CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A STUDY OF CONTENT, STRUCTURE, AND FORMATION FEATURES

Nikita A. Bystrov

Lomonosov Moscow State University
(Moscow, Russia)
nikbyst.notabene@yandex.ru

Abstract: This paper examines the defining characteristics of contemporary American political discourse, aiming to identify, analyze, and classify these traits in terms of content, structure, and formative features. The analysis draws upon a corpus of speeches by American politicians during the 2016 and 2020 Presidential Elections, as well as journalistic articles, to illustrate the distinctive elements of American political discourse. Understanding a nation's political discourse necessitates examining the idiosyncrasies of its political culture. Therefore, this study foregrounds the cultural underpinnings of modern American politics, exploring the interrelationships between American political discourse and the nation's political history and culture. Employing discourse analysis, linguacultural analysis, and comparative analysis, the paper delineates the characteristics of modern American politics, including societal heterogeneity, the imperative of political correctness, a pronounced degree of religiosity, an individualistic political culture, and the dramatized nature of political contention. These cultural traits manifest in four salient features of contemporary American political discourse: a syntactic orientation in speech production, the employment of nicknames and sobriquets, the fluidity of political concepts, and the contentious exchanges between the two predominant parties, which engender linguistic divergences. While some features may be present in other national discourses, the unique combination and intensity in the American context accentuate their presence. This paper contributes to political discourse studies by examining political discourse through a linguacultural lens, thereby enhancing understanding of American society and its worldview. It underscores the pivotal cultural attributes of American politics, correlates them with political discourse, and presents concrete examples from speeches of current American politicians and contemporary media, laying the groundwork for future research into American political discourse from a linguacultural standpoint.

Keywords: American political discourse studies, discourse analysis, political public speaking, linguaculturology, linguacultural analysis, political concepts, professional communication.

1. INTRODUCTION

Political language is well-known for being extremely explicit. Indeed, the more eloquent the style is, the more effective and persuasive the speech is. However, experienced politicians are used to hiding their real thoughts and intentions behind big words. Thus, political discourse, if studied properly, can provide linguists with valuable and diverse material.

As English has been adopted as a lingua franca for world politics and diplomacy, English-speaking political discourse has a massive impact on the political discourses of other countries. Among all English-speaking countries, the United States of America should be mentioned as the most powerful politically and culturally. Speeches of American politicians are broadcast worldwide influencing both American citizens and people across the globe when it comes to external affairs and forming political and social agenda in the world. Therefore, the correct response to contemporary challenges depends largely on the accuracy of decoding and understanding messages sent by American politicians.

Modern linguistics has developed a wide scope of works concerning political discourse in general, and American political discourse in particular. These subjects have been thoroughly studied by both Russian and foreign researchers.

However, many works on the matter pay little attention to the linguacultural aspects of American political discourse. Various features of American political discourse are strongly connected to the peculiarities of the country's political culture. Indeed, American political culture heavily influences the way how American politicians communicate with each other and the nation. Therefore, a proper understanding of American political discourse requires detailed linguacultural analysis.

The paper aims to identify the basic peculiarities of American political discourse and to discover connections between them and a specific character of American political culture. For this purpose, methods of discourse analysis, linguacultural analysis, and comparative analysis are applied.

The research may contribute to American political discourse studies providing analysis from a linguacultural perspective. The paper attempts to display how national political culture and history correlate to American political discourse and predetermine its formation. Understanding this correlation is crucial when analyzing different aspects of American politics and political discourse.

2. THEORETICAL GROUNDING

2.1. Political discourse and its definition

The central notion of the presented article is "political discourse." Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that many definitions of discourse itself may derive from its polysemantic nature and a variety of existing approaches (Beaugrande, 1997).

To begin with, the role of context needs to be highlighted. It is believed that text cannot exist in isolation from context and can be artificially separated from it only for research purposes. Therefore, discourse is "text and context together, interacting in a way which is perceived as meaningful and unified by the participants" (Cook, 1992, p. 4). In analyzing discourse, a researcher should pay meticulous attention to the socio-cultural context (Stubbs, 1983). It is important to consider this type when analyzing political discourse.

In terms of Critical Discourse Analysis discourse can be described as "a form of social prac-

tice" (Fairclough, 2010, p. 7) or semiosis, meaning including not only words but also pictures, symbols, gestures, facial expressions, etc. Thus, discourse both shapes verbal and non-verbal contexts and is shaped by them. They are mutually constitutive.

Political discourse is created by all participants of political practices, hence not only actors (i.e., politicians) but also different groups and classes acting politically should be considered. From this perspective, Van Dijk (1997) offers a contextual definition of political discourse. According to it, discourse should be understood "in terms of special events or practices of which the aims, goals or functions are maybe not exclusively but at least primarily political" (van Dijk, 1997, p. 15). The researcher suggests focusing on the following three aspects: participant, nature, and the context of sundry political practices (Op. cit.).

