobs. And these tax incentives to people, for people to weatherize, which he wants to get, get rid of. It's going to make the economy much safer. Look how much we're paying now to

deal with the hurricanes, with, deal with. . . By the way, he has an answer for hurricanes. He said, maybe we should drop a nuclear weapon on them, and they may go away.

TRUMP: I never said that at all.

BIDEN: Yeah, you did say that.

TRUMP: They made it up.

BIDEN: And here's the deal. . .

TRUMP: You make up a lot.

BIDEN: . . . we're going to be in a position where we can create hard, hard, good jobs by making sure the environment is clean, and we all are in better shape. We spend billions of dollars now, billions of dollars, on floods, hurricanes, rising seas. We're in real trouble. Look what's happened just in the Midwest with these storms that come through and wipe out entire sections and counties in Iowa. They didn't happen before. They're because of global warming. We make up 15% of the world's problem. We in fact, but the rest of the world, we've got to get them to come along. That's why we have to get back into, back into the Paris Accord.

WALLACE: All right, gentlemen. . .

TRUMP: Wait a minute, Chris. So why didn't he do it for 47 years? You were Vice-President?

BIDEN: For 47?

TRUMP: So why didn't you get the world—China sends up real dirt into the air. Russia does. India does. They all do. We're supposed to be good. And by the way, he made a couple of statements. The Green New Deal is a hundred trillion dollars. . .

BIDEN: That is not my plan.

TRUMP: . . .not 20 billion. . . .

BIDEN: The Green New Deal is not my plan. . .

TRUMP: . . . You want to rebuild every building.

BIDEN: . . . If you knew anything about. . .

TRUMP: Well, you want to rebuild everything

BIDEN: If he knew anything about. . .

WALLACE: Gentlemen. . . Gentlemen. . .

TRUMP: He made a statement about the military. He said I said something about the military. He and his friends made it up, and then they went with it. I never said it.

WALLACE: Okay.

BIDEN: That is not true.

TRUMP: What he did is he said. . .

WALLACE: Okay, we're going to get into a new segment. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Vice President. . .

TRUMP: . . .is he called the military stupid bastards.

BIDEN: I did not say that.

TRUMP: He said it on tape. . . [crosstalk]

BIDEN: Not true.

TRUMP: . . .He said "stupid bastards."

WALLACE: Sir. [crosstalk] Stop.

BIDEN: Play it.

TRUMP: I would never say that.

BIDEN: Play it.

WALLACE: Go ahead.

TRUMP: You're on tape.

WALLACE: Mr. Vice President answered his final question.

BIDEN: The final question is, I can't remember which of all his rantings was the final question.

WALLACE: [laughing] I'm having a little trouble myself, but...

BIDEN: Yeah.

WALLACE: And about the economy and about this question of what it's going to cost.

BIDEN: The economy. . .

WALLACE: The Green New Deal and the idea of what your environmental changes will do.

BIDEN: The Green New Deal will pay for itself as we move forward. We're not going to build plants that, in fact, are great polluting plants, we're gonna build. . .

WALLACE: So, do you support the Green New Deal?

BIDEN: Pardon me?

WALLACE: Do you support the . . .

BIDEN: No, I don't support the Green New Deal.

TRUMP: Oh, you don't? Oh, well, that's a big statement.

BIDEN: I support . . .

TRUMP: You just lost the radical left. It's done. Oh you don't?

BIDEN: I support the Biden plan that I put forward.

WALLACE: Okay.

BIDEN: The Biden plan, which is different than what he calls “The Radical Green New Deal.”

WALLACE: All right, gentlemen, final segment: Election integrity. As we meet tonight, millions of Americans are receiving mail-in ballots or going to vote early. How confident should we be that this will be a fair election, and what are you prepared to do over the next five plus weeks? Because it will not only be to election day, but also counting some ballots—mail-in ballots—after election day. What are you prepared to do to reassure the American people that the next president will be the legitimate winner of this election. In this final segment, Mr. Vice President, you go first.

