Кваліфікаційна робота магістра

**Вербалізація образу ворогів
в інавгураційних промовах американських президентів**

Бєлікова Миколи Костянтиновича

студента групи МЛа 59-19

факультету германської філології

заочної форми навчання

Спеціальності 035 Філологія

Науковий керівник

доктор філологічних наук,

проф. Потапенко С.І.

Допущена до захисту

«_____» _____ року

Завідувач кафедри

_____ проф. Маріна О. С.

(підпис)   *(ПІБ)*

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів:_____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ – 2020

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Professor O. M. Morokhovsky Department of English Philology, Translation, and

Philosophy of Language

Master's Thesis

Verbal Image of Enemies in American Presidential Inaugurals

Mykola Bielikov

Group МЛа 59-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Study by Correspondence

Speciality 035 Philology

Research Adviser

Professor S.I. Potapenko

Doctor of Science (Philology)

Kyiv –2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The research topic I have chosen is very relevant and relatively new for Ukrainian philology since our state is cooperating more and more deeply with the United States of America on various issues: economic, military and cultural.

The United States of America is a state that has been enjoying the status of a superpower since the end of World War II. The United States is the world's most powerful economy, the most powerful nation in terms of military power, and the country with the longest history of democracy. It has never been a monarchy or an authoritarian state. Since the first day of the proclamation of independence, the United States has been and remains a republic, since the first day of the state there has been the institution of the presidency.

This institution is not a decoration or a copy of someone's custom, but rather a model for the entire civilized world (Gruber 2013; Köker 2014; Potapenko 2020: 71). When the newly elected president takes office and announces his inaugural speech, not only his own citizens, who are certainly the most important for the newly elected head of state, listen to his words, but also leaders and peoples around the world.

The provisions that will be stated in the speech will set the course not only for domestic political life, but also for the interaction of the entire world community and global processes. Given this, we can unequivocally say that they are clearly programmatic speeches. They set the course for the whole nation for the next four years, so it is extremely important for each president to determine who is his country's friend and who is the opponent and to convey this correctly to his voters.

From the philological point of view, nothing prevents us from finding out what language units and methods the presidents use so as to accurately convey the image of the enemy to the audience, to outline its importance and the need to combat it, to trace the main lexical units and symbols of enemies and trends in their use, to group those units into categories.

The period of the 20th and 21st centuries is chosen for the study, because it is during this period that the role of the United States in the world community increased most and in the inaugural speeches of American presidents of this period, we can trace the widest possible range of references to both external and internal enemies.

The **relevance** of the study is that the inaugurals of American presidents are program speeches that determine the direction of development of the world and set the example of speaking about the current national and international affairs which gives grounds to consider this type of language exemplary.

The **object** of the study is the inaugural speeches of American presidents of the 20th and 21st centuries.

The **subject** of this study is the verbal images of enemies in the speeches of American presidents of the 20th and 21st centuries.

The **aim** of the study is to identify the naming units creating images of enemies in the inaugural speeches of American presidents.

The tasks of the study are

- to single out the main language tools of English to denote enemies;

- to reconstruct the history of the American inauguration ceremony and inaugural speeches;

- to identify functions, role and subject of the inaugural speeches of American presidents;

- to single out the linguistic means of constructing external and internal enemies.

Methods of the study include: induction and deduction; definitional and componential analysis; contextual analysis; theory of conceptual metaphor.

Material of the study is based on 27 inaugurals by US presidents, from the address by President Wilson in 1913 to the speech of incumbent President Trump in 2017.

The **novelty** of the work lies in a comprehensive approach to the study of a large array of inaugural speeches of American presidents. Previously, the themes of enemies and friends were revealed in the speeches of individual presidents. This paper offers a combination of both theoretical and practical research based on a large array of material.

The results of the paper were discussed at the conference "Ad orbem per linguas" (Kyiv Linguistic National University, 17-18 June 2020).

The theoretical significance of the work lies in expanding knowledge in the field of effective public speaking. The paper takes a new approach to the analysis of the texts of inaugurals and ways to achieve a pragmatic effect from the standpoint of rhetorical studies.

The **practical importance** of my work is that its results can be used in the courses of English lexicology and stylistics, text interpretation, in special courses in discourse studies and rhetoric.

The paper **consists of the** introduction, two chapters with conclusions, general conclusions, resume and a list of references.

CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STUDYING THE VERBAL IMAGE OF ENEMIES IN AMERICAN PRESIDENTS' INAUGURALS

The first section of the thesis deals with the theoretical foundations of the topic under consideration. Firstly, I will look at lexical items that denote enemies, frequency of their use, and their emotional coloring. Further, I consider the role of the inaugural speech in the American presidency, discuss the historical events that influenced the subject and context of the inaugurals of the period under consideration, i.e. from President Wilson to President Trump. An important part that will also be discussed in this section is the structure of the speech itself, in particular, those components in which presidents most often refer to enemies.

1.1. The role of inaugural address at the US Presidency Institute

United States presidential inauguration is ceremony during which the President is sworn into office (Kesavan, Sidak 2016). It is held on January 20 of the year following a presidential election. Although the day is not a public holiday, many U.S. citizens attend the ceremony and accompanying festivities or, since 1949, watch the events on television (This Day in History. A&E Television Networks).

1.1.1 Inaugural ceremony. The day of the inauguration includes a number of events that have become tradition. For instance, since Franklin D. Roosevelt attended church services on the morning of his first swearing-in ceremony in 1933, all the succeeding presidents have done the same. After the worship services, the president-elect and vice president-elect—as well as the current president and vice president, family members, and various public

officials—proceed to the U.S. Capitol for the swearing-in ceremonies. The vice president-elect is sworn in first, often by an official of his choosing, and then the president-elect is sworn in, typically by the chief justice of the Supreme Court. After taking the oath of office, the new president gives an inaugural address, during which he usually expresses his goals for the country. An inaugural luncheon and a parade follow. That evening the president typically attends various inaugural balls (Williams 2017a).

The U.S. Constitution originally directed that a president be inaugurated on March 4 of the year following a presidential election. This date was used from 1793 to 1933. However, the four months when a defeated president would continue to serve until the president-elect was sworn in was often a time of political inaction, which sometimes led to problems. With the ratification (1933) of the Twentieth Amendment, the inauguration was moved to January 20, thus reducing the length of time to transition presidential administrations. If January 20 falls on a Sunday, the president is inaugurated that day in a small ceremony, with a public inauguration and the subsequent festivities being held the next day (Encyclopedia of the American Presidency 2009, p 262-63).

1.1.2 Inaugural address. The presidential inaugural address is a discourse whose significance all recognize but few praise. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., for example, acknowledges that, during inaugural addresses, "the nation listens for a moment as one people to the words of the man they have chosen for the highest office in the land," but he finds little merit in them: "even in the field of political oratory, the inaugural address is an inferior art form. It is rarely an occasion for original thought or stimulating reflection. The platitude quotient tends to be high, the rhetoric stately and self-serving, the ritual obsessive, and the surprises few" (Campbell, Jamieson 1985).

Inaugurals are a subspecies of the kind of discourse which Aristotle called epideictic, a form of rhetoric that praises or blames on ceremonial occasions,4

addresses an audience that evaluates the rhetor's skill (Campbell, Jamieson 1985), recalls the past and speculates about the future while focusing on the present (Campbell, 1985), employs a noble, dignified literary style (Campbell, Jamieson 1985).

Presidential inaugurals are epideictic speeches because they are delivered on ceremonial occasions, fuse past and future in present contemplation, affirm or praise the shared principles that will guide the incoming administration, ask the audience to "gaze upon" traditional values, employ an elegant, literary language, and rely on "heightening of effect," that is, on amplification and reaffirmation of what is already known and believed (Campbell, Jamieson 1985). The special character of the presidential inaugural address is defined by these general epideictic features and by the nature of the inauguration ceremony. Inauguration is a rite of passage, a ritual of transition in which the newly-elected President is invested in the office of the Presidency (Campbell, Jamieson 1985). The fusion of epideictic features with the requirements of this rite of investiture creates the distinct rhetorical type that is the presidential inaugural address.

The special sense of the present is central to the generic character of the inaugural because the address is about an institution and form of government fashioned to transcend any given moment. The timelessness of the inaugural address affirms and ensures the continuity of the constitutional system, the immortality of the Presidency as an institution, and it is reflected in its contemplative tone and by the absence of calls to specific and immediate action (Campbell, Jamieson 1985).

The variability in inaugural address is evidence of an identifiable cluster of elements that fuse to form the essential inaugural act. Each apparent variation is an emphasis on or a development of one or more of the key elements we have described. (Campbell, Jamieson 1985) Franklin Roosevelt's first address explores the nature of executive leadership and the limits of executive power whereas his second address constitutes the audience as a caring person Wilson's first explores

the meaning of our industrial development and waste of natural resources in his address (Campbell, Jamieson 1985).

Finally, the inaugural is an epideictic ritual which is formal, unifying, abstract, and eloquent, and at the core of this ritual lies epideictic timelessness, the fusion of the past and future of the nation in an eternal present in which we reaffirm what Franklin Roosevelt called "our covenant with ourselves" (Roosevelt 1937), that covenant between the executive and the nation that is the essence of democratic government and it is underlined in each inaugural speech (Campbell, Jamieson 1985).

1.2 History of American inaugural addresses

The inauguration, as we are accustomed to seeing it, was first held on April 30, 1789, for George Washington, the founding father of the United States. It was preceded by military salutes and church bells at dawn. The ceremony took place in New York, because until 1790 it was there that the Congress building was located. On Thursday morning, Washington, accompanied by military and government officials, walked from the presidential residence to the Federal Hall building on Wall Street. There he took the oath, after which he delivered a speech: *"I solemnly swear that I will faithfully serve as President of the United States and do my best to protect, defend, and defend the Constitution of the United States,"* said one of the founding fathers of the United States, and every new American president has repeated it ever since.

Thomas Jefferson promised the same to the people in 1801. In the same year, the inauguration was held for the first time in Washington. In 1817, James Monroe, the fifth President, became the first to give an Inaugural Address to an assembled public crowd. Since that time, the traditional Inaugural Address has been an opportunity for the President to speak directly to the American people. George Washington said juts 135 words after his second inauguration in 1793,

while William Henry Harrison gave the longest Inaugural Address ever, taking almost two hours to deliver 8,445 words (Williams 2017b).

Washington's 1793 second inaugural address is the shortest in presidential history. Thomas Jefferson explains the difference in intention between a first and second inaugural address. In his notes from the day before he began his second term in office, Jefferson states:

"The first was promise. This is performance" (Jefferson, 1805).