Defining political discourse might also be a complicated task. Its complexity stems from the fact that the term "politics" might be interpreted differently. For example, there is an idea that there are two types of political discourse: discourse of politicians and discourse of response (Plotnikova, 2005). On the one hand, the discourse of politicians is institutional and involves politics in its narrow sense, i.e., it is a purely professional sphere. On the other hand, the discourse of response is a public response to the discourse of politicians, and, therefore, politics is taken in its much broader sense and has a non-professional nature. Besides, there are three levels of political discourse: "discourse used by professional politicians, discourse used in the field of politics, and discourse related to any notions of power, conflict, and control" (Ji, 2019, p. 19).

2.2. Features of political public speaking

Political discourse and its characteristics are greatly influenced by the peculiarities of political public speaking. By its nature, oratory is the unity and struggle of opposites. The antinomy between the spontaneous nature of oral speech and the conventionality of written speech manifests itself in political public speaking (Baranova, 2008).

This antinomy was noticed much earlier in the USSR. Soviet linguists defined oratory as a special type of written speech that always imitates oral speech (Peshkovsky, 1959). However, they pointed out that a good orator should be capable of both coping with the wild nature of colloquial speech and properly targeting written speech.

Another feature of political oratory is its extreme subjectivity. Commonly, such subjectivity is ideologically motivated causing a phenomenon called ideological polysemy. The nature of ideological polysemy derives from the ability of some words, collocations and even phrases to be interpreted differently. In some cases, the difference can be dramatic, e.g. in various types of discourse, the word "nationalist" can be either the description of a patriot or a narrow-minded person who believes that his or her nation is better than others. Some researchers name it a structure-forming feature of political discourse (Mukhortov, 2014). To understand it, one may look at the earlier Soviet history and remember the use of "Trotskyist", a word used to deface political opponents without giving proper argumentation, or the "McCarthy era" in the United States when everyone suspected of having left-wing or even communist sympathies could be fired, expelled, ostracized, imprisoned or even executed (e.g. the Rosenberg case).

Another example may be of interest. Ex-President D. Trump criticized Dr. Anthony Fauci, the Chief Medical Advisor to the President during the pandemic. Also, he kept calling him "a democrat" even though Dr. Fauci is not affiliated with any political party. Once, he said: "He's a nice guy, so I keep him around. Right? We'll keep him around. He's a Democrat, everybody knows that. He's Cuomo's friend" (Colson, 2020). It may be understood as "I criticized him a lot but he is a

nice guy despite being a democrat." This fact is interesting because belonging to the Democratic Party stops being just a political orientation and becomes a stigmatizing stamp.

Additionally, it should be noted that being a politician is not a profession in the traditional sense. American presidents have come from different professional and educational backgrounds, which in turn influence their political discourse with perspectives from various spheres of life, not strictly limited to politics. The frequent mention of 'deals' in Donald Trump's speeches exemplifies the intersection of the business world with political discourse.

2.3. Political discourse and professional communication

First, it needs to be said that the communicative and functional spheres of professional communication and their boundaries are defined differently by researchers. Some of them limit the number of extralinguistic situations, whereas others, on the contrary, extend the scope of such situations. Thus, professional speech exists in such spheres as law, politics, industry, trade, administration, social work, and international affairs (Malyuga, 2015).

Specialists distinguish three basic functions of professional communication: phatic, informational, and the function of making a pragmatic impact. The emotive function is put just on the sixth place (Khramchenko, 2019). However, the emotive function is central in political discourse since any politician longs to impact people's hearts and feelings while appealing to reasoning is commonly not a priority.

One can argue that communication among politicians has such characteristics since their interaction is primarily purposeful and problem-solving-oriented. However, this is not the case when it comes to political speeches and communication with the electorate. Hence, participants heavily influence the nature of political communication and political discourse. It may be highly purpose-oriented only when a communication situation excludes ordinary people. Otherwise, political discourse is impact-oriented.

3. MATERIAL AND METHODS

To achieve the aim of this paper, the research data were collected from political speeches delivered by contemporary American politicians predominantly during the 2016 and 2020 Presidential Elections, and examples of journalistic critical articles responding to these events.

The U.S. Presidential Elections have been chosen for the investigation because such significant political events are characterized by heated political debates. During the elections, the most skilful and powerful politicians do their best to influence Americans and neutralize their opponents. Moreover, the American media reacts to politicians' actions and words by producing analytical articles and criticism. This intense political struggle provides scholars with valuable and diverse research materials that vividly illustrate American political discourse and its unique features.