BIDEN: Prepare to let people vote. They should go to [iwillvote.com](https://www.iwillvote.com). Decide how they’re going to vote, when they’re going to vote, and what means by which they’re going to vote. His own Homeland Security director, and as well as the FBI director, says that there is no evidence at all that mail-in ballots are a source of being manipulated and cheating. They said that. The fact is that there are going to be millions of people because of COVID that are going to be voting by mail-in ballots like he does, by the way. He sits behind the Resolute Desk and sends his ballot to Florida. Number one.

Number two, we’re going to make sure that those people who want to vote in person are able to vote because there are enough poll watchers are there to make sure they can socially distance. The polls are open on time, and the polls stay open until the votes are counted. And this is all about trying to dissuade people from voting because he’s trying to conf—to scare people into thinking that it’s not going to be legitimate.

Show up and vote. You will determine the outcome of this election. Vote, vote, vote. If you're able to vote early in your state, vote early. If you're able to vote in person, vote in person. Vote whatever way is the best way for you. Because you will—he cannot stop you from being able to determine the outcome of this election. And in terms of whether or not, when the votes are counted and they're all counted, that will be accepted. If I win, that will be accepted. If I lose, that'll be accepted. But by the way, if in fact he says, he's not sure what he's going to accept. Well, let me tell you something, it doesn't matter, because if we get the votes, it's going to be all over. He's gonna go. He can't stay in power. It won't happen. It won't happen. So vote. Just make sure you understand, you have it in your control to determine what this country is gonna look like the next four years. Is it going to change, or are you going to get four more years of these lies?

WALLACE: Mr. President, two minutes.

TRUMP: So when I listen to Joe talking about a transition, there has been no transition from when I won. I won that election. And if you look at crooked Hillary Clinton, if you look at all of the different people, there was no transition, because they came after me trying to do a coup. They came after me spying on my campaign. They started from the day I won, and even before I won. From the day I came down the escalator with our first lady, they were a disaster. They were a disgrace to our country, and we've caught 'em. We've caught 'em all. We've got it all on tape. We've caught 'em all. And by the way, you gave the idea for the Logan Act against General Flynn. You better take a look at that, because we caught you in a sense, and President Obama was sitting in the office.

He knew about it too. So don't tell me about a free transition. As far as the ballots are concerned, it's a disaster. A solicited ballot, okay, solicited, is okay. You're soliciting. You're asking. They send it back. You send it back. I did that. If you have

an unsolicited—they're sending millions of ballots all over the country. There's fraud. They found 'em in creeks. They found some, with the name Trump, just happened to have the name Trump, just the other day in a wastepaper basket. They're being sent all over the place. They sent two in a Democrat area. They sent out a thousand ballots. Everybody got two ballots. This is going to be a fraud like you've never seen. The other thing, it's nice. On November 3rd, you're watching, and you see who won the election. And I think we're going to do well because people are really happy with the job we've done.

But you know what? We won't know. We might not know for months because these ballots are going to be all over. Take a look at what happened in Manhattan. Take a look at what happened in New Jersey. Take a look at what happened in Virginia and other places. They're not losing 2%, 1%, which by the way is too much. An election could be won or lost with that. They're losing 30 and 40%. It's a fraud, and it's a shame. And can you imagine where they say, uh, "You have to have your ballot in by November 10th." November 10th. That means, that's seven days after the election, in theory, should've been announced.

WALLACE: Okay

TRUMP: We have major states with that. . .

WALLACE: Sir. Time. . .

TRUMP: ... all run by Democrats-

WALLACE: Sir, two minutes is two minutes.

TRUMP: All run by Democrats.

WALLACE: President Trump. . . I, I, . . .

TRUMP: It's a rigged election.

WALLACE: You're going to be able to continue. You have been charging for months that mail-in balloting is going to be a disaster. You say it's rigged, that it's going to lead to fraud. But in 2018, in the last midterm election, 31 million people voted mail-in voting. That was a quarter, more than a quarter of all the voters that year, cast their ballots by mail. Now that millions of mail-in ballots have gone out, what are you going to do about it? And are you counting on the Supreme Court, including a Justice Barrett, to settle any dispute?