Perhaps the clearest distinction between a first and second inaugural address appears in the speeches of Abraham Lincoln. During his first inaugural address in 1861, Lincoln explained why his election would not threaten the sanctity of the Union. Four years later, with the bond between the states temporarily dissolved, Lincoln explained how, despite the best efforts of his administration, the threat of war became a reality (Хома 2018):

"While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, urgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came" (Lincoln, 1865).

In spite of his initial promises, the nation was devastated by war. Does Lincoln's second inaugural address provide plausible explanation for this diversion from intent? How do you think this address was received by the people? Why?

From James Monroe's account of the war with England in 1813, to Ronald Reagan's discussion of a missile defense system, a president's second inaugural address tends to focus more on current policy than future promises (Ketcham 2003).

George Washington set a precedent for future presidents when he delivered the first inaugural address in 1789. Washington used the opportunity to discuss some of his positions, including his refusal to take a salary while in office: *"When I*

was first honored with a call into the service of my country...the light in which I contemplated my duty required that I should renounce every pecuniary compensation. ...being still under the impressions which produced it, I must decline as inapplicable to myself any share in the personal emoluments which may be indispensably included in a permanent provision for the executive department, and must accordingly pray that the pecuniary estimates... be limited to such actual expenditures as the public good may be thought to require" (Washington, 1789).

The rejection of a salary despite its inclusion in the Constitution did not become a common part of subsequent inaugural addresses. However, George Washington's religious invocation did start a presidential trend:

"[I]t would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe...No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States" (Washington, 1789).

There is more than one example in US history when a president's speech, or even a phrase from a speech, became a symbol of the leaders who uttered it.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said in his 1933 speech: *"Let me emphasize my firm conviction that the only thing we need to fear is fear itself* (Roosevelt, 1933)*".* This speech was remembered by several generations of Americans who survived the Great Depression. The speech was refined and bold (Alter 2006).

An inaugural address reflects the era in which it's delivered. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt explained in his third inaugural address on January 20, 1941, every president faces a different challenge:

"On each national day of inauguration since 1789, the people have renewed their sense of dedication to the United States. In Washington's day the task of the people was to create and weld together a nation. In Lincoln's day the task of the people was to preserve that Nation from disruption from within. In this day the task of the people is to save that Nation and its institutions from disruption from without (Roosevelt, 1941).*"*

The discussion of communism in inaugural addresses from the mid- to late-twentieth century offers one example of how ideas and platforms can change over time (Evans, 2007). In the wake of World War II, Harry Truman's 1949 inaugural address defined communism as:

"[A] false philosophy which purports to offer freedom, security, and greater opportunity to mankind. Misled by this philosophy, many peoples have sacrificed their liberties only to learn to their sorrow that deceit and mockery, poverty and tyranny, are their reward" (Truman, 1949).

Dwight Eisenhower responded to the changing events in Eastern Europe in the 1950s. His 1957 inaugural address targeted "International Communism" as he proclaimed:

"Budapest is no longer merely the name of a city; henceforth it is a new and shining symbol of man's yearning to be free."

In the last half century, the speech that has changed the world was called the address of John F. Kennedy, delivered in 1961:

"My compatriots, Americans! Don't ask: what can your country do for you? Ask: what can you do for your country?" said John F. Kennedy historically.

These words have become a symbol of the era. It seems that a leader who is able to catch the trends of the time, from the very beginning can give his stay in office a special character.

While John F. Kennedy didn't directly mention communism in his 1961 inaugural address, it was his apparent topic when he said:

"Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction (Kennedy, 1961).*"*

In the midst of the Vietnam War, Richard Nixon's 1969 inaugural address examined the American spirit:

"We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord on earth. We are caught in war, wanting peace. We are torn by division, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them (Nixon, 1969).*"*

Almost a decade later, Jimmy Carter's 1977 inaugural address emphasized the potential outcome of a number of foreign affairs when he said:

"I would hope that the nations of the world might say that we had built a lasting peace, built not on weapons of war but on international policies which reflect our own most precious values" (Carter, 1977).

However, there are speeches of a completely different nature. Like Ronald Reagan, who looked like a grandfather who got up from rocking chairs and firmly assured that everything would be fine. This speech marked the beginning of a conservative social revolution that lasted about a quarter of a century.

As the Cold War moved into the 1980s, Ronald Reagan discussed the potential benefits of a missile defense system in his second inaugural address:

"Now, for decades, we and the Soviets have lived under the threat of mutual assured destruction; if either resorted to the use of nuclear weapons, the other could retaliate and destroy the one who had started it. Is there either logic or morality in believing that if one side threatens to kill tens of millions of our people, our only recourse is to threaten killing tens of millions of theirs? I have approved a research program to find, if we can, a security shield that would destroy nuclear missiles before they reach their target. It wouldn't kill people, it would destroy weapons" (Reagan, 1985).

Four years later, George H.W. Bush avoided Cold War rhetoric, proclaiming in his inaugural address:

"Great nations of the world are moving toward democracy through the door to freedom. Men and women of the world move toward free markets through the door to prosperity. The people of the world agitate for free expression and free

thought through the door to the moral and intellectual satisfactions that only liberty allows" (Bush, 1989).

By the time Bill Clinton delivered his first inaugural address in 1993, he was able to speak of the Cold War in the past tense and focus his attention on America's economy:

"Today, a generation raised in the shadows of the Cold War assumes new responsibilities in a world warmed by the sunshine of freedom but threatened still by ancient hatreds and new plagues. Raised in unrivaled prosperity, we inherit an economy that is still the world's strongest, but is weakened by business failures, stagnant wages, increasing inequality, and deep divisions among our people" (Clinton, 1993).

In 1993, President Clinton spoke of himself as a man born in a town with the symbolic name Hope, and added a kind of gilding to his speech with the help of poetess Maya Angela:

"Come in peace, and I will sing the songs that the creator gave me when I wood and stone were one. Before cynicism was baked on your forehead, and when you still knew you knew nothing».

It so happened that Clinton's presidency was marked by a confrontation with Congress, which was dominated by political opponents, and eventually overshadowed by scandals with his extramarital affairs.

The truth is that he who stands on the steps of the Capitol never knows what fate has prepared around the corner. "*Everyone has the most important tasks of democracy. I will use these principles both in my personal life and at work to spread my convictions with politeness, to defend the interests of society with courage. To stand for greater justice with compassion. I will call for responsibility and be responsible myself* "- promised George W. Bush in January 2001 (Bush, 2001).

He spoke after the election, the results of which were still the subject of heated debate. He did not yet know that in nine months he would have to deal with

an attack on the United States, an attack that would affect his presidency and lead to a split in his country.

To conclude, the main essence of the inaugural speech of American presidents, which has not changed from the beginning, is the oath to faithfully serve the American people, but this is only part of the ceremony. The main message for the future presidential term of the presidents is formulated individually, it is influenced by events related to their election, domestic and foreign policy situation. Sometimes events in the course of the presidential term force to deviate from the course declared in the speech.

1.3 Functions of American inaugural addresses

Political speeches, particularly the presidential inaugural addresses, which are the concern of this paper, should be delivered in a more formal speech style. They can be authored by a specialized and professional speech writer other than the speaker (Allen 2007).

Moreover, the presidential inaugural addresses are designed to unify the audience since they all listen to the speech of the person they have chosen for the highest executive position, and who will lead the country during the upcoming four years (Liu 2012).

Without the presence of "the people," the rite of presidential investiture cannot be completed. The people ratify the president's formal ascent to power by witnessing his enactment of his role, acknowledging his oath, and accepting the principles he lays down to guide his administration (Campbell and Jamieson 1985: 397).

However, the presidential inaugural address is not required by the American Constitution. Rather, it is a tradition set by the first president of the USA George Washington. It is delivered every four years by the newly elected president to sign the beginning of a new administration. Hence, the presidential inaugural address

can be seen as an extension of the oath through which the newly elected president is invested in the presidency office (Liu 2012: 2409).

Accordingly, the inaugural address is a rite of transition of power from one party to another or from one administration to another. This address is therefore considered to be an occasion for the new elected president to announce the principles that will govern his/her tenure in office and to persuade people that s/he is fit to play the assigned political role and to achieve his political program objectives. At the same time, it can be seen as a "call for support and loyalty to the political regime" (Liu 2012: 2409).

The incoming president invokes a supreme being to identify with his audience by acknowledging their common humanity. He is confessing that even as he assumes the highest office in the land, he shares with the members of his audience all the limitations of human nature. He is also confessing that he cannot fulfill the stringent duties of his new office without the assistance of a power beyond his, or any other person's, control. What, then, is "transient" in inaugural addresses is the incoming president's personal conception of that higher power; what is "permanent" is his recognition of the limits of his all-too-human powers (Пильгун 2013).

To conclude, the inaugural address serves certain functions, i.e. the transition of presidential power, the covenant with people, the platform to deliver their political program points, to unite the people around a problem or enemy, that can be reflected through the speech itself. It is mainly used to convince the audience with the speaker's point of view by using different techniques.

1.4. Structure of American inaugural addresses

Despite the variation in tones, themes and forms, the regularities in the internal structure of addresses have been sought and analyzed. To locate the

features of presidential inaugurals in structure, this section takes all the inaugural addresses from the reviewed period (20th - 21st centuries) into the corpus.

As the communicative purpose is the criterion to distinguish a genre, the communicative intention can be considered as the defining feature for moves. Whenever a linguistic unit indicates a communicative intention subservient to the general communicative purpose of the discourse a move can be identified (Liu 2012). The combination of these communicative intentions makes the communicative purpose of the particular genre.

Since submoves (Liu 2012) are non-discriminative, a linguistic unit that indicates the same communicative intention, or only part of the whole, or a unit that is just a different strategy to accomplish the same intention, can only be identified as submoves or steps. Otherwise, it can be a new move. In the case of move-structure of American inaugural address summarized by Swales, the writer may decide to establish the research field either by:

(a) asserting centrality of the topic

Each president concentrates on one main topic in his speech.

(b) stating current knowledge

Each president refers to current situation in the country and his predecessors.

(c) ascribing key fields of future work

Each president outlines things which he is going to accomplish.

These strategies are essentially non-discriminative type and belong to submoves. To identify moves and submoves, linguistic clues such as explicit lexical items, phrases, grammatical specifiers of content relations, discourse conjuncts should also be resorted to (Liu 2012):

Move I — Salutation

Move II — Announcing entering upon office

Move III — Articulating sentiments on the occasion

The first three moves are not interesting for us in context of enemies.

Move IV — Making pledges

This move intends to fulfill the expectations of audience for promise. The new president carries out this speech act to help the public with confidence in the new leader and his government. While using this move, a president-elect usually uncovers urgent issues and often stars using references to enemies. A president-elect can both refer to internal and external enemies, it depends of the main line of his policy.

