

НАУЧНЫЕ СООБЩЕНИЯ

ПРЕДВЫБОРНОЕ ОБРАЩЕНИЕ К НАЦИИ: РИТОРИЧЕСКИЕ КАНОНЫ ИЛИ ИХ ОТСУТСТВИЕ?

И.А. Широких

Ключевые слова: публичное выступление, предвыборное обращение к нации, структурный аспект выступления, составляющие части обращения, озвучивать проблемы, вызвать отклик у аудитории.

Keywords: public oratory, election address, structural aspect of the speech, constituents of the address, voice problems, resonate with the audience.

DOI 10.14258/filichel(2020)2-10

Political communication is a complicated but an integral part of the world of policy. Public oratory has been in the focus of the American project from the time of its founders. Every American president is punctuated with set-piece speeches, and historical turning points of this country have been marked by historic speaking. All genres of political discourse are described widely: political speeches in public (inaugural address, in particular), slogans, booklets, leaflets [Shirokikh, 2018]. As for election-campaign address, made by people running for presidency, it seems not to be studied enough by Russian linguists, rhetoric and communication experts. Moreover, foreign studies in political rhetoric are numerous [Johnson, Leith, Viser, URL]. But the authors do not dwell upon the structures of addresses, the necessity or the absence to implement rhetorical canons. These facts predetermine the novelty and topicality of this research.

The object under study is a complex linguistic and rhetorical phenomenon – election-campaign address. The subject matter of the research is rhetorical peculiarities of Presidential Announcements, delivered by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during the US presidency election campaign in 2016. Both candidates do not change the content of their speech, while addressing to people of different states. The aim of the article is to describe and to compare rhetoric strategies the candidates resort to in their addresses. The main objective of the research is to analyze the structural aspect of the speeches. Another objective is to define whether the speaker follows rhetoric canons or avoids them. The methods used while studying these factors are the analysis of text structures, the analysis of address components from the point of view of linguistic rhetoric, and the comparative analysis of rhetoric strategies used by both people running for Presidency.

According to the antique rhetoric, any speech should include four or five parts, i.e. introduction, exposition, argument, conclusion and, probably, objection [Mihal'skaya, 2014]. The main parts of the speech are considered to be: introduction, the narrative body and the conclusion. The analysis of D. Trump's address makes it possible to state that he does not follow the pattern mentioned above. In any introduction, a speaker tries to achieve a definite goal – to resonate with the audience. Mr. Trump manages to do it,

using short simple sentences *So nice, thank you very much... That's really nice. It's great to be at Trump Tower... It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York.*

being thankful to people present in Trump Tower *...Thank you... And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this.*

making a joke about hot weather and a broken air-conditioner *...They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.*

Coming back to the principles of a public speech composition, one may say that introduction should pronounce the topic and the main thesis of the address. But it is next to impossible to define the topic and the thesis of Trump's introductory part, as well as the exposition and the argument of his address. Upon greeting the audience, he goes on to speak about the international policy of the USA, general problems of the country and the country's enemies. «The plain structure, the plain style he has» [Viser, URL]. The main topic of D. Trump's speech is to defend the state from its foreign enemies.

Our country is in serious trouble... The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems... It's coming from all over South and

Latin America, and it's coming probably – probably – from the Middle East... Because we have no protection and we have no competence.

Having spoken about the US international policy, D. Trump proceeds to the home affairs, to the program Obamacare, to be exact. And here he punctuates his speech with repetition. It hammers the point home and it is also a delaying tactic, giving him time to select his next choice of words. Though, he uses a «pretty small working vocabulary» [Leith, URL].

We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare...

His next step is to oppose the policy of the predecessor to his own agenda. D. Trump criticizes B. Obama's activity and actions, then he starts describing his own ideas which are in fact his election agenda. Being clever enough, he does not use the pronoun *I* (1st person, singular) he uses *we* and *our* (1st person, plural), the so-called identification formula, to become a part of the audience.

<...> (Obama) He's been a negative force. He wasn't a cheerleader; he was the opposite... So ladies and gentlemen... we are going to make our country great again <...> Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people...

To make a public address sound logical, a speaker as a rule uses some «verbal bridges», connectors. As for Donald Trump, he does not use any connectors. To change the topic of his address he resorts to some anecdotes from his own life that sound exciting and relaxing.

So, here's a couple of stories happened recently...

These short stories are a good tool to gain trust of people and then to draw their attention to the actions he is going to undertake. This strategy adds more persuasive effect to his words.

<...> I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say. «Please reconsider», I'll say no. He'll say, «Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico».

That's it.

At the end of the main part of the address (or the so-called body) D. Trump describes his own life, his success, trying to persuade the American people that it is he who will save the United States and make this country powerful again.

I would build a great wall, and nobody build walls better than me, believe me... Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.

To finish the address, D. Trump outlines numerous problems that the country faces. His final part (conclusion) sounds pessimistic. But it

resonates with the audience and this is where Donald Trump excels: emotions.