TRUMP: Yeah. I think I'm counting on them to look at the ballots, definitely. I don't think—I hope we don't need them, in terms of the election itself. But for the ballots, I think so, because what's happening is incredible. I just heard, I read today where at least 1% of the ballots for 2016 were invalidated. They take 'em. We don't like 'em. We don't like 'em. They throw 'em out. . .

WALLACE: But what are you going to do about it-

TRUMP: . . . left and right.

WALLACE: There are millions of ballots going out right now. What are you going to do. . .

TRUMP: What you do is you go and vote. You do a solicited ballot, and that's okay. . .

WALLACE: No. No. I know your complaint. I'm asking you about the fact that millions of people have received. . .

TRUMP: You go and vote. You go and vote. . .

WALLACE: No. But what I'm saying is . . .

TRUMP: . . . like they used to in the old. . .

WALLACE: . . . what are you going to do about the fact that millions of people. . .

TRUMP: You either do, Chris, a solicited ballot, where you're sending it in, they're sending it back and you're sending. They have mailmen with lots of it. Did you see what's going on? Take a look at West Virginia, mailman selling the ballots. They're being sold. They're being dumped in rivers. This is a horrible thing for our country.

BIDEN: There is no—there is no evidence of that. . .

TRUMP: This is not going to end well.

BIDEN: There is no evidence of that. . .

TRUMP: This is not going to end well.

WALLACE: Okay. Vice President Biden, in fact, go ahead, sir-

BIDEN: Five states have had mail-in ballots for the last decade or more. Five, including two Republican states. And you don't have to solicit the ballot. It's sent to you. It's sent to your home. What we're saying is, they're saying is that it has to be a postmark by the time, by election day. If it doesn't get in until the seventh, eighth, ninth, it still should be counted. He's just afraid of counting the votes because. . .

TRUMP: You're wrong. You're wrong. I love counting the votes. . .

BIDEN: . . . he knows what the outcome will be.

WALLACE: I want to continue with you on this, Vice President Biden. . .

TRUMP: Chris, he's so wrong when he makes a statement like that-

WALLACE: No. Excuse me. Vice President Biden, the biggest problem, in fact, over the years with mail-in voting has not been fraud, historically. It has been that sizable numbers, sometimes hundreds of thousands of ballots are thrown out because they have not been properly filled out, or there is some other irregularity,. . .

TRUMP: That could be fraud.

WALLACE: . . .or they missed the deadline. So the question I have is, are you concerned that the Supreme Court with a Justice Barrett will settle any dispute?

BIDEN: I am concerned that any court would settle this, because here's the deal. When you file—when you get a ballot and you fill it out, you're supposed to have an affidavit. If you didn't know, you have someone say that, this is me. You should be able to, if in fact you can verify that's you when, before the ballot is thrown out, that's sufficient to be able to count the ballot because someone made a mistake and not dotting the correct i. Who they voted for, testify, say who they voted for, say it's you. That is totally legitimate.

WALLACE: All right.

TRUMP: Excuse me, Chris, when you have eighty million ballots. . .

WALLACE: No. No. No. I have a final [crosstalk].

TRUMP: . . . sent in and swamping the system. . .

WALLACE: Gentlemen, I have a final question . . .

TRUMP: You know it can't be done. You know it can't, and already, there's been fraud deception and . . .

BIDEN: Mail service delivers 185 million pieces of mail a day. . .

TRUMP: . . . Eighty million ballots.

WALLACE: We can keep talking. In eight states, election workers are prohibited, currently by law, eight states, from even beginning to process ballots, even take them out of the envelopes and flatten them until election day. That means that it's likely, because there's going to be a huge increase in mail-in balloting, that we are not going to know on election night who the winner is, that it could be days. It could be weeks. .

TRUMP: Could be months.

WALLACE: . . . until we find out who the new president is. So, I—first for you, sir. Finally, for the Vice-President, and I hope neither of you will interrupt the other. Will you urge your supporters to stay calm during this extended period, not to engage in any civil unrest? And will you pledge tonight that you will not declare victory until the election has been independently certified? President Trump, you go first.