Move V — Arousing patriotism in citizens. The function of this move is to bear the audience with love for the country and confidence in the future, with which the new president successfully unites all the Americans as a whole(Liu, 2012). That move is a place to refer to some ideological and external enemies. For example, I provide the illustration of this move in the first speech of president Reagan, where he refers to the Soviet Union as an ideological enemy and mentions that the nation will never surrender:

"As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it--now or ever" (Reagan, 1981).

Move VI — Announcing political principles to guide the new administration. This move is indispensable for setting forth political principles and that is also the main expectations of the audience from the speech (Liu, 2012). Generally, the political principles that will control the government include two parts: those basic principles on which stand the American political institutions and the main policies that will shape the coming administration. This stage is clearly visible in Roosevelt's and Reagan's speeches. For an instance, President Roosevelt put forward policies to solve the problems during the Depression and President Reagan concentrates on national security:

"Our greatest primary task is to put people to work... "

"Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers and, by engaging on a national scale in a redistribution and endeavor to provide a better use of the land for those best fitted for the land.… "

"Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order; there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be... " (Roosevelt, 1933).

Move VII — Appealing to the audience. The audience can never be ignored. There is always a general appeal for aids or assistance or some specific appeal for sacrifice and dedication (Liu 2012). This move has some similarities with arousing patriotism and is also used to mobilize the nation against enemies. For example, in 1989 president Bush rallies the citizens to fight drug trafficking:

"There are few clear areas in which we as a society must rise up united and express our intolerance. The most obvious now is drugs. And when that first cocaine was smuggled in on a ship, it may as well have been a deadly bacteria, so much has it hurt the body, the soul of our country. And there is much to be done and to be said, but take my word for it: This scourge will stop" (Bush, 1989).

Move VIII — Resorting to religious power. Every president will refer to God many times in his inaugural address as God is the common religious belief for- nearly all Americans. The function of this move is to unite the American people (Liu 2012). Generally, presidents supplicate the help of God by two means: invoking God for guidance and seeking divine blessings. Example is listed to explicate the first and second case respectfully:

(1) *"And yet it will be no cool process of mere science. The Nation has been deeply stirred, stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of wrong, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an instrument of evil. The feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heartstrings like some air out of God's own presence, where justice and mercy are*

reconciled and the judge and the brother are one. We know our task to be no mere task of politics but a task which shall search us through and through, whether we be able to understand our time and the need of our people, whether we be indeed their spokesmen and interpreters, whether we have the pure heart to comprehend and the rectified will to choose our high course of action" (Wilson, 1913).

(2) *"God bless you all, and God bless America"* (Bush, 2001).

To sum up, presidential inaugural addresses form the separate genre. Since any genre has its own particular cognitive structure to follow, the schematic structure of presidential speech is investigated. Such moves as "Making pledges", "Arousing patriotism in citizens", "Announcing political principles to guide the new administration", "Appealing to the audience", "Resorting to religious power" usually include references to enemies.

1.5 Topics of American inaugural addresses

To analyze the speeches and units that denote enemies in the inaugural speeches of American presidents, it is necessary to outline their topics in general and highlight those topics that are directly related to enemies.

Coverage of this aspect is carried out on a broad historical background. To achieve that I used content analysis and event analysis (Zakaria 2008).

Content analysis reveals stereotypes of "freedom", "tyranny", "leadership ambitions", "war" and "peace" in the rhetoric of American presidents and determines the degree of their influence on the formation of external United States policy. The indicators of the revealed stable representations become the most commonly used categories, including "free peoples of the world", "democracy", "dictatorship", "aggression", "God's election", "American mission", "world leadership", "war", "military power", "armed forces", "peaceful coexistence", "peace agreements" and "disarmament". Event analysis made possible

consideration of the political situation and its assessment as a consequence of the influence of the participants in the events (Chang 2011).

Regarding domestic policy, the main categories of enemies were and are "unemployment", "poverty", "crime", "social inequality", "racial intolerance", "religious intolerance", "drugs" (Gorodnia 2009).

Further, I am going to cover topics of enemies in selected speeches of American presidents of the reviewed period (from Wilson to Trump).

The theme of Wilson's inaugural did not concentrate on the pageant of the nation's history or the Constitutional responsibilities of the office of the President, but rather on an idea of government being the enemy of the people: "*The Nation has been deeply stirred, stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of wrong, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an instrument of evil"* (Wilson, 1913).

When World War I broke out in Europe in the summer of 1914, Wilson was determined to keep the United States out of the conflict. On May 7, 1915, a German submarine torpedoed and sank the British ocean liner Lusitania, killing more than 1,100 people (including 128 Americans). Wilson continued to maintain U.S. neutrality but warned Germany that any future sinkings would be viewed by America as "deliberately unfriendly (Berg 2013). Wilson, who campaigned on the slogan *"He kept us out of war,"* won with a narrow electoral margin of 277-254 and a little more than 49 percent of the popular vote.

Woodrow Wilson's second term in office was dominated by World War I. Although the president had advocated for peace during the initial years of the war, in early 1917 German submarines launched unrestricted attacks against U.S. merchant ships. Around the same time, the United States learned about the Zimmerman Telegram, in which Germany tried to persuade Mexico to enter into an alliance against America. On April 2, 1917, Wilson asked Congress to declare war on Germany, stating, *"The world must be made safe for democracy"* (Wilson, 1917).

Wilson referred to Germany and their allies in his second inaugural speech which took place less than two weeks before the proclamation of the war. He mentioned their crimes against the USA on the sea and danger to freedom. He referred to the sinking of the cruise ship "Lusitania", which took place during his first term: *"We have been deeply wronged upon the seas, but we have not wished to wrong or injure in return".* He is also referring to the practice of both German and British ships of stopping U.S. merchant ships and confiscating their cargo (Clements 1992).

The rampage of crime became the subject of enemies in the inaugural speeches of Calvin Coolidge («*While there may be those of high intelligence who violate the law at times, the barbarian and the defective always violate it*») and Herbert Hoover ("*The most malign of all these dangers today is disregard and disobedience of law. Crime is increasing*"). They saw criminals as enemies of society.

Roosevelt began the momentous first 100 days of his presidency by closing all banks for several days until Congress could pass reform legislation and he presents the vision of banks as enemies in his first inaugural address ("*Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order; there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be an end to speculation with other people's money, and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency*").

However, he didn't mention the Second World war in his 1941 inaugural address, in it's text we can find no reference to external enemies with President Roosevelt was very brief on this topic in his 1945 address: "*And so today, in this year of war, 1945, we have learned lessons-- at a fearful cost--and we shall profit by them*" (Roosevelt, 1945). As the war was coming to its victorious ending for Americans and due to the overall small size of the speech, which was more a tribute to tradition than a real address by the president. It is more interesting that American president Obama referred to WWII enemies more than 60 years after the

end of war, but not its direct participant: "*Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks, but with the sturdy alliances and enduring convictions.*"

The excessive use of hostile images while describing communism was the main feature of Truman's 1949 inaugural address, which is known to be a starting point for the Cold War. Here starts the depiction of communist regimes as "enemies of freedom": "*That regime adheres to a false philosophy which purports to offer freedom, security, and greater opportunity to mankind. Misled by this philosophy, many peoples have sacrificed their liberties only to learn to their sorrow that deceit and mockery, poverty and tyranny, are their reward*" (Truman, 1949).

As a Wilsonian internationalist, President Harry S. Truman strongly supported the creation of the United Nations and included Eleanor Roosevelt on the delegation to the UN's first General Assembly. With the Soviet Union expanding its sphere of influence through Eastern Europe, President Truman and his foreign policy advisors took a hard line against the USSR. In this, he matched American public opinion, which quickly came to view the Soviets as intent upon world domination (Wells 1979).

President Truman announced his "Truman Plan" to Congress on March 12, 1947, and further developed it on July 12, 1948, when he pledged to contain Soviet threats to Greece and Turkey. More generally, the Truman Doctrine implied American support for other nations threatened by Soviet communism. This became the foundation of American foreign policy, and led to the 1949 formation of NATO, a military alliance that is still in effect. Historians often use Truman's speech to date the start of the Cold War (Holsti 1996).

The resistance between the USA and the Soviet bloc took major place in both speeches of President Eisenhower. The main enemies remained communists: "*The divisive force is International Communism and the power that it controls.The designs of that power, dark in purpose, are clear in practice*" (Eisenhower, 1953).

The president embodied the perception of the enemy described in his inaugural speech and took steps to reduce the threat posed by the Soviet Union and the Korean Communists. Dwight D. Eisenhower brought a "New Look" to U.S. national security policy in 1953. The main elements of the New Look were: (1) maintaining the vitality of the U.S. economy while still building sufficient strength to prosecute the Cold War; (2) relying on nuclear weapons to deter Communist aggression or, if necessary, to fight a war; (3) using the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to carry out secret or covert actions against governments or leaders "directly or indirectly responsive to Soviet control"; and (4) strengthening allies and winning the friendship of nonaligned governments. Eisenhower's defense policies, which aimed at providing "more bang for the buck," cut spending on conventional forces while increasing the budget for the Air Force and for nuclear weapons (Ambrose 1984).

John F. Kennedy became president in 1961 when the Cold War and the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union were vital international issues throughout his political career. His inaugural address stressed the contest between the free world and the communist world, and he pledged that the American people would *"pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty"* (Kennedy, 1961).

The issues with poverty, social inequality, religious discrimination and race tension were the main images of enemies in President Johnson's 1965 inaugural address: "*In a land of great wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children just must not go hungry. In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die unattended. In a great land of learning and scholars, young people must be taught to read and write. For the more than 30 years that I have served this Nation, I have believed that this injustice to our people, this waste of our resources, was our real enemy*" (Johnson, 1965).

Defining poverty as an enemy in the inaugural address resulted in War on Poverty, expansive social welfare legislation introduced in the 1960s by the

administration of U.S. Pres. Lyndon B. Johnson and intended to help end poverty in the United States. It was part of a larger legislative reform program, known as the Great Society, that Johnson hoped would make the United States a more equitable and just country. The War on Poverty and its associated reforms became a lightning rod for conservative criticism as well as an idealistic touchstone for liberals for generations (Dallek 1998).

From the outset, Johnson encountered resistance to the War on Poverty from almost all quarters: from the South on issues of race, from conservatives who thought that federal money should not be used to help the poor, and from liberals who thought that the reforms did not go far enough. The War on Poverty was ultimately limited in its effectiveness by the economic resources consumed by the country's increasing involvement in the Vietnam War (Dallek 1998).