The paper takes speeches by Donald Trump, Joe Biden, Bernie Sanders, and Hillary Clinton as examples since they were central figures in both the 2016 and 2020 Presidential Elections. The politicians mentioned have delivered numerous speeches and received significant attention from the press. Moreover, their influence over Americans stems from their persuasive oratory. Therefore, their speeches may hold particular interest for political analysts.

In the research, several methods are utilized: discourse analysis, comparative analysis, and linguacultural analysis.

First, it is necessary to examine the distinctive traits of American society and politics. Then,

one should explore the connection between American political culture and discourse. Based on this connection, the fundamental characteristics of American discourse can be analyzed. Thus, in addition to the content and structure typical of discourse analysis, one must also consider the formative features that are linguaculturally specific.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. American political life and its distinctive traits

Before studying American political discourse, one should pay attention to several aspects that distinguish American political culture and make it stand out from other English-speaking political cultures.

4.1.1. Heterogeneous society

The first aspect distinguishing American political discourse as unique is the extreme heterogeneity of American society concerning race, ethnicity, and religion. Americans, being immigrants or descendants of immigrants, may not be fully aware of the various subtleties of American history, culture, and traditions.

In addition, English is not the native language for many individuals. Politicians who aim to succeed must consider their diverse backgrounds. The importance of the so-called "cultural literacy" (Hirsch et al., 2002) for American political discourse is greater than for more ethnically and religiously homogeneous English-speaking societies. This factor makes American politicians simplify their speeches, use less sophisticated stylistic devices, and specify most references and allusions.

4.1.2. Political correctness

Another distinctive feature of American political language, which should be considered, is political correctness. The phenomenon of political correctness (the term was later substituted by 'sensitive language') originated in the United States and became an integral part of its political discourse. Political correctness (or PC) "is concerned with avoiding certain attitudes, actions and above all, forms of expression, which suggest prejudice and are likely to cause offence" (Crowther & Kavanagh, 1999, p. 418). For instance, researchers of American political discourse say that it is typically more acceptable for American politicians belonging to the Republican Party to speak of "pro-life" and not "anti-abortion" policies (Baranova, 2013). This difference can be viewed as a practical example of PC in American political discourse.

Ahead of his 2016 run, Donald Trump started emphasizing that he was a "pro-life politician" to fit the Republican agenda (CNN, 2015). However, users on Twitter pointed out that he had stuck to the opposite opinion previously and called himself "pro-choice" (Rousselle, 2016). "Pro-choice" is the expression used to describe those who support free access to abortions. It seems, that the 45th President changed self-description to win Republican voters.

4.1.3. Extreme religiosity

The third aspect worth taking into consideration when analyzing American political discourse is the extreme religiosity of Americans. The USA has always been a very religious country and most of the American population belongs to various branches of Protestantism. Moreover, the increasing Hispanic and African American population may just sustain the trend. Christianity plays

a great role in politics and everyday life. Therefore, it is not surprising that religious allusions are frequently used by American politicians, especially the older ones.

In the analysis of data from the CIDE (Cambridge International Dictionary of English), there is a comparison of British and American political discourse and the sources of allusions used by politicians from these two countries. Biblical quotes hold a more prominent place in the American political discourse than in the British one (Minayeva, 2014). The total percentage of allusions to the Bible in the political discourse of the two major English-speaking countries is 5%, however, the number of allusions of this nature made by American politicians is much higher and equals 12%. Religion plays a significant role in American political life and partly forms how political texts are created and delivered. Similar data was provided by other researchers (Levenkova, 2008).

For example, in his Victory Speech and Inaugural Address the President-Elect, Joe Biden utilizes various biblical citations to make his words more influential and powerful: "The Bible tells us to everything there is a season, a time to build, a time to reap and a time to sow. And a time to heal. This is the time to heal in America" (Phillips, 2020), "And I promise this, as the Bible says, 'Weeping may endure for a night, joy cometh in the morning'. We will get through this together. Together" (Biden, 2021).

Interestingly enough, not only Christian politicians may gravitate towards the "Christian" approach. Bernie Sanders, being a Jew, appealed to his audience with the words "Brothers and sisters" in his speech in Iowa during his campaign rally (Choi, 2019). Associations with Christian preachers arise immediately, which can be explained by the religious American landscape and the necessity to adapt to it, notwithstanding personal views. It is noteworthy that this appeal is used at the beginning of several paragraphs; therefore, the phrase may be regarded as anaphora, which adds to a certain rhythmic structure of the passage.

4.1.4. Self-focused political culture

In the CIDE data analysis, one can notice another curious detail. In comparison with British politicians, their American counterparts tend to allude to the country's political figures of the past much more often. Besides, the percentage of allusions is considerably high making up half of all references. However, political figures of other countries are not of interest and rank fifth. The most popular Americans with current political figures are Abraham Lincoln, the Founding Fathers, Franklin Delano Roosevelt (often shortened as FDR), and Ronald Reagan. References to ordinary citizens are 17%. This allows a researcher to conclude that American political discourse is extremely America-centered.