TRUMP: I'm urging my supporters to go into the polls and watch very carefully, because that's what has to happen. I am urging them to do it. As you know, today there was a big problem. In Philadelphia, they went in to watch. They're called poll watchers, a very safe, very nice thing. They were thrown out. They weren't allowed to watch. You know why? Because bad things happen in Philadelphia. Bad things. And I am urging, I am urging my people. I hope it's going to be a fair election. If it's a fair election. . .

WALLACE: You're urging them what?

TRUMP: . . . I am 100% on board. But if I see tens of thousands of ballots being manipulated, I can't go along with that. And I'll tell you what. . .

WALLACE: What does that mean, not go along. . .

TRUMP: . . . from a common sense. . .

WALLACE: . . .does that mean you're going to tell your people . . .

TRUMP: I'll tell you what it means. . .

WALLACE: ... to take to the streets?

TRUMP: It means you have a fraudulent election. You're sending out 80 million ballots. . .

WALLACE: And what would you do about that?

TRUMP: They're not equipped. These people aren't equipped to handle it, number one. Number two, they cheat. They cheat. Hey, they found ballots in a wastepaper

basket three days ago, and they all had the name military ballots. They were military. They all had the name Trump on them.

WALLACE: Vice President Biden-

TRUMP: You think that's good?

WALLACE: Vice President Biden, final question for you. Will you urge your supporters to stay calm while the vote is counted? And will you pledge not to declare victory until the election is independently certified?

BIDEN: Yes. And here's the deal. We count the ballots, as you pointed out. Some of these ballots in some states can't even be opened until election day. And if there's thousands of ballots, it's going to take time to do it. And by the way, our military—they've been voting by ballots for since the end of the Civil War, in effect. And that's, and that's what's going to happen. Why was it not, why is it for them, somehow not fraudulent. It's the same process. It's honest. No one has established at all that there is fraud related to mail-in ballots, that the, somehow it's a fraudulent process.

TRUMP: It's already been established. Take a look at Carolyn Maloney's race. . .

WALLACE: I asked you. You had an opportunity to respond [crosstalk].

TRUMP: Look at Carolyn Maloney's race. They have no idea what happened. . .

WALLACE: Go ahead. Vice President Biden, go ahead.

BIDEN: He has no idea what he's talking about. Here's the deal. The fact is, I will accept it, and he will too. You know why? Because once the winner is declared after

all the ballots are counted, all the votes are counted, that'll be the end of it. That'll be the end of it. And if it's me, in fact, fine. If it's not me, I'll support the outcome. And I'll be a president, not just for the Democrats. I'll be a president for Democrats and Republicans. And this guy if in fact. . .

TRUMP: I want to see an honest ballot count. . .

WALLACE: Gentlemen, just say that's the end of it [crosstalk]. This is the end of this debate-

TRUMP: I want to see an honest ballot count.

WALLACE: We're going to leave it there. . .

TRUMP: And I think he does too. . .

WALLACE: ... to be continued in more debates as we go on. President Trump, Vice President Biden, it's been an interesting hour and a half. I want to thank you both for participating in the first of three debates that you have agreed to engage in. We want to thank Case Western Reserve University and the Cleveland Clinic for hosting this event. The next debate, sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates, will be one week from tomorrow, October 7th, at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. The two Vice-Presidential nominees, Vice President Mike Pence and Senator Kamala Harris will debate at 9:00 PM Eastern that night. We hope you watch. Until then, thank you, and good night.

SUMMARY

This study explores the use of communication strategies and tactics in political discourse in American politics based on the televised presidential debates of 1960 and 2020.

During our research, we have defined the concept of political discourse. In spite of its multidimensional nature and the array of interpretations that exists, we have come to the conclusion that political discourse is the correlation of language, politics, ideology, and manipulation. Political discourse is an environment for expressing political ideas and influencing public with the help of political language, which is an integral constituent of political events. The emergence of such a new communicative environment enables political actors to perform their political roles using specific language signs in a situation of appropriate communication.