Ronald Reagan had been devoted to stopping communism as the main enemy of the country since the first day in office. His extremely loyal position against communism has been clear since his first address to the American people (Prados, 2011). He described the "enemies of freedom" in his inaugural address and this was the type of rhetoric that he used when referring to communism in his speeches: "*As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people*" (Reagan, 1981).

Ronald Reagan was the fortieth president of the United States and served from 1981 to 1989. He became president at a very crucial time due to the tensions rising from the Cold War. Reagan was a staunch anti-communist and he has been credited as the man who ended communism. He was as committed to promoting and upholding American democracy as he was to stopping communism. President Reagan's activities are associated with the task of a decisive blow to the Soviet system, including at the ideological level, one of the tools for this was his inaugural speeches (Prados 2011).

The war on terrorism and the dictatorial regimes of the Middle East was the main topic of the inaugural speeches of President George W. Bush.

The concept of the U.S. at war with terrorism may have begun on 11 September 2001 when Tom Brokaw, having just witnessed the collapse of one of the towers of the World Trade Center, declared "Terrorists have declared war on".

On 20 September 2001, during a televised address to a joint session of Congress, George Bush said, "*Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated*" (Bush, 2001). There is no surprise that terrorists became main external enemies in his 2005 inaugural address.

He referred to the terrorists from the Middle East in his 2005 inaugural address: "*For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny - prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder - violence will gather, and multiply in destructive power, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a mortal threat*" (Bush, 2005).

To sum up, all of American major struggles of 20th century and two first decades of 21st century found their representation in presidents' inaugural addresses as references to enemies.

1.6 Classification of naming units referring to enemies

In this section, I will list the lexical units that denote enemies and are found in the speeches of American presidents of the 20th and 21st centuries. First of all, I will turn to the dictionary definitions of specific words, as well as indicate metaphors that relate in their meanings to the definitions of enemies.

Adversary is the most emotionally neutral units among the words which denote enemies in this list, so it comes the first. It means one who is turned against another or others with a design to oppose or resist them or a member of an opposing or hostile party (The Legal Dictionary). The most close synonym to this

word is the word *opponent* or *antagonist* - not an *enemy.* It describes rivalry more than enmity. This word and its synonyms are most often used in formal texts and conversations (MWD).

The word *adversary* occurs in speeches of four presidents. J.F. Kennedy uses it to refer to external enemies *("Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our <u>adversary</u>..."),* we can see the same in J. Carter's inaugural address *("The world is still engaged in a massive armaments race designed to ensure continuing equivalent strength among <u>potential adversaries</u>."),* R. Reagan also uses this word to refer to external enemy *("It is a weapon our <u>adversaries</u> in today's world do not have")* and B. Clinton doesn't break the tradition *("Instead, now we are building bonds with nations that once were our <u>adversaries</u>.").* So, we can see that in the reviewed period the word *adversary* is used to refer to external enemies, or ideological opponents.

Enemy is the next on the list, it would seem, that if the study refers to enemies the word is strongly emotionally colored, but the word is less emotionally colored than the following ones and is more neutral. *Enemy* is one hostile to another or the one who hates, and desires or attempts the injury of, another (YourDictionary). The synonyms of enemy are a foe, an adversary. It can act as an enemy of or to a person, as an enemy to truth, or to falsehood.

If we look up the legal definition of this word, which is needed, for example, to denote war enemies according to international law definition, by this term is understood the whole body of a nation at war with another. It also signifies a citizen or subject of such a nation, as when we say an alien enemy. In a still more extended sense, the word includes any of the subjects or citizens of a state in amity with the United States, who, have commenced, or have made preparations for commencing hostilities against the United States; and also the citizens or subjects of a state in amity with the United States, who are in the service of a state at war with them.

The term *public enemy* is used in inaugural speeches to designate a nation at war with the United States, and includes every member of such nation. To make a public enemy, the government of the foreign country must be at war with the United States; this term is also used to denote organized crime (MWD). In the discussed period this term was used only in 1953 by D. Eisenhower in his first inaugural address in a word combination: *"The enemies of this faith know no god but force, no devotion but its use."*

All in all, the noun *"enemy"* is used six times in inaugural speeches: four times in L. Johnson's address*: "I have believed that this injustice to our people, this waste of our resources, was our real enemy"* and *"Our enemies have always made the same mistake.* The noun *enemy* occurs in President Carter's speech: *"We will be ever vigilant and never vulnerable, and we will fight our wars against poverty, ignorance, and injustice – for those are the enemies against which our forces can be honorably marshaled".* It is also found in President Clinton's speech: *"Profound and powerful forces are shaking and remaking our world, and the urgent question of our time is whether we can make Change our friend and not our enemy"* (Johnson, 1965). As we can see, these four presidents used the word *enemy* for different purposes: President Eisenhower denoted an ideological enemy, president Johnson referred to a social enemy, president Carter marked global threats and president Clinton in referred to external enemies.

Foe is a synonym to enemy, but listed after it in my list, because it has a more formal use, so it's more emotionally colored. In the first meaning it's one who entertains personal enmity, hatred, grudge or malice against another (MWD). In the second meaning, like to the word enemy, it can denote an enemy in war, an enemy of a nation at war with another, whether he entertains enmity against the opposing nation or not (MWD). Foe, in the singular, is used to denote an opposing army, or nation at war (Legal Dictionary). Also, it denotes one who opposes any thing in principle. For example, *a foe to religion, a foe to virtue, a foe to the measures of the administration* (Cambridge Dictionary).

The interesting fact is that three out of four presidents, who used this term were elected from the Democratic party. The word *foe* is used twice in speeches of J.F. Kennedy he uses the combination of terms *adversary* and *foe* in his inaugural address: *"... support any friend, oppose any <u>foe</u> to assure the survival and the success of liberty")* to denote actual external enemies and B. Obama to refer to former external enemies: *"With old friends and former <u>foes</u>, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet "* (Obama, 2013).

Criminal is a popular term for anyone who has committed a crime, whether convicted of the offense or not. More properly, it applies only to those actually convicted of a crime. Repeat offenders are sometimes called habitual criminals (MWD). It is emotionally neutral and gains emotional coloring only if used paired with adjectives, for example, *notorious criminal*. The word can denote certain acts or people involved in or relating to a crime. Examples include "*criminal taking,*" "*criminal conspiracy*," a "*criminal* gang" (Cambridge Dictionary). Criminals get a separate place in this classification, because they were topical in inaugural addresses of at least two presidents: Coolidge and Hoover.

Evil is the last word which I'm going to cover among words which denote actual enemies, because it is the most emotionally colored, expresses extreme hatred of the enemy, and has a biblical connotation that is often very important in the inaugural speeches of American presidents.

Evil, in a general sense, is the opposite or absence of good. It can be an extremely broad concept, although in everyday usage is often occurs in a more narrow sense to talk about profound wickedness. It is generally seen as taking multiple possible forms, such as that of personal moral evil commonly associated with the word, or impersonal natural evil (as in the case of natural disasters or illnesses), and in religious thought, the form of the demonic or supernatural/eternal (Griffin, 2004).

Evil can denote profound immorality, but typically not without some basis in the understanding of the human condition, where strife and suffering (cf. Hinduism) are the true roots of evil. In certain religious contexts, evil has been described as a supernatural force. Definitions of evil vary, as does the analysis of its motives. Elements that are commonly associated with personal forms of evil involve unbalanced behavior including anger, revenge, hatred, psychological trauma, expediency, selfishness, ignorance, destruction and neglect (Why does God allow evil?)

Evil is also sometimes perceived as the dualistic antagonistic binary opposite to good, in which good should prevail and evil should be defeated (Ingram, Streng 1986).

As mentioned above, presidents have often used this term with biblical connotations, so I will try to give its definition based on the Bible:

- *"Moral evil is wrong done to others, and it can exist even when unaccompanied by external action. Murder is an evil action, but it has its start with the moral evil of hatred in the heart"* (Matthew 5:21–22).

- *"Committing adultery is evil, but so is the moral evil of lust in the heart"* (Matthew 5:27–28).

- *"What comes out of a person is what defiles them. For it is from within, out of a person's heart, that evil thoughts come—sexual immorality, murder, theft, adultery, greed, malice, deceit, lewdness, envy, slander, arrogance and folly. All these evils come from inside and defile a person"* (Mark 7:20–23).

Physical evil is the trouble that befalls people in the world, and it may or may not be linked to moral evil or divine judgment. Ecclesiastes 11:2 counsels us to diversify our investments, for this reason: *"thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth"* (Ecclesiastes 11:2). The word *evil* is the most emotionally strong among all the linguistic devices used to denote enemy. It's synonyms such as *wrong, evildoing, ill, darkness, cancer* are also used in the inaugural addresses form the reviewed period.

This word is used in inaugural addresses three times as a bare term, but has nine representations in noun phrases. This term was mainly used by the presidents of the first half of 20th century - the first to use was President Wilson and the last - President Eisenhower in his first address. In Eisenhower's address we can find an example of a bare word "*evil*": *"We sense with all our faculties that forces of good and **evil** are massed and armed and opposed as rarely before in history"* and *"This trial comes at a moment when man's power to achieve good or to inflict evil surpasses the brightest hopes and the sharpest fears of all ages..."* and an example of a noun phrase in president Roosevelt's first address: *"Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order..."* (Roosevelt, 1933).

Fear is my next pick. It is also highly emotionally charged, conveying one of the most unpleasant human emotions, despite its infrequent use in speeches, it marks very serious problems in American history, such as the Great Depression in President Roosevelt's speech. I will consider this word not as something that directly denotes the enemy, but as something that denotes the result of his perception. That is, the enemy himself may be denoted by a neutral term, but the word "fear" gives it an emotional connotation.

Fear is an emotion induced by perceived danger or threat, which causes physiological changes and ultimately behavioral changes, such as fleeing, hiding, or freezing from perceived traumatic events (Öhman, 2000). Fear in human beings may occur in response to a certain stimulus occurring in the present, or in anticipation or expectation of a future threat perceived as a risk to oneself. The fear response arises from the perception of danger leading to confrontation with or escape from/avoiding the threat (also known as the fight-or-flight response), which in extreme cases of fear (horror and terror) can be a freeze response or paralysis (Olsson, Phelps 2007).

Like the word *evil*, it is sometimes used in speeches with a biblical connotation (the speech of the same President Roosevelt features fear and denies

its significance as God's punishment). Fear of God refers to fear or a specific sense of respect, awe, and submission to a deity. People subscribing to popular monotheistic religions might fear divine judgment, hell or God's omnipotence. Its synonym *terror* is also used in inaugural addresses and is usually described as the feeling of dread and anticipation that precedes the horrifying experience.