One occasion may illustrate this peculiarity of American society. During the 2016 Presidential Election, Donald Trump made up many sobriquets for his opponent, Hillary Clinton, alluding to Angela Merkel, ex-federal chancellor of Germany, and the situation with completely uncontrolled immigration in this country. However, his attempt was unsuccessful, because most Americans were not aware of who Angela Merkel was. More than that, they knew nothing about the immigration crisis in Europe (Vishnyakova, 2017). However, this cannot be explained by the insignificance of the figure or the event. Germany was the 5th trading partner of the USA (United States Census Bureau, 2017), and German was the 4th most popular foreign language taught in institutions of higher education in 2016 (Looney & Lusin, 2018) (the year when D. Trump was elected), so the ties between the two countries are supposed to be strong. Also, the data provided in the cited research indicates a decline in the number of students who want to study foreign languages. This

number has been decreasing over the last decade which may implicitly indicate the «encapsulation" of American society (Op. cit.).

4.2. Syntactic "wrapping" as a distinctive feature of American political discourse

Due to the features of American society and American politics mentioned in Section 3.1., there is a distinctive tendency for American politicians to simplify lexical content and wrap it into more complex syntactic forms. This "stylistic tendency" was highlighted in some papers devoted to analyzing Bill Clinton's speeches and comparing them to the ones of Barack Obama. For instance, the researchers pointed at the vast number of anaphors, parallel constructions, and repetitions in the speeches of the 42nd US President and added that parallel constructions serve as a basic feature of the American presidency per se (Mukhortov, 2015).

The lack of "cultural literacy" and extreme religiosity mentioned previously can be an explanation. Due to their audience being extremely heterogeneous, a politician needs to adjust their speeches making them less complicated for the widest audience possible. Hence, to achieve the goal of impact, they lean towards more complex syntactic tools. Moreover, it may seem that American politicians imitate the manner of preaching prevailing among Baptist priests, which can be characterized as monotonous and rich in syntactic devices.

Special syntactic composition might be created with various syntactic tools. 2020 summer civil unrest was a significant event in the political life of the USA, and many politicians commented upon it expressing their point of view. Donald Trump said, "America needs creation, not destruction, cooperation not contempt, security not anarchy, healing not hatred, justice not chaos" (Rev Transcripts, 2020). The stylistic effect created by multiple cases of antithesis is supplemented by parallel constructions. His rival for the 2020 presidency, Joe Biden, stated that the road to democracy and other American values is hard and added: "At our best, the American ideal wins out. It's never a rout. It's always a fight" (Nilsen, 2020). The example of antithesis expressed in antonymic adverbs and nouns is supported by the use of syntactic anaphora.

In this context, it will be interesting to touch upon the article "How Obama Does That Thing He Does. A Professor of Rhetoric Cracks the Candidate's Code" (Shafer, 2008) saying that people did not remember what exactly had been said by President Obama but were left with a feeling of great happiness and optimism. Jack Shafer, the author of the article, refers to the words of George Parker who mentioned that "the speech dissolved into pure feeling, which stayed with me for days" (Shafer, 2008). Such a description reminds one of religious ceremonies when people are influenced emotionally, not logically. It is suggested that such a «religious» effect described in the article was achieved by the special syntactic composition of the speeches.

4.3. Nicknames as a device of evaluation

It is typical of American political tradition to give prominent political figures sobriquets and nicknames.

One can recall The Father of His Country (George Washington), Honest Abe (Abraham Lincoln), The Apostle of Democracy (Thomas Jefferson), and The Phrasemaker (Woodrow Wilson), and this is not a complete list of such nicknames.

In terms of rhetoric, sobriquets are a powerful tool that uses "imagery to express evaluation induced by attitudes towards the object of nomination and involves further expansion of linguistic meanings" (Vishnyakova & Vishnyakova, 2020, p. 22). It is important to highlight the correlation between discourse and nicknames due to their evaluative characteristics. In this respect, they "can

be regarded as an important axiological element of discourse and an indicator of attitudes of society to an individual, created based on outstanding features of the object of nomination" (Op. cit., p. 24).

In most cases, the authorship of nicknames tends to be unknown, and they become something like a part of folklore. However, some politicians use this device in their speeches to humiliate opponents or praise their allies. It is assumed that using sobriquet nomination "becomes one of the key points in rhetoric" of some American politicians such as George Bush or Donald Trump (Vishnyakova, 2017).

4.4. A volatile tool of political concepts

The ideological polysemy can be a volatile phenomenon. Once uttered, a phrase can be altered and utilized against its originator.