The study uncovers several defining characteristics of political discourse, including its extralinguistic nature, interactivity, topic selection linked to a political reality, emotionality and theatricality. The extralinguistic nature of political discourse is stipulated by external factors such as communicative activity, status, the role of participants and their goals. Interactivity is crucial, as it requires both an addresser's intention and an addressee's interpretation to understand the message conveyed. Politicians select topics that assert their interests, which is another feature of political discourse. Additionally, the level of emotional language used in political discourse can impact its effectiveness. Finally, theatricality has emerged as a key characteristic of political discourse in recent years, with political actors using dramatic and performative techniques to engage and persuade the audience.

In regard to the classification of political discourse, various perspectives exist in Ukrainian and foreign academic arenas. Some approaches base their discourse typology on the form, function of the addresser, goal and sphere of functioning. We find this classification to be the most multifaceted and versatile. We have focused on the oral form of political discourse that encompasses political speeches, appeals to public and official statements as monologue types of oral political discourse and interviews, press conferences and debates as dialogue ones.

In our research of political discourse, we have observed that political language genres are in a state of constant development and modification nowadays. The goal or motive of political language varies, as does its function, influencing the genre type as a result. Within our research, we have paid attention to the classification that outlines the following language genres of political discourse: presentation and image, informative, ritual, agitation, and agonally-argued. Image presentation language genres are a crucial set of texts necessary for the addresser's involvement in political activities, which include slogans, programmes, and biographies. Ritual language genres in political discourse are linked to heightened phatic characteristics and are present during political rituals that involve verbal elements such as speeches or public appearances. Agitation language genres are predominantly used during election campaigns to motivate voters to support a political entity and are conveyed through forms such as slogans, political speeches and leaflets. Agonally-argued language genres are marked by a high emotive degree and expressiveness and are widely employed in presidential election debates, election speeches and electoral meetings. Having analysed the goal and functioning of the agitation and agonally-argued language genres, we have concluded that the televised presidential debate in American political discourse encompasses traits of both aforementioned types. The televised election debate is typically a blend of pre-planned, well-delivered arguments and spontaneous arguments arising from the need to adapt to the interactive nature of the event. The genre is characterized by persuasiveness and argumentation, as well as communicative rivalry and agony, which have become increasingly prevalent in recent decades.

We have analysed the concepts of communication strategy and tactic. In political discourse, communication is composed of specific techniques to achieve communicative intentions by political actors. Communication strategy and tactics are considered to be the subject of linguistic research in political discourse. We have summarised that a communication strategy in politics and political discourse refers to a particular set of speech acts designed to achieve a specific goal of political activity. This set of actions is a framework to accomplish the addresser's communicative

intention, which includes employing different linguistic tools to attain the desired outcome or influence the audience. The implementation of speech strategies can be fulfilled only with a help of certain communication or speech tactics. Communication strategies refer to more general and abstract approaches that are evident in the overall communication process. On the other hand, tactics are specific rhetorical tools, techniques, and lines of speech behaviour that are used locally within one or another communication strategy.

Three main communication strategies that play a crucial role in obtaining voters' support and maintaining power during an electoral campaign, specifically during a presidential debate, have been identified as: the strategy of positive self-representation, the strategy of opponent discredit, and the strategy of theatricality. The positive self-representation strategy aims to create a positive image of oneself using various tactics such as identification (relating oneself to an authority figure), positive image creation, self-explanation, and self-justification. The strategy that stands in opposition to the aforementioned one is the opponent discredit strategy. It can have different forms of implementation such as attacking a political opponent, the tactic of accusation and the tactic of offence (humiliation and ridicule of the opposition), the tactic of exposure, etc. The theatricality strategy is implemented to make the performance of a presidential candidate efficient and for it to have a long-lasting influence on the potential voters. The choice of tactics used within a communication strategy is influenced by the political context and the linguistic style of the politicians involved. However, it is worth noting that although politicians use a variety of communication strategies, there are always some strategies that prevail in their rhetoric.