In speeches it is used more rarely than *evil,* but we can also find its use as a bare term, in a noun phrase or as a part of a compound word. For example, as a single word in president Hoover's address: "*The dangers to a continuation of this peace to-day are largely the <u>fear</u> and suspicion which still haunt the world."* , in president Roosevelt's first speech there is an example of a noun phrase with the synonym of fear: "*nameless, unreasoning, <u>unjustified terror</u> which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."* and two examples of compound adjectives: *We have been proud of our industrial achievements, but we have not hitherto stopped thoughtfully enough to count the human cost, the cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, the <u>fearful</u> physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children upon whom the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen pitilessly the years through* (Wilson, 1913) and "*Though our challenges are fearsome, so are our strengths."* in Pesident Clinton's first address.

Threat is the last word in this list because of the fact that this word denotes a potential enemy: threat refers to a person or thing in a danger that something unpleasant might happen to them. A threat is also the cause of this danger. Also, a threat is a statement by someone that they will do something unpleasant, especially if you do not do what they want (MWD).

The term "*threat*", unlike *evil* has become widespread in the second half of the 20th century and in the beginning of the 21st. It occurs in speeches of D. Eisenhower, B. Clinton, G.W. Bush and B. Obama. Eisenhower was the first to use it in 1953 in his first address (*"We wish our friends the world over to know this above all: we face the <u>threat</u>—not with dread and confusion—but with confidence and conviction"*). But the next use takes place only in 1997 - more than 40 years

after Eisenhower's speech and in the addresses of three presidents in a row. President Clinton used it to refer to global threats in the statement *"Our children will sleep free from the <u>threat</u> of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons."* G.W. Bush in 2001 used this word to refer to terrorists: *"For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny - prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder - violence will gather, and multiply in destructive power, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a <u>mortal threat</u>."* and *" My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people against further attacks and <u>emerging threats</u>."* B.Obama uses this term to talk about a global threat of climate change: *"We will respond to the <u>threat of climate change</u>, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations."*

In total, I counted 83 units to denote enemies in 27 speeches from 1913 to 2016 (during 100 years) which means an arithmetical average of 3,07 units per an address. None of the presidents of the reviewed period avoided images of enemies: all of them had at least one, even though, some have no reference to enemies, authors who avoided them once had an opportunity to deliver one more address.

These seven terms – *evil, fear, enemy, foe, criminal, adversary, threat* – were repeated in speeches more than once, so we can speak about them as standard means. Later in the paper we will discuss other lexical means such as metaphors, comparisons, antitheses, but they are relevant in a particular speech and cannot be considered standard language means to denote enemies.

Conclusions to Chapter One

In this chapter, I have defined the main lexical units denoting enemies in the inaugural speeches of American presidents of the period under study, i.e. from President Wilson to President Trump. These linguistic means are the words *evil, fear, enemy, foe, criminal, adversary, threat*.

The most emotionally colored of these words is *evil*. Equating the enemy to evil is a demonstration of extreme hatred for him. Next in the degree of

emotionality is the word *fear*, denoting the result of perceiving enemy, because fear is a very strong emotion, fear of the enemy is a very strong experience. The third word on the list in terms of emotional coloring is the word *enemy* - a direct reference to the enemy. The fourth is the word *foe*, which is very close in meaning to the noun *enemy*, but at the same time is part of a more formal lexicon, so it is stronger in emotional coloring and has more weight if used to appeal to the public. The word *criminal* usually takes on the status of an enemy in a noun phrase with an epithet, meaning a public enemy, but is so low on the list because unlike other terms it can only denote an internal enemy. The word *adversary* is emotionally neutral and shows rather not a hostile attitude, but the opposite views, policies and so on. The last on the list is the word *threat*. Being an emotionally colored term, this noun occupies the last place in the list because it means a potential enemy.

Analyzing the inaugural speeches of American presidents, I came to the conclusion that they are epideictic because they are delivered on ceremonial occasions, fuse past and future in present contemplation, affirm or praise the shared principles that will guide the incoming administration, ask the audience to "gaze upon" traditional values, employ an elegant, literary language, and rely on "heightening of effect," that is, on amplification and reaffirmation of what is already known and believed. The special character of the presidential inaugural address is defined by these general epideictic features and by the nature of the inauguration ceremony which is a rite of passage, a ritual of transition in which the newly-elected President is invested in the office of the Presidency.

As for the functions of the inaugural address, I can conclude that it is a transition of presidential power, the covenant with people, the platform to deliver their political program points, to unite the people around a problem or enemy, that can be reflected through the speech itself. It is mainly used to convince the audience of the speaker's point of view by different techniques.

As for the structure the inaugural address can be divided into eight moves: "Making pledges", "Arousing patriotism in citizens", "Announcing political

principles to guide the new administration", "Appealing to the audience", "Resorting to religious power".

Considering the topics of inaugural speeches of American presidents, I can conclude that they were influenced by events that took place in the world before the election of a candidate for president. The subject of enemies has almost always reflected the current enemies of the country at the time of his election.

CHAPTER TWO. ENEMY REPRESENTATION IN INAUGURAL SPEECHES OF 20th-21st CENTURIES AMERICAN PRESIDENTS

In this section, I will consider the use of naming units to denote enemies in the inaugural speeches of American presidents from President Wilson to President Trump. This chapter is divided into the sections with the analysis of the use of the units denoting internal and external enemies.

2.1. Internal enemies

In most well-known dictionaries there is no definition of the term "internal enemies". Therefore, we have to formulate its understanding using the phrase's components "internal" and "enemy".

According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (MWD), internal is "something existing or situated within the limits or surface of something: such as situated near the inside of the body, situated on the side toward the median plane of the body, of, relating to, or occurring on the inside of an organized structure (such as a club, company, or state)". In our thesis we'll refer to the level of state.

The proper definition of the noun "enemy" is "something harmful or deadly", for example: The usual enemies, cigarettes and alcohol, are targeted for tax rises (MWD). That definition is the most suitable to combine with the word "internal" as it is not an opponent or a competitor and not the foreign country which the state is fighting in war (MWD).

Combining those two definitions we can interpret the term "internal enemies" as something or somebody harmful or deadly within an organized structure of a state.

Internal enemies concern economic issues, criminals and social issues. They are discussed in this order on the basis of impact they create in topical sentences in addresses.

2.1.1 Economic issues as enemies. Economic issues facing the world economy, as well as regions and countries, include prospects for growth, inflation, energy and the environment, inequality, labor issues, emerging markets. Economic issues are discussed first because they had the biggest impact on social life among all internal enemies.

Economic problems were not a popular topic among the presidents of the period studied in this paper, most mentioned the economy in the context of social problems. Only three presidents focused on them: President Roosevelt, President Clinton and President Trump.

The Great Depression, which appears to be the main enemy in F.D. Roosevelt's speeches was the biggest challenge to American economy in the 20th century. It is dwelled on in his first and second inaugural addresses in 1933 and 1397 as the main enemy and in the epilogue of the third speech (1941).

President Roosevelt begins his first speech directly with reference to an economic enemy ("*conditions in our country today*"), which is a sign that this is the main topic of his speech.

In this very address President Roosevelt infers that people actually fear the Great Depression as they are usually afraid of somebody or something, which is dangerous for them and perceive it not as an enemy, but as a verdict: *I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper.*

So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself--nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days (Roosevelt, 1933).

In the extract above President Roosevelt urges the nation not to be afraid of the Great Depression, but to prepare for the fight against it as a real enemy. This "*fear*"(emotion) could be considered as a background enemy, President Roosevelt calls it "*terror*", i.e. reference to extreme fear to intimidate people (MWD), denotes an emotion which can be felt when facing an enemy. It is characterized by adjectives "*nameless*", "*unreasoning*", "*unjustified*". It sounds more like a call for a fight since he uses adverbs and nouns which characterize traits of character natural to strong men, especially warriors, and praises those traits by units "*frankly*", "*boldly*", "*leadership*", "*frankness*", "*vigor*". Simultaneously he rejects traits natural of insecure people, named the unit "*shrink*". Finally, the President uses words "*retreat*" and "*advance*" from military lexicon to mobilize the nation and compare the Depression with the war.

Further, in the fourth paragraph, we can find labels for the depression as an enemy itself: it is described by the units "*distress*" and "*plague of locusts*". The first unit is a common noun which denotes emotion: "*pain or suffering affecting the body, a bodily part, or the mind*" (MWD). The second unit is reference to the Bible comparing the Great Depression with one of the biblical punishments, i.e. plague of locusts, which struck Egypt, from the Old Testament which incurs economic losses. The quotation from the Bible with reference to *locusts* is as follows: "*This is what the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, says: 'How long will you refuse to humble yourself before me? Let my people go, so that they may worship me. If you refuse to let them go, I will bring locusts into your country*

tomorrow. They will cover the face of the ground so that it cannot be seen. They will devour what little you have left after the hail, including every tree that is growing in your fields. They will fill your houses and those of all your officials and all the Egyptians—something neither your fathers nor your forefathers have ever seen from the day they settled in this land till now" (Exodus 10:3–6).

These two terms – "*distress"* and "*plague of locusts"* – are opposed to each other, since President Roosevelt wants the Great Depression to be perceived by his citizens as something that brings problems, but at the same time as temporary and possible to overcome by people, and not as God's punishment.

Later on, in the twelfth paragraph, the speech gives a more tangible image of the enemy referring to those who caused the economic breakdown: the imperfect bank system and stock market called *evils of the old order*: *"Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we <u>require two safeguards</u> against a return of the <u>evils of the</u> <u>old order</u>: there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits: and investments, so that <u>there will be an end to speculation with other people's money</u>; and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency"* (Roosevelt, 1933).

In the cited extract, the word "*evils"* implies the causes and preconditions of the Great Depression. Unlike the beginning of the speech where President Roosevelt described this enemy by the units denoting fear ("*fear"* and "*terror"*) in the cited extract he shows the enemy not through emotions, but refers to his essence by the word *evil* alluding to *"*something that is harmful, carrying a sinful nature*"* (MWD).

In the extract discussed above the phrase "*old order"* is also very interesting since it evokes the historical context, being used by President Roosevelt to show the contrast between his policies and those of his predecessors. In dictionaries, this phrase appears mainly as a French version (ancien régime) referring to the system of France until 1789: *"*a political and social system that no longer governs especially the system that existed in France before the French Revolution*"*

(FreeDictionary). Also in America in the late 19th - early 20th century there was a religious movement of the old order, i.e. *"an orthodox Anabaptist sect separated from the Mennonites in late 17th century; settled chiefly in southeastern Pennsylvania"* (Free Dictionary).