In his inaugural address, Donald Trump promised changes to the citizens of the USA and stated: "This American carnage stops right here and stops right now" (ABC News, 2017). Just before these words, he listed the flaws of the country, including "poverty in inner cities", "rusted-out factories", an ineffective "education system flush with cash" and a high crime rate (Op. cit.). All these problems are called "this American carnage", the problem which he was going to solve as soon as possible. The concept of "American carnage" was meant to blacken the previous administration and, consequently, the whole Democratic and liberal political camp.

Later, it was used as the title of the book "American Carnage. On the Front Lines of the Republican Civil War and the Rise of President Trump" by Tim Alberta, a political correspondent for "Politico" (Alberta, 2019). The book describes metamorphoses in the Republican Party and their evolution from Bush's conservatism into the MAGA movement (Make America Great Again) and Trumpism.

A year later, an essay «American Carnage. Donald Trump and the Collapse of the Union» by Don Watson (Watson, 2020), published in "The Monthly" magazine, alludes to the same utterance of the ex-President. The whole article is devoted to criticizing Donald Trump's presidency. It is full of uncomplimentary words and characteristics, as well as the fear of further division in American society and the possibility of Donald Trump being elected the second time.

«American carnage» turned back on D. Trump. The words changed their meaning and transformed from the concept in favour of the Ex-President and his supporters stigmatizing Democrats and their president into the concept against the Republicans and the Republican policy, the symbol of everything the MAGA movement stood for. Such development is undoubtedly undesired by the author of the phrase. The unflattering characteristic of the results of Obama's presidency happened to be used against Donald Trump and his administration.

Turning to the phenomenon of interpretation may cast light on the reasons for this conversion. To start with, interpretation in science is commonly understood as "a method that stresses the importance of understanding intentional human action" (Jary & Jary, 1991, p. 325). It is underlined that interpretation per se is distinguished by "the recognition that any statement about the social world is necessary relative to any other" (Op. cit.). Thus, it is necessary to note that when one interprets something, he or she understands it in its relation to other things, e.g. socio-cultural context, or a person's background knowledge. In addition, any interpretation is context-dependent since any utterance obtains its sense only in the context of the given situation of interpreting (Dem'yankov, 1999). One event might be verbalized differently, and this can influence the way how the event is remembered, interpreted, and evaluated (Vishnyakova et al., 2022).

First, "American carnage" was associated with and, consequently, interpreted as an assault

on the administration preceding D. Trump's presidency. However, liberal journalists went on to change the context, adding new associations and making this concept related to other things. By doing this, they changed the way most Americans understood and interpreted this utterance. As a result, Trump's own words started working against him describing his presidency, not Obama's.

Such metamorphoses are highly typical of extremely manipulative political discourse. However, it should be added that the character of American politics when everything should look like a show for the amused and amazed spectators makes this trait even more vivid and evident.

4.5. Cross-party differences

It is well-known that the United States has a two-party system, and American politics is dominated by two major parties: the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. The Republican Party belongs to the conservative camp of American politics, whereas the Democrats are considered as the liberal-wing party. This ideological division produces differences in the language and, in particular, in the choice of allusions and references made by politicians. All these differences can be expressed in one opposition 'personal freedoms vs equality'.

Personal freedoms are the manifestation of private liberty and both the government and social organizations have no right to interfere unless a citizen does not do anything breaking the law. Interestingly, it works in both ways, so any white citizen is free to discriminate against minorities and enjoy his or her privileges if he or she does not explicitly practice racism, homophobia, and other kinds of non-tolerant behaviour and manifest his or her personal views. The concepts of equality and inclusive society presuppose active involvement of the government and other social institutes in the life of the American society. This approach quite often leads to the violation of the private freedoms of an individual.

This difference may be visible when looking at one of America's core concepts, the American dream, and its understanding by contemporary Republicans and contemporary Democrats. Most political concepts are difficult to define due to their abstract nature. It can be suggested that the vocabulary definition should be taken as a core of a concept, whereas every additional meaning arising in discourse should be regarded as a field of a concept (Levenkova, 2011).

Thus, it is necessary to deduce the core meaning of the American dream. Based on the dictionaries of the English language and especially of its American variant, four basic aspects of the concept can be distinguished: wealth, success, equal rights/equality of opportunities, and democracy/freedom (Chanturidze, 2016).

Throughout the whole history of America, this concept has been given new meanings. For example, the tragedy of September 11 made American society reinterpret its values and stimulated its desire to live a calm and happy life, which opposes the idea of an eternal run for wealth and success (Baranova, 2007).

Hence, the different attitude to the American dream reveals the different image of the future of the United States manifested by the politicians of the Republican and Democratic parties.

The Republicans keep exploiting the notion of the American dream, which has brought millions of people to the American continent. The notions of enormous prosperity and high living standards, capitalism, businesses, and welfare for hard-working and ambitious people are cherished and propagandized by Republican politicians.