Sadly, the American dream is dead. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.

The idea of American Dream is so close to any citizen of the USA. D. Trump claims to be the person who is able to revive this idea, to bring it back and to make it true again. He uses the aspirational language of the American Dream. Thus, the conclusion seems to be simple, understandable, so American and promising.

A modern approach to the constituents of a public speech states: «An address follows the principle of rhetoric in its structure 5+(-)2. It cannot contain fewer than 3 parts (introduction – the narrative body – the conclusion) or more than 7 constituents (narrative hook – initial review – introduction – connection – narrative body – development of the idea – the end)» [Taranov, 2002, с. 46]. Thus, analyzing the composition of the election address of Hillary Clinton, it is essential to keep in mind the number and the order of its parts. Moreover, H. Clinton's speech abounds in stylistic devices. Anaphoric repetition in its introductory part makes her speech more emotional, persuasive and logical.

To be in New York with my family, with so many friends, including many New Yorkers who gave me the honor of serving them in the Senate for eight years. To be right across the water from the headquarters of the United Nations, where I represented our country many times. To be here in this beautiful park dedicated to Franklin Roosevelt's enduring vision of America, the nation we want to be.

Then, she describes the events, which date back to some important moments in the history of the country, to former American presidents.

You know, President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms are a testament to our nation's unmatched aspirations and a reminder of our unfinished work at home and abroad. His legacy lifted up a nation and inspired presidents who followed. One is the man I served as Secretary of State, Barack Obama, and another is my husband, Bill Clinton.

And to add some personal touch to the history, she speaks about her ancestors. H. Clinton has an ability to shift register mid-speech though logically enough – to say something historic-sounding but then to humanize it with a personal story.

President Roosevelt called on every American to do his or her part, and every American answered... It's what kept my grandfather going to work in the same Scranton lace mill every day for 50 years. It's what led my father to believe that if he scrimped and saved, his small business

printing drapery fabric in Chicago could provide us with a middle-class life. And it did.

After the transition passage of her address, which is devoted to national problems, H. Clinton voices the main thesis «Successful nation means a successful country».

America can't succeed unless you succeed. That is why I am running for President of the United States.

And to gain success for the nation, she defines the goals to achieve. Her aims are presented by simple short sentences with similar structures and again anaphoric repetition.

For the successful and the struggling. For the innovators and inventors. For those breaking barriers in technology and discovering cures for diseases. For the factory workers and food servers who stand on their feet all day. For the nurses who work the night shift.

Clinton's introduction is logical and easy to understand. Every statement is clear-cut and connected to the previous one. This lady, running for President, follows the strategy «demonstration of desires» [Johnson, URL]. She voices the problems, which worry people of the country, the whole nation. At the same time, she compares her agenda to D. Trump's. Hillary Clinton expresses dissatisfaction with the Republican Party, but not with Donald Trump as a person. She cannot afford to criticize him. Again, her election address intermits with stories of her own life. On the one hand, this rhetoric trick makes her closer to the audience. On the other hand, the narration of her biographical facts paves the way to understanding why she participates in that political rally.

<...> And later, as a law student, I advocated for Congress to require better working and living conditions for farm workers whose children deserved better opportunities <...> As a leader of the Legal Services Corporation, I defended the right of poor people to have a lawyer<...> As Senator, I had the honor of representing brave firefighters, police officers, EMTs, construction workers, and volunteers who ran toward danger on 9/11 and stayed there, becoming sick themselves...

The body of narration in H. Clinton's address is represented by Four Fights [2016 Presidential Policy Agenda as «Four Fights», URL].

If you'll give me the chance, I'll wage and win Four Fights for you.

The First Fight is to strengthen the American economy, whose profit should be available to every citizen of the USA. To win this fight, H. Clinton offers people to act together. She uses analytical form of the Imperative Mood, the construction *Let's*.

<...> Let's make college affordable and available to all <...> and lift the crushing burden of student debt. Let's provide lifelong learning for

workers to gain or improve skills the economy requires, setting up many more Americans for success.

The Second Fight is to make American families strong. The essence of this idea is to show the importance of family values, the importance of healthy, well-educated and ambitious children who represent the next generation. Only then, the country will be strong, prosperous and powerful.

Now, the second fight is to strengthen America's families, because when our families are strong, America is strong.

The Third Fight is to protect the USA from foreign enemies. She does not expand on this problem much. But defining it as a Fight, H. Clinton realizes the importance of robust foreign policy for the country.

No other country is better equipped to meet traditional threats from countries like Russia, North Korea, and Iran – and to deal with the rise of new powers like China. No other country is better prepared to meet emerging threats from cyber-attacks, transnational terror networks like ISIS and diseases that spread across ocean and continents. As your president, I'll do whatever it takes to keep Americans safe.

And the Fourth Fight is to build an efficient political system in the USA. Again, she calls upon all Americans to do it together.