It is not known which of these two options President Roosevelt meant, but it is clear that either an outdated political system or a religious sect were used in conjunction with the word "*evil"* to describe backward and imperfect things. The "*old order"* phrase can also bring up the idea that the President blames his predecessors for misgoverning: *"there will be an end to speculation with other people's money"*. In W. Wilson's speech, who was the first to use the word *evil* in the reviewed period, this noun has an opposite meaning, denoting an imperfect system of government, which is at the same time vital for the country: *"The Nation has been deeply stirred, stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of wrong, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an <u>instrument of evil"</u>* (Wilson, 1913). In the cited extract the phrase "*instrument of evil"* denotes people's perception of the government, which is meant to be wrong by President Wilson, while President Roosevelt blames the incumbent government, which led the country to the Depression.

The phrase "*we require two safeguards"* is the proof about President Roosevelt's intent to depict an enemy as a physical entity that needs to be fought. The unit "*safeguards"* is most likely to refer to state institutions of president and the government.

At the same time, President Roosevelt justifies the expansion of president's power and compares the depression with an external enemy which invaded the country: *"I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the <u>crisis</u>—broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign <u>foe"</u>*.

The noun *foe* at the end of the cited extract refers to the Great Depression, because Roosevelt combines the two terms "*foe"* and "*crisis"*. The phrase "*foreign*

foe" means *"*a political entity, a foreign enemy with which the state is at war" (Free Dictionary), but the phrase is used in the interaction with the noun "*crisis"* being rather a hyperbole to emphasize the Great Depression denoted by the noun "*crisis"* and treated as an enemy.

The President compares the depression to the epidemics in the beginning of the address by the term "*economic epidemics"* suggesting that this disaster is managed in the same way as people cope with other diseases: *...after centuries of fatalistic suffering, we had found a way to master epidemics of disease* (Roosevelt, 1937).

In the second address (1937), President Roosevelt admits significant progress achieved in fighting the Depression and reiterates that this problem is more than doable in the third passage of the address: *...to solve problems once considered unsolvable.*

The phrase "*economic epidemic"* denotes a medical metaphor used to characterize the Great Depression by the term "*epidemic"* to show the all-encompassing nature of the internal enemy in the utterance *"We would not admit that we could not find a way to master economic epidemics just as, after centuries of fatalistic suffering, we had found a way to master epidemics of disease".* This order of presentation of the Great Depression in the abstract given above again suggests examples of biblical disasters like the image of a "*locust".*

In the first third of the speech, President Roosevelt refers to "*intricacies of human relationships"*, which in this context denote the rising complexity of business and economic activities intensified by the phrase "*power to stop evil"*/ In this extrct "*power"* stands for president's increasing executive authority and the meaning of the noun "*evil"* is tantamount to that of *foe* denoting the depression in the first speech. In his 1933 and 1937 speeches President Roosevelt asks for more executive power.We can come to such this conclusion because the message of the passage is identical: *"I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis—broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as*

great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign <u>foe</u> - broad Executive power". It was stated in the first address and *power to govern* in 1937 address: *Nearly all of us recognize that as intricacies of human relationships increase, so <u>power to govern them also must increase--power to stop evil; power to do good</u>. The essential democracy of our Nation and the safety of our people depend not upon the absence of power, but upon lodging it with those whom the people can change or continue at stated intervals through an honest and free system of elections. The Constitution of 1787 did not make our democracy impotent.* In both speeches President Roosevelt asks for more executive power justifying it by using phrases such as "*the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis"* and "*power to do good."*

In the middle of the speech, the word "*evil"* in the expression "*evil things"* corresponds in meaning to the noun "*evils"* from the first speech referring to the *enemy* represented by the imperfections of economy: *"In this process <u>evil things formerly accepted</u> will not be so easily condoned. Hard-headedness will not so easily excuse hardheartedness".* Moreover, the phrase "*formerly accepted"* can be related to the phrase "*old order",* which in its turn refers to the imperfect banking and credit system, from which we conclude that the phrase "*evil things formerly accepted"* is used in this sense.

There is one more metaphorical reference in President Roosevelt's second address to these imperfections and imbalances as enemies – the phrase *cancers of injustice* in the extract *"If I know aught of the will of our people, they will demand that these conditions of effective government shall be created and maintained. They will demand a nation uncorrupted by <u>cancers of injustice</u> and, therefore, strong among the nations in its example of the will to peace".* As we know, cancer is a medical term, and in the cited extract we come across the medical metaphor expressed by the term "*epidemic"* to refer to the Great Depression, but in the abstract given above he uses the medical term for denoting injustice. As we know from history (Tobin 2014), President Roosevelt suffered from polio, which had

serious consequences for his health. Therefore, in his speech he uses medical metaphors to compare the Great Depression with a serious illness.

President Roosevelt's 1941 address, the third in a row, summarizes his confrontation with the Great Depression. He again turns to the image of fear as an enemy using the synonym to the word "*terror*" as in the first speech and states that it is already defeated because of courageous and cold-minded action of the nation: *"We were in the midst of shock—but we acted. We acted quickly, boldly, decisively"*. In the cited extract the noun "*shock*" means *"a sudden or violent mental or emotional disturbance"* (MWD) with shock being a direct effect of fear.

He also points out that the Depression as an enemy is also defeated, because the government managed to get rid of imperfections and imbalances of economic system using the expression "*put away many evil things*": *"Most vital to our present and our future is this experience of a democracy which successfully survived crisis at home; put away many evil things.. "* (Roosevelt, 1941). In this extract we again find the phrase "*evil things*" and the word "*evil*" itself with the same meaning as in first two speeches: we can observe the process of recognizing, fighting and finally defeating an enemy.

President Roosevelt's successors didn't refer to economic issues as enemies until the presidency of Bill Clinton who turned to social issues. President Clinton refers to the economic enemy with the word *challenges*: *" To renew America, we must meet challenges abroad as well at home"* (Clinton, 1993). According to the dictionary, the word "*challenge*" means *"a stimulating task or problem"* (Cambridge Dictionary). Generally, that word doesn't have a connotation of hostility, but again, as it was the case with President Roosevelt's attributes "*nameless", "unreasoning", "unjustified*" it make us think that this is an image of an enemy: *"Though our challenges are fearsome, so are our strengths*. In the cited example the adjective *fearsome* shows that Clinton talks about something dangerous, in his case internal and external issues: *To renew America, we must*

meet <u>challenges</u> <u>abroad as well at home"</u> (Clinton, 1993). So, we can identify "*challenges*" with "*enemies*".

The noun "*enemies*" refers to economic problems because in the speech we can find the following extract from which we can infer that those "*challenges*" have physical nature and are connected to economy: *"We know we have to face hard truths and take strong steps. But we have not done so. Instead, we have <u>drifted</u>, and that <u>drifting</u> has <u>eroded</u> our resources,<u> fractured</u> our <u>economy</u>, and <u>shaken</u> our confidence. From this part we can infer some <u>issues</u> which lead to the reduction of welfare"* (Clinton, 1993).

The words "*drifted", "eroded", "fractured"* in the cited extract indicate natural processes of destruction or physical damage, suggesting that the economic enemy inflicted a visible damage.

Economic problems as an enemy are also addressed in Donald Trump's speech (2017) in the context of opposing the existing establishment: *"Washington flourished, <u>but</u> the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, <u>but</u> the jobs left and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, <u>but </u>not the citizens of our country"* (Trump, 2017).

From this quote we cannot single out outright lexical units which denote enemies, because it creates an image of an enemy only as a whole due to the opposition. In fact, the President does not use tokens that denote enemies, but builds an opposition with the help of syntax, namely using the adversative conjunction "*but*", whose name originates from the noun "*adversary*".

President Trump uses adversative conjunction *"but"* which does not entail the denial of the first part of a compound sentence. Rather, it simply gives rise to the implicature that the second conjunction is something unexpected given the first conjunction. In the sentence *"Washington flourished, <u>but</u> the people did not share in its wealth"* both clauses don't deny each other, though the consequence does not coincide with the cause.

To conclude, economic troubles as enemies in the inaugural speeches of American presidents of the 20th-21st centuries cover the following phenomena: The Great Depression of the 1930s, the economic problems of the Clinton and Trump eras combined with the latter president's opposition to existing elites. The phenomena named above are referred to by the following linguistic means: the noun "*foe"*, which is the only regular reference to enemies in these speeches, "*challenges", "distress", "crisis", "epidemics"*, word combinations *"evil things", "plague of locusts",* "*cancers of injustice"* portray enemies as demonic beings with biblical connotations. Nouns "*fear", "terror", "shock"* give enemies an emotional coloring. The adjectives "*fearsome", "nameless"*, "*unreasoning", "unjustified"* describe the previously mentioned nouns denoting fear.

2.1.2 Criminals as enemies. According to dictionaries, the criminal is "someone who breaks the law, relating to crime or to the prosecution of suspects in a crime, convicted of a crime. In that case criminal activities are all things that are illegal" (MWD).

In general, we can relate references to criminals as enemies to two periods: the times of gangsterism outbreak in 1920s and references to drug trafficking since 1980s until now. The first period, which coincides with the Prohibition Era in the US was during the presidencies of C. Coolidge and H. Hoover, while the second period starts with G.H.W Bush and is topical even now, because reference to drug dealing as a public enemy is found in President Trump's speech.

2.1.2.1. Organized crime as enemies. The term "organized crime" hadn't really existed in the United States before Prohibition. Criminal gangs had run amok in American cities since the late 19th century, but they were mostly bands of street thugs running small-time extortion and loansharking rackets in predominantly ethnic Italian, Jewish, Irish and Polish neighborhoods (Landesco 1932).

But the overwhelming business opportunity of illegal booze changed everything. For one thing, sourcing and distributing alcohol is an interstate and even international enterprise. Mobsters couldn't work in isolation if they wanted to keep the liquor flowing and maximize profits (Landesco 1932).

President Coolidge refers to gangsters as enemies of the law. He calls them *barbarian* and *defective* comparing the outlaws to animals*: "While there may be those of high intelligence who violate the law at times, the <u>barbarian </u>and the <u>defective</u> always violate it. <u>Those </u>who disregard the rules of society are not exhibiting a superior intelligence, are not promoting freedom and independence, are not following the path of civilization, but are displaying the traits of <u>ignorance,</u> of <u>servitude,</u> of <u>savagery,</u> and treading the way that leads back to the <u>jungle"</u>* (Coolidge, 1925).