In his victory speech Donald Trump as a good businessman concentrates on this issue: "Work-

ing together, we will begin the urgent task of rebuilding our nation and renewing the American dream. I've spent my entire life in business, looking at the untapped potential in projects and people all over the world" (CNN Staff, 2016).

In 2020 Donald Trump spoke about the inclusiveness of society and its necessity for achieving the dream: "The next step forward in building an inclusive society is making sure that every young American gets a great education and the opportunity to achieve the American dream. Yet, for too long, countless American children have been trapped in failing government schools" (The New York Times, 2020). However, the orator focuses not on equality as such but on equal opportunities to get a good education and, therefore, a well-paid job.

Leaving the Oval Office in 2021, the ex-president reports to the nation on how he has strengthened the American Dream: "Incomes soared, wages boomed, the American Dream was restored, and millions were lifted from poverty in just a few short years. It was a miracle" (Post Staff Report, 2021). Once again, nothing is said about racial, sexual, and gender equality. The Republican American dream is about money and financial flourishing.

It becomes apparent that the American dream of the Republicans is the dream of a businessman or an entrepreneur. It does not matter what colour your skin is, what god you worship, or what your sexual orientation is, your freedoms and willingness to work hard and prosper are the only things that matter.

The Democrats use the idea of the dream to follow as well. Delivering the inaugural address, the President-Elect speaks about the dream not of wealth and prosperity but of justice: "A cry for racial justice, some 400 years in the making, moves us. The dream of justice for all will be deferred no longer" (Biden, 2021).

After the 2016 Presidential Elections, Hillary Clinton accepted her defeat and spoke about the idea of the American dream and its accessibility: "We spent a year and a half bringing together millions of people from every corner of our country to say with one voice that we believe that the American dream is big enough for everyone. For people of all races, and religions, for men and women, for immigrants, for LGBT people, and for people with disabilities. For everyone" (Golshan, 2016).

The main thing the Democrats pay attention to is just distribution of goods and services and the well-being of minorities. They attach significance to another aspect of the American Dream, equality.

It can be concluded that the old concept of the American dream remains unchanged since the XX century only in the rhetoric of the Republicans. The Democrats reinvented its meaning or some of them even replaced it with the concept of equality of everyone.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it needs to be said that American political discourse is a prominent linguistic phenomenon generating a huge amount of data to analyze.

In the paper, the following traits are identified as typical of American political culture:
1) heterogeneity of American society;
2) political correctness and its significance;
3) extreme religiosity;
4) self-centered political culture.

All these traits and their various combinations result in unique features of American political

discourse that distinguish it from other English-speaking political discourses. When analyzing American political discourse, a researcher needs to take into account the following features:

1) syntactic tendency in speech production;
2) usage of nicknames and sobriquets;
3) volatility of political concepts;
4) violent political fights between two parties causing linguistic differences to emerge.

Naturally, some of the listed features are typical of political discourse per se, however, American political discourse (due to its distinctive political culture) exaggerates them making them more noticeable. Moreover, American political discourse has developed its unique characteristics which cannot be applied to any other English-speaking political discourse.

It should be stated that there is a direct connection between American political culture and its political discourse. American political culture influences the nation's political communication and stems from America's history and culture and the peculiarities of American society. Thus, studying American political discourse inevitably involves linguacultural analysis, since it provides a deeper and broader understanding of the matter.

REFERENCES

1. ABC News. (2017, January 20). FULL TEXT: President Donald Trump's Inauguration Speech. *ABC News.* https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/full-text-president-donald-trumps-inauguration-speech/story?id=44915821

2. Alberta, T. (2019). *American Carnage. On the Front Lines of the Republican Civil War and the Rise of President Trump.* New York City, USA: HarperCollins.

3. Baranova, L.L. (2007). Kontsept "Amerikanskaya mechta": ego struktura i realizatsiya v yazykovoy deyatel'nosti lyudey [The Concept of the American Dream: its structure and implementation in linguistic activity]. *Kognitivnaya lingvistika: novye problemy poznaniya. Seriya Yazykoznanie [Cognitive linguistics: new issues in cognition. Series: Linguistics], 5,* 78–84 (in Russian).

4. Baranova, L.L. (2008). *Ontologiya angliyskoy pismennoy rechi. Uchebno-metodicheskoye posobiye k kursu lektsiy po orfoepii i orfografii sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka [Ontology of English written speech. Study guide to the lecture course on contemporary English orthoepy and orthography].* Russia, Moscow: Saint Tikhon's Orthodox University (in Russian).

5. Baranova, L.L. (2013). Political Correctness in Political Discourse: Language Made Plain. In O. V. Alexandrova (Ed.), *LATEUM 2013. ELT and Linguistics – 2013: New Strategies for Better Solutions: proceedings* (pp. 67-71). Moscow, Russia: MAKS Press.