The examination of communication strategies employed in two different political epochs - 1960 and 2020 - has uncovered how political candidates stick to particular communication strategies and how the choice of such strategies has evolved over the course of a century. The 1960 US presidential campaign was a significant event for various reasons, one being the first televised general election debates between the major-party candidates. The initial debate between Nixon and Kennedy drew a

record-breaking 70 million viewers, making it the most-watched television event up to that point. The introduction of a new medium for presidential debates is considered a crucial moment in the 1960 campaign. While some attribute Kennedy's victory to his charismatic televised image, our analysis suggests that JFK's success was due to a combination of factors, including his usage of communication strategies and tactics.

Kennedy delivered an inspiring speech aimed at urging the nation to work towards becoming a better country. In contrast, Nixon's didactic speaking style, although logical and reasonable, did not immediately captivate the audience's attention. The Democratic candidate effectively implemented dramaturgy and theatricality to enthrall viewers. Nixon's objective was to build on the policies of the Eisenhower Administration by adopting a conservative approach to protecting America against Communism and promoting economic growth. In contrast, Kennedy presented a well-defined vision for America's future, highlighting the challenges facing the country, such as race and civil rights issues, poverty, economic development, the Cold War and Communism.

When analysing the communication strategies of the presidential candidates, the first noticeable difference lies in the self-representation strategies. Richard Nixon heavily relied on his experience and association with the Eisenhower Administration to create a positive image of himself. On the other hand, John Kennedy opened with a visionary statement outlining his goals for America and appealed to an ordinary American through stories and personal examples of his understanding of the country's issues.

Regarding the opponent-discredit strategy, Richard Nixon's reluctance to voice personal allegations and accusations may be perceived as a mature and well-considered move. In contrast, John Kennedy's emotionally charged and explicit comments made him appear more concerned and occupied with the future of the United States. While Senator Kennedy felt confident criticising the Republican Party and his opponent, Nixon appeared to lack such an opportunity. The main focus of Nixon's opponent-discredit strategy was to save face and refute his rival's accusations.

Concerning the theatricality strategy, we observed that John Kennedy and Richard Nixon employed comparable tactics such as cooperation, prompting, provocation, and warning. However, their means and techniques of implementing these tactics differed, with the primary contrast being the level of directness and explicitness employed. Kennedy's language was more forthright and candid, whereas Nixon's tended to be more impersonal and oblique.

Our analysis of the 2020 presidential debate has revealed significant changes in the nature of political discourse over the past century. While analysing the 2020 presidential debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden, it is clear that their communication styles had a significant impact on their perceived images and voter appeal. Trump employed an attacking, aggressive communication style that often criticised U.S. democracy and institutions using incendiary language. Despite its unorthodox nature, this strategy resonated with a wide audience, who felt that Trump represented the ordinary people and condemned the elite.

During the debate, Trump mainly used the opponent discredit strategy, insulting and interrupting his opponent. However, this approach failed to captivate the audience and ignored their interests. Trump also used the positive image creation strategy, namely self-praise techniques and notes of a paranoid mood warning his supporters of a "rigged" election.

In contrast, Joe Biden adopted a more respectful, well-mannered, and conventional approach to his opponent. His communication style emphasised democratic ethos, unity, and concord among Americans. Biden's extensive political experience set him apart from his opponent. His communication strategies were mainly focused on theatricality to gain support from the electorate.

In times of crisis, Biden's compassionate and collaborative communication style inspires more trust and hope than Trump's coercive and aggressive approach. Biden's focus on middle-class voters and sympathy for them helped him connect with the undecided fraction of the electorate. Trump's message had a different direction that may have influenced the election outcome.

The examination of the two presidential debates through a strategic-tactic lens sheds light on how American political discourse has evolved from positive campaigning to negative campaigning and how the nature of debates has become less focused on norms and information. This analysis offers a deep understanding of the linguistic personalities of prominent political figures such as Richard Nixon, John Kennedy, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden. By exploring their communication styles, it becomes clear how each candidate used various communication strategies and tactics to convey their message and influence the electorate. This research can be used as a foundation for future studies on the linguistic personalities or idiostyles of politicians, providing a valuable resource for researchers seeking to delve further into this topic. Overall, the study offers a unique perspective on how political communication has evolved and how candidates use language to sway public opinion.