The cited extract is placed in the last third of the speech which makes us think that this problem was not the most urgent for President Coolidge though serial criminals constantly violated the law and obtained traits inherent in uncivilized people. They are referred to by such substantivized adjectives as "*the barbarian"* and "*the defective"* which denote traits of character natural to uncivilized and undeveloped subjects: "*savagery"* and "*ignorance of servitude".*

An important element in constructing the image of the enemy in this case is the opposition of a civilized man and the non-civilized entity, both designated by the demonstrative pronoun "*those".*

His successor President Hoover also focuses on perpetrators. Hoover's address (1929) is divided into parts and he brings the problem with criminals straight into the very first paragraph after his salutation, which means that the problem of criminals was very serious. Hoover calls criminals *dangers* and uses the adjective *safeguarded: "But all this majestic advance should not obscure the constant <u>dangers</u> from which self-government must be <u>safeguarded</u>. The strong man must at all times be alert to the <u>attack of insidious disease"</u>* (Hoover, 1929). President Roosevelt resorted to a similar image, but it was associated with the

Great Depression and the state as a defender. President Hoover's deals with criminals, and again, most likely, the word *"safeguarded"* refers to the protective role of the state in this problem which means resistance. In his speech *"dangers"* denotes *"enemies"* which implies gangsters. Besides, gangsters are described by the metaphorical phrase *"the attack of insidious disease": this* medical metaphor rfers to something that ruins from inside. He gives the name of the enemy directly in the same passage combining the noun *"crime"* with the word *"danger"*: *"The most <u>malign</u> of all these <u>dangers</u> today is disregard and disobedience of law. <u>Crime</u> is increasing. Confidence in rigid and speedy justice is decreasing. I am not prepared to believe that this indicates any decay in the moral fiber of the American people. I am not prepared to believe that it indicates an impotence of the Federal Government to enforce its laws"* (Hoover, 1929).

In the end of the first part of his speech President Hoover refers to gangsters by the word *"evils"* which denotes all law violators though further on in Roosevelt's speeches delivered later it will be used to refer to economic issues: *"It must not come to be in our Republic that it can be defeated by the indifference of the citizen, by exploitation of the delays and entanglements of the law, or by combinations of <u>criminals.</u> Justice must not fail because the agencies of enforcement are either delinquent or inefficiently organized. To consider these <u>evils</u>, to <u>find their remedy</u>, is the most sore necessity of our times... "* (Hoover, 1929) and wants to *"find their remedy"* using a medical metaphor. The cited passage indicates that Hoover wants to improve the law enforcement system to deal with the problem of gangsterism: *"<u>Reform, reorganization</u> and <u>strengthening</u> of our whole <u>judicial and enforcement system</u>, both <u>in civil and criminal sides</u>, have been advocated for years by statesmen, judges, and bar associations. First steps toward that end should not longer be delayed. <u>Rigid and expeditious justice is the first safeguard of freedom</u>, the basis of all ordered liberty, the vital force of progress"* (Hoover, 1929).

President Hoover uses numerous medical metaphors to create an image of criminals as a disease from which the body suffers in the face of the state: "*insidious disease*", "*remedy*".

2.1.2.2. Drug trafficking as an enemy. This is a relatively new phenomenon in the criminal world of the United States, which arose in the 1980s as a result of drug production in Latin American countries and the illegal imports of drugs into the United States.

The first to refer to drug trafficking as an enemy was G.H.W. Bush. In his 1989 speech he clearly names the problem of drugs in general (*The most obvious now is <u>drugs</u>*) and cocaine in particular (*And when that first <u>cocaine</u> was smuggled in on a ship...*). However, he refers to them as enemies metaphorically, calling them deadly bacteria: *"...it may as well have been a <u>deadly bacteria</u>, so much has it hurt the body, the soul of our country"*. Like President Hoover he addresses the enemy as an illness, which dissolves the body, i.e. the country, from inside, though in this case that's not gangsters, but drug traffickers and drugs. Like President Hoover he believes in victory over that enemy, named by the unit "*scourge*": *This <u>scourge</u> will stop*.

Although Hoover and Bush were presidents with a time difference of more than 50 years, in President Bush's speech we again encounter the medical metaphor of "*deadly bacteria*" to classify criminals, though in this case it refers to cocaine.

Drugs as an enemy are also mentioned in President Trump's speech (2017) in combination with other crimes, which proves that crime as an enemy is still a big problem in American society: *"...and the <u>crime</u>, and the <u>gangs</u>, and the <u>drugs</u> that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential"* (Trump, 2017).

In the cited passage, President Trump uses gradation and invectives to create an impression of major problems with the criminogenic situation. Initially, the nouns "*crime*", "*gangs*", "*drugs*" are used in his speech in a kind of deduction from

the general term to the specific. Then there is a list of negative features of crime expressed by homogeneous predicates "*robbed*", "*stolen*".

To sum up, criminals are never called by the units that mean enemies since presidents see crime as a problem rather than an enemy. However, two presidents (Hoover, Coolidge) use the medical metaphor to characterize criminals as enemies by reference to bodily diseases. Epithets "*barbarian", "defective"* are used to describe the non-civilized way of life.

2.1.3. Social issues as enemies. A social issue is a problem that influences many citizens within a society (Mills, Gitlin 2000). Social issues are distinguished from economic problems though some issues (such as immigration) have both social and economic aspects. There are also issues that do not fall into either category, such as warfare.

The first to refer to social issues as enemies in 20th century was President Wilson (1913). This passage is found in the end of his speech as a justification for his planned reforms: *"The Nation has been deeply stirred, stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of <u>wrong</u>, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an <u>instrument of evil</u>"*. In this extract social issues are represented by the units "*wrong"* and "*instrument of evil"* with the latter referring not to the authorities but to the imperfect laws created by them.

Next reference to social issues as enemies is found in Warren Harding's speech (1921). He says the following about the state system and dishonest enrichment: *"There is <u>something inherently wrong</u>, <u>something out of accord</u> <u>with the ideals of representative democracy</u>, when <u>one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive war</u> while another is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for national preservation"*. In his speech the enemies are those who make fortunes in an unjust way during a war: *"one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive warfare"*. While using no direct reference to enemies in the given example, he employs antithesis

expressed by conjunction *while* to portray the adversaries in bad light. Besides, President Harding repeats the word *something* to point to the essence of the problem in the end of the passage by the phrase *dishonest enrichment*. He uses the synonyms *wrong, out of accord* to stress the problem of dishonest enrichment and to blame the government which makes it possible.

For the next thirty years the presidents didn't turn to social issues as enemies or touched only on economic problems. The first post-war president to refer to social issues as adversaries was Lyndon Johnson (1965), who dwelled on social inequality: *"In a land of great wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children just must not go hungry. In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die unattended. In a great land of learning and scholars, young people must be taught to read and write. For the more than 30 years that I have served this Nation, I have believed that this injustice to our people, this waste of our resources, was our real enemy"* (Johnson, 1965).

President Johnson used repeated antithesis to enumerate parts of a collective enemy denoted by the phrases *"waste of our resources, was our real enemy"*. Further, in the second part of his speech he returns to the social inequality again: *"Before this generation of Americans is finished, this enemy will not only retreat— it will be conquered"*. In this passage social issues denoted by the phrase *this enemy* are represented as a military confrontation by such military terms as *retreat* and *conquer*. Moreover, President Johnson refers to the problems of racism and religious intolerance in the following extract: *"Justice requires us to remember that when any citizen denies his fellow, saying, "His color is not mine," or "His beliefs are strange and different," in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this Nation"*. In the cited passage the President condemns intolerant people presenting them as enemies of society and the state comparing them to traitors by the verb *betray*.

President Carter refers to the Watergate scandal by the metaphorical phrase *"national nightmare"*: *"My fellow Americans, our long national nightmare is*

over". In the given context *"nightmare"* denotes an unpleasant dream or unpleasant situation and the word *"national*" is a marker of a scale of such situation. Here the image of an enemy is a serious political conflict, which shocked the American society in 1973.

Like President Johnson, Bill Clinton also excessively mentions racial problems and those of intolerance and prejudices posing them as enemies. At first, in his 1997 address, he refers to slavery as an enemy calling it "*awful scourge"*: *"It was extended and preserved in the 19th century, when our nation spread across the continent, saved the union, and abolished the <u>awful scourge of slavery"</u>. The word "*scourge"* in the cited extract is used metaphorically since it can be replaced with units "*issue* "or "*problem"*, but it has also a hidden meaning here as scourge or whip is connected with slavery with whip used to beat slaves. The word *"scourge"* was also used by President G.H.W. Bush in his speech, but to denote drugs.

In the middle of the speech, President Clinton continues with social issues treating them as enemies: *"And each new wave of immigrants gives new targets to <u>old prejudices</u>. <u>Prejudice and contempt</u>, <u>cloaked in the pretense of religious or political conviction</u>, are no different. <u>These forces</u> have <u>nearly destroyed our nation in the past</u>. <u>They plague</u> us still. <u>They fuel</u> the <u>fanaticism of terror</u>. And they torment the lives of millions in fractured nations all around the world"*. In the extract above the enemy is intolerance named by the word combination "*old prejudices":* intolerant person is compared to a backward sectarian by the image of a cloak and is considered of Dark Ages by the noun "*plague"*. President Clinton stresses the problem of racial and national intolerance replacing its name with pronouns "*these", "they"* or using short statements.

To wrap up, American presidents have cited speculations, social injustice, hunger, poverty, racism and intolerance as social enemies. As for linguistic means, the noun "*enemy"* was used by President Johnson being replaced by metaphorical

images ("*scourge"*), military terms ("*retreat", "conquer"*), comparisons with sects or medieval backwardness ("*old prejudices"*, "*fanaticism"*).

2.2 External enemies

Symbolic boundaries are constructed around the "national community" both internationally and intra-nationally. For example, enemies do not only reside outside the territorial confines of the nation-state but may also sit within, reflecting the "internal structure of social divisions" (Cesari 2013) as well as particular national myths, narratives, and traditions. It is therefore possible to create a two-dimensional typology of symbolic boundaries within the national community: friends/enemies and internal/external. Through boundary-maintaining processes, social agents are located in one of four cells, which are internal friends, internal enemies, external friends, and external enemies.

This section discusses reference to external enemies in inaugural speeches of American presidents from the reviewed period.

As for the definition of the term "external enemies" the study of national symbolic boundaries addresses the ways citizens engage in the exclusion of some groups from the national community (Cesari 2013). A national community is embedded in institutions and practices that are concerned with the "moral regulation of social life" (Cesari 2013). As such, it includes traditions, rituals, texts, discourses, and collective memories that reinforce and construct symbolic boundaries around the national community.

Symbolic codes are the underlying common constituents of these cultural practices that divide the world into those who are "citizens" or "friends" and those who are "enemies" (Cesari 2013). In general, external enemies are hostile elements which threaten the state from outside.

I'll focus on ideological enemies, war enemies, terrorists and global threats.

2.2.1. Ideological enemies. Some enmities, such as between America and the former USSR, are considered ideologically-driven while others, e.g. between Eritrea and Ethiopia, are not. So, what defines ideological enmity?