6. Beaugrande, R. de. (1997). The Story of Discourse Analysis. Discourse as Structure and Process. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 35-62). New York, US: SAGE Publications.

7. Biden, J. (2021, January 20). Inaugural Address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. *The White House.* https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/01/20/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/

8. Chanturidze, Yu.M. (2016). *Afro-amerikanskiy politicheskiy diskurs: kognitivniy, lingvokul-*

turologicheskiy i ritoricheskiy aspect [African-American political discourse: cognitive, linguocultural and rhetoric aspects] [Candidate's Thesis, Moscow State University]. Moscow, Russia (in Russian).

9. Choi, D. (2019, March 8). Read Bernie Sanders' full speech from his first Iowa 2020 campaign rally. *Business Insider.* https://www.businessinsider.com/bernie-sanders-iowa-2020-rally-speech-transcript-2019-3?r=US&IR=T

10. CNN Staff. (2016, November 16). Here's the full text of Donald Trump's victory speech. *CNN.* https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/donald-trump-victory-speech/index.html

11. CNN. (2015, July 30). *Donald Trump: I'm pro-life, with exceptions (CNN interview with Dana Bash)* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2xEeIRfrpCY

12. Colson, T. (2020, October 16). Trump says 'everyone knows' that Dr. Fauci is a Democrat, even though he is not a member of any party. *Business Insider.* https://www.businessinsider.com/donald-trump-claims-dr-fauci-is-a-democrat-no-evidence-2020-10

13. Cook, G. (1992). *The Discourse of Advertising.* London, UK: Routledge.

14. Crowther, J., & Kavanagh, K. (1999). *Oxford Guide to British and American Culture: For Learners of English.* Oxford University Press.

15. Dem'yankov, V.Z. (1999). Interpretatsiya kak instrument i kak ob'ekt lingvistiki [Interpretation as a tool and as an object of linguistics]. *Voprosy filologii [Philological issues],* 2, 5-13 (in Russian).

16. Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language.* London, UK: Routledge.

17. Golshan, T. (2016, November 9). Hillary Clinton's concession speech full transcript: 2016 presidential election. *Vox.* https://www.vox.com/2016/11/9/13570328/hillary-clinton-concession-speech-full-transcript-2016-presidential-election

18. Hirsch, E.D. Jr., Kett, J. F., & Trefil, J. (2002). *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy.* Boston, N.Y., USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

19. Jary, D. & Jary, J. (1991). *Collins dictionary of sociology.* Glasgow, UK: HarperCollins.

20. Ji, Xiaoxiao. (2019). *Pragmalinguistically Motivated Functions of Metaphor in Political Discourse: A Case of American Presidential Rhetoric* [Candidate's Thesis, Lomonosov Moscow State University]. Moscow, Russia. https://istina.msu.ru/dissertations/232827586/

21. Khramchenko, D.S. (2019). Functional-linguistic Parameters of English Professional Discourse. *Professional Discourse & Communication,* 1, 9-20. doi: 10.24833/2687-0126-2019-1-1-9-20

22. Levenkova, E.R. (2008). Intertekst kak lingvokulturniy marker v politicheskom diskurse Velikobritanii i SShA [Intertext as a linguacultural marker in British and American political discourse]. *Izvestiya Samarskogo nauchnogo tsentra RAN [Izvestia of Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences], 6*(2), 261-270 (in Russian).

23. Levenkova, E.R. (2011). *Britanskiy i amerikanskiy politcheskiy diskurs: kontrastivnyi analiz [British and American Political Discourse: contrastive analysis].* Russia, Samara: Volga State Academy of Social Sciences and Humanities (in Russian).

24. Looney, D. & Lusin, N. (2018). *Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016: Preliminary Report.* Modern Language Association (Web publication). https://www.mla.org/content/download/83540/file/2016-Enrollments-Short-Report.pdf

25. Malyuga, E.N. (2015). Individual-oriented training in professional communication teach-

ing. In L. Gómez Chova, A. López Martínez, I. Candel Torres (Eds.), *ICERI2015: 8th Internationalal Conference of Education, Research and Innovation, Seville, Spain, November 16th-18th, 2015: proceedings* (pp. 4807-4811). Seville, Spain: IATED Academy.

26. Minayeva, L.V. (2014). Ob intertekstual'nosti i gipertekstual'nosti politicheskogo disckursa [On political discourse intertextuality and hypertextuality]. *Vestnik Mockovskogo Universiteta. Seriya 21. Upravlenie (gosudarstvo i obshchestvo) [The Lomonosov Public Administration Journal. Series 21], 2,* 15-30 (in Russian).