We need a political system that produces results by solving problems that hold us back, not one overwhelmed by extreme partisanship and inflexibility.

The final part of the speech (or conclusion) is rather eloquent: Hillary Clinton tries to persuade people that their country is the place where any person can achieve much, even become President.

We can build an economy where hard work is rewarded. We can strengthen our families. We can defend our country and increase our opportunities all over the world. And we can renew the promise of our democracy <...> America where a father can tell his daughter: yes, you can be anything you want to be. Even President of the United States.

The comparative analysis of rhetorical aspects of the Presidential Announcements, delivered by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, makes it possible to come to the following conclusions.

H. Clinton's address is composed according to the classical structure of a public speech. She uses a five-part model - introduction – connection – narrative body – development of the idea – the conclusion (the end). She gives the main thesis and provides arguments throughout the whole address. Speaking about Donald Trump's speech, one can hardly identify certain constituents of his speech. He seems to have some kind of introduction (his greeting the audience), a huge narration body and

a conclusion (American Dream). The question is: does he follow any structure at all?

Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton resort to similar topics: home and foreign policy of the state, protection of the country, stories from their own lives, but they present the subjects in different ways. He appeals to emotions of the audience, she offers definite actions. His speech appears trustworthy and passionate, rather than scrutinized and autocued by numerous advisers.

Both of them manage to create persuasive messages but use different tools. D. Trump is illogical but more emotional. H. Clinton is too logical but «people mistrust smooth talkers» [Viser, URL]. He trails into incoherence, she sounds dignified and recognizably already presidential. Donald Trump uses rhetorical linguistic devices to tap into the raw emotions of potential voters – and it seems to work. The results of the latest presidential elections in the USA proved this statement.

The results of this research are important to anyone who deals with public oratory. According to O.V. Nikitin, rhetoric is a science of the future [Nikitin, 2016]. This art, the art of verbal persuasion, is essential nowadays. Presidential election campaigns are coming in Russia and the USA soon. It means that it is time to resume the subject of rhetoric strategies used in Presidential Policy Agenda.

Литература

- Михальская А.К. Практическая риторика и ее теоретические основания. М., 2014.
- Никитин О.В. Риторика – это наука будущего // Филология и человек. Барнаул, 2016. № 4.
- Таранов П.С. Искусство риторики. Универсальное пособие для умения говорить красиво и убедительно. М., 2002.
- Широких И.А. Инаугурационная речь как образчик публичного политического выступления // Языки и литература в поликультурном пространстве. Барнаул, 2018.
- 2016 Presidential Policy Agenda as «Four Fights» [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues>
- Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>
- Johnson E. Hillary Clinton Can't Give a Decent Speech. Does It Matter? // National Review. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/419818/hillaryclinton-cant-give-decent-speech-does-it-matter-eliana-johnson>
- Leith S. You Talkin' To Me?: Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/talking-to-me-aristotle-obama-review>
- Viser M. For Presidential Hopefuls, Simpler Language Resonates. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2015/10/20/donald-trump-and-ben-carson-speak-grade-school-level-that-today-voters-can-quickly-grasp/LUCBY6uwQAXiLvXbVTSUN/story.html>

References

Mihal'skaya A.K. *Prakticheskaya ritorika i eyo teoreticheskie osnovaniya* [Practical Rhetoric and its Theoretical Basis]. Moscow, 2014.

Nikitin O.V. *Ritorika – nauka budushchego* [Rhetoric is a Science of the Future]. *Filologiya i chelovek* [Philology & Human]. Barnaul, 2016. No. 4.

Taranov P.S. *Iskusstvo ritoriki. Universal'noe posobie dlya umeniya govorit' krasivo i ubeditel'no* [Rhetorical Art. Universal Textbook for a Skill to Speak Eloquently and Persuasive]. Moscow, 2002.

Shirokikh I.A. *Inauguracionnaya rech' kak obrazchik publichnogo politicheskogo vystupleniya* [Inaugural Address as a Specimen of Public Political Speech]. *Yazyki i literatura v polikul'turnom prostranstve* [Languages and Literature in Multicultural Context]. Barnaul, 2018.

2016 *Presidential Policy Agenda as «Four Fights»*.
URL: <http://www.hillaryclinton.com>issues>

Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech.
URL: <http://www.time.com>3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>

Johnson E. Hillary Clinton Can't Give a Decent Speech. Does It Matter? *National Review*. URL: <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/419818/hillaryclinton-cant-give-decent-speech-does-it-matter-eliana-johnson>

Leith S. *You Talkin' To Me?: Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*.
<http://www.theguardian.com>talking-to-me-aristotle-obama-review>

Viser M. *For Presidential Hopefuls, Simpler Language Resonates*. URL: <https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2015/10/20/donald-trump-and-ben-carson-speak-grade-school-level-that-today-voters-can-quickly-grasp/LUCBY6uwQAxILvvXbVTSUN/story.html>