27. Mukhortov, D.S. (2014). Manipulyativnyy potentsial ideologicheskoy polisemii v sovremennom politicheskom diskurse [The manipulative potential of ideological polysemy in political discourse today]. In I.V. Kultyshev (Ed.), *Ubezhdenie i dokazatel'stvo v sovremennom politicheskom diskurse [Persuasion and proof in contemporary political discourse], Yekaterinburg, Russia, August 26-28, 2014: proceedings* (pp. 68-76). Yekaterinburg, Russia: Ural State Pedagogical University (in Russian).

28. Mukhortov, D.S. (2015). Praktika kognitivno-diskursivnogo analiza yazykovoy lichnosti politika (opyt prochteniya publichnykh vystupleniy Billa Klintona) [Cognitive discursive insights into the politician's linguistic identity: perusing Bill Clinton's public statements]. *Kommunikativnye issledovaniya [Communicative Studies], 2*(4), 86-95 (in Russian).

29. Nilsen, E. (2020, June 2). "The presidency is a duty to care": Read Joe Biden's full speech on George Floyd's death. *Vox*. https://www.vox.com/2020/6/2/21277967/joe-biden-full-speech-george-floyd-death-trump

30. Peshkovsky, A.M. (1959). *Izbrannye Trudy [Selected Papers]*. Moscow, Russia: Ministry of Education of the RSFSR Press (in Russian).

31. Phillips, A. (2020, November 7). Joe Biden's victory speech, annotated. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/11/07/annotated-biden-victory-speech/

32. Plotnikova, S.N. (2005). Politik kak konstruktor diskursa reagirovaniya [Politician as a constructor of a discourse of reaction]. *Politicheskiy diskurs v Rossii: Svyatye bez zhitiy: materialy postoyanno deystvuyushchego seminara [Political Discourse in Russia: Saints without Lives: materials of a permanent seminar], 8,* 22-26. Moscow: MAKS Press (in Russian).

33. Post Staff Report. (2021, January 19). President Trump's farewell: Read his full speech. *New York Post.* https://nypost.com/2021/01/19/president-trumps-farewell-read-his-full-speech/

34. Rev Transcripts. (2020, June 1). Donald Trump Speech Transcript June 1: Trump May Deploy US Military to Cities. *Rev*. https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-speech-transcript-june-1-trump-may-deploy-us-military-to-cities.

35. Rousselle, C. (2016, March 29). Donald Trump: I've Evolved, I'm Pro-Life Now. *Townhall*. https://townhall.com/tipsheet/christinerousselle/2016/03/29/donald-trump-ive-evolved-im-prolife-now-n2140838

36. Shafer, J. (2008, February 14). How Obama Does That Thing He Does. *Slate Magazine.* http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/press_box/2008/02/how_obama_does_that_thing_he_does.html

37. Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.* Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press.

38. The New York Times. (2020, February 5). *Full Transcript: Trump's 2020 State of the Union Address.* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/05/us/politics/state-of-union-transcript.html

39. United States Census Bureau. (2017, January). *Top Trading Partners – January 2017.* https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/statistics/highlights/toppartners.html

40. Van Dijk, T. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics,*

11(1), 11-52. doi: 10.1075/BJL.11.03DIJ

41. Vishnyakova, E.A., & Vishnyakova, O. D. (2020). Soubriquet nomination referred to cultural awareness and intercultural competence. *Training, Language and Culture, 4*(3), 21-30. doi: 10.22363/2521-442X-2020-4-3-21-30

42. Vishnyakova, O.D., & Aleksandrova, O.V. (2017). Antroponimicheskoye prozvische kak indikator otsenochnosti v politicheskom diskurse [Anthroponymic sobriquet as evaluation indicator in the political discourse]. *Vestnik Mockovskogo Universiteta. Seriya 19. Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya [Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication], 2,* 70-82 (in Russian).

43. Vishnyakova, O.D., Lipgart, A.A., & Martyushova N.O. (2022). Problema issledovaniya pamyati v lingvistike: mezhdisciplinarnyy podkhod [The Study of Memory in Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Approach]. *Voprosy zhurnalistiki, pedagogiki, yazykoznaniya [Issues in Journalism, Education, Linguistics], 41*(4), 700-706 (in Russian). doi:10.52575/2712-7451-2022-41-4-700-706

44. Watson, D. (2020, July). American Carnage. Donald Trump and the collapse of the Union. *The Monthly.* https://www.themonthly.com.au/issue/2020/july/1593525600/don-watson/american-carnage#mtr

About the author:

Nikita A. Bystrov holds an MA in Philology and is currently a third-year PhD candidate at Lomonosov Moscow State University (Moscow, Russia). He is a senior lecturer in the Department of Foreign Languages at MIREA — Russian Technological University (Moscow, Russia). His main research areas include linguoculturology, political discourse, discourse analysis, functional linguistics, rhetoric, and teaching methods. ORCID: 0009-0005-9683-7116.