Ideology is a fundamental set of ideas defining a unique way of life (van Dijk, 2006). Ideological distinctions could be economic (capitalism vs communism), political (democracy vs totalitarianism), religious (monotheism vs polytheism) or cultural (individualistic vs communitarian) (Turner 2006). However, ideological distinctiveness does not necessarily mean ideological enmity which arises when entities competing regionally or globally in spreading their distinct ideologies attempt to block, harm or eliminate the other ideology or entity, as in the case of America and the erstwhile Soviet Union (Blattberg 2009).

According to dictionaries, ideological is something related to ideology, so that must be a subject of hostile matter related to ideology (Eagleton 1991).

Ideological enemies that oppose American democracy are the most frequent among external enemies in inaugural speeches of American presidents from the period discussed (Langston 2012). All in all, there are ten references to ideological enemies in the speeches by three presidents: W. Harding, H. Truman and D. Eisenhower. Also, presidents Kennedy, Nixon, Reagan, Bush and Clinton refer to them.

I'm going to start with President Harding, who was the first in the 20th century to mention ideological enemies. In the beginning of his 1921 inaugural address he used the phrase *"I wish for an America no less alert in guarding dangers from within than it is watchful against enemies from without"*. In the cited phrase the word *enemies* refers to communists as it was the time of Civil war in Russia and of a series of uprisings in Europe. First, this statement is based on antithesis rendering the opposition of internal and external enemies. The idea is that if you need to protect yourself from internal enemies, you need to be vigilant about external ones. This assumption is proved further in the text of the address by the following extract*: "If revolution insists upon overturning established order, let other peoples make the tragic experiment. There is no place for it in America. When World War threatened civilization we pledged our resources and our lives to its preservation, and when revolution threatens we unfurl the flag of law and order*

and renew our consecration". In the extract above, the units "*revolution"*, "*overturning established order"*, "*tragic experiment"*, "*revolution threatens"* characterize revolution as an enemy, because it is portrayed as a phenomenon that is dangerous, i.e. posing a threat for society. This reference serves as the first example of ideological enemies, because this revolution is an enemy to the "*established order"* which is American democracy. At the time this address was delivered, revolutions were made only by communists, so this address has the first reference to communism as an ideological enemy. The phrase "*tragic experiment"* serves here as a metaphorical substitute for the noun "*revolution"*.

The next reference to ideological enemies is found in Harry Truman's speech (1949) who used a complex of metaphors to conjure up an image of communism as an enemy. The first metaphor is "*false philosophy"* in the extract *"That regime adheres to a <u>false philosophy</u> which purports to offer<u> freedom</u>, security, and greater opportunity to mankind".* According to the dictionary (Fisher 2007), "*false philosophy"* is an idea or system which does not meet an expected set of standards (Fisher, 2007). In our case that's an ideology which is not acceptable for Americans since the opponent is powered by "*false philosophy"*. According to Truman, it's "*false",* because it opposes freedom, which is one of American fundamental values. The term «*philosophy» in* the given sentence could be replaced with the word "*ideology"*, giving grounds to conclude that if the ideology is contrary to some fundamental national values it is hostile.

Further, in the introduction President Truman gives another synonymic reference to the same ideological enemy by the phrase *regime with contrary aims*: *"In the pursuit of these aims, the United States and other like-minded nations find themselves directly opposed by <u>a regime with contrary aims</u> and a totally different concept of life".* The cited example shows that the US is "*opposed"*, i.e. set or placed in opposition (MWD) to this ideological enemy, which is synonymic to "*confronted"* meaning to deal with a difficult problem, situation, or person (MWD) with reference to confrontation.

In the following passage, Truman calls the ideological enemy, he previously described indirectly, by its exact name "*Communism*". In his speech we can find phrases ("*maintains that social wrongs*", "*subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause*") which prove that previous units and the word "*Communism*" (collective image) refer to the same external ideological enemy.

The President uses the following sentence, which correlates with the thesis that Communist ideology is fundamentally opposite to American values: "*Communism is based on the belief that man is so weak and inadequate that he is unable to govern himself, and therefore requires the rule of strong masters*". The phrases "*man is weak*" and "*requires the rule of strong masters*" are the evidence that communism is opposed to freedom.

Communism is also described by other phrases, which present it in the negative light: "*Communism subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause, punishment without trial, and forced labor as the chattel of the state. It decrees what information he shall receive, what art he shall produce, what leaders he shall follow, and what thoughts he shall think*". In the extract above President Truman emphasizes again that communism limits human's freedom by the phrases "*punishment without trial*" and "*forced labor*". The President states that it even determines what thoughts the individual should have. The subject groups "*arrest without lawful cause*", "*punishment without trial*", "*forced labor*" form a collective image of communism as an enemy.

Communism is considered by Truman in opposition to democracy: "*Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence. Democracy has proved that social justice can be achieved through peaceful change*" (Truman, 1949).

The units discussed above – "*forced labor*", "*arrest without lawful cause*", "*punishment without trial*", "*violence*" – lead to the conclusion that communism, in Truman's opinion, is hostile and dangerous for American society, and it is considered as enemy. President Truman summarizes that this ideological enemy

might even convert into a war enemy: *"Communism holds that the world is so deeply divided into opposing classes that war is inevitable"*. Units "*war"* and "*divided world"* (bipolar) are a sign that the Cold war existed and the president believed that communism was sure to become a war enemy.

President Dwight Eisenhower developed reference to communism as an ideological enemy in his inaugural addresses, mainly drawing on the antithesis of "*good"* and *"evil"*.

This reference is first used in his 1953 inaugural address: *"We sense with all our faculties that forces of good and evil are massed and armed and opposed as rarely before in history"*. This passage rests on the opposition between "*forces of good"* representing the US and their allies and "*evil forces"*, i.e. the communist world. This division proves that at Eisenhower's time the world was divided into two hostile camps on the ground of ideology, the typical picture of Cold war bipolar world.

President Eisenhower continues this opposition with reference to a more abstract mission of mankind to preserve the world from evil making his audience feel this resistance on the mental level: *"This trial comes at a moment when man's power to achieve good or to inflict evil surpasses the brightest hopes and the sharpest fears of all ages"* (Eisenhower, 1953). The phrase "*man's power to achieve good or to inflict evil surpasses"* is a reference to Plato's Gorgias: *"... with the eventual determination that no evil surpasses that of inflicting wrong and escaping punishment. Herein lies the text's first suggestion of an overarching .."* (Plato, 1871). However, in my opinion it also refers to external ideological enemy represented by communism. According to President Eisenhower, the desire to do good is the goal of a democratic society, while the desire to do evil is the desire of totalitarian rule. Thus, here again bipolar opposition is metaphorically traced. I came to this conclusion because the "trial" mentioned in the quote above is first mentioned in Eisenhower's speech in the following quote about the Korean War with the Communists: *For our own country, it has been a time of recurring trial.*

We have grown in power and in responsibility. We have passed through the anxieties of depression and of war to a summit unmatched in man's history. Seeking to secure peace in the world, we have had to fight through the forests of the Argonne, to the shores of Iwo Jima, and to the cold mountains of Korea (Eisenhower, 1953).

President Eisenhower's first address contains a reference similar to the one found in Truman's speech: he refers to antidemocratic communist forces by the phrase *enemies of this faith* in the statement *"The enemies of this faith know no god but force, no devotion but its use"*. The *enemies of faith* phrase is very close to Truman's *false philosophy* expressed in the statement: *"That regime adheres to a false philosophy which purports to offer freedom, security, and greater opportunity to mankind"*. The nouns "*faith"* and "*philosophy"* are almost identical in their meaning and in this context they both refer to American democracy. The replacement of democracy with "*faith"* is the evidence that President Eisenhower uses spiritual images to create the image of a so-called holy war. In addition, an important detail is the use of the adversative conjunction "*but"*: "*no god but force, no devotion but its use"*.

Consequently, this ideological enemy has to be suppressed by force, which like Truman's speech can lead to military resistance: *"The enemies of this faith know no god but force, no devotion but its use"*. This resistance deepens with ongoing antithesis *lightness against the dark*, *freedom against slavery* in the statement *"Freedom is pitted against slavery; lightness against the dark"*. Both antitheses create the same image, but the latter is more general as it denotes basic natural phenomenon.

President Eisenhower's second address (1957) resorts to almost the same imagery as the first one: most references again are based on antithesis, and the image of communism as an enemy becomes even more distinctly presented as a collective image by the phrase "*International Communism"*. This external enemy is again named by the nouns *darkness* and *slavery* with the meaning opposite to *light*

and *freedom*, associated with the US and their allies: *"The designs of that power, dark in purpose, are clear in practice"* and *"May the light of freedom, coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly—until at last the darkness is no more"*. In the quote above nouns "*light"* and *"darkness"* create visual images of almost black and white where communism is portrayed as black and democracy is portrayed as white.

The tendency of converting the ideological conflict into a military one also continues in the second address, but the President emphasizes that this enemy is the one which escalates the hatred in the world presenting communists as a *menace* for the US and their allies: *"So we voice our hope and our belief that we can help to heal this divided world. Thus, may the nations cease to live in trembling before the menace of force"*. From the cited extract we can clearly see that President Eisenhower declares readiness to confront the ideological enemy, though he also understands the danger of possible outbreak of the next world war. President Eisenhower also uses the phrase "*divided world"* once again to stress the bipolar resistance. The second use of this phrase in his speeches brings us to the conclusion that the world is divided between "*light"* and *"darkness",* two other visual images frequently used by the president.

President Eisenhower's successor John Kennedy also portrays communists as an ideological enemy, but he is less obsessed with communism referring to all enemies of democracy. In his 1961 address the word "*foe"* refers to "*enemies of liberty"*, because the main objective of "*friends"* of the US is *to assure the survival and the success of liberty* as we can see from the extract *"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty"*. Like Truman's and Eisenhower's addresses "*liberty"* (*freedom* in previous speeches) is treated as one of the main virtues, so the word "*foe"* here also refers to an ideological enemy and, provided we don't have any other ideological enemies denoted by the noun "*freedom",* it's possible to assume that it

again refers to communists, because in his predecessors' speeches we could come across the idea that communism was akin to "*slavery*".

President Kennedy mentions another aspect of communism represented by the newly established regimes in Latin America: *"But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas".* In the cited example, the president refers to the "*revolution*" in "*Americas*", which led to a seizure of power by "*hostile powers*" which refers to nations considered enemies to America as we can replace the word "*powers*" with "*nations*".

It is known that no revolutions occurred in North America in 1950s and even 1960s, and even till now, which leads to the conclusion that President Kennedy refers to South America and the Caribbean where left regimes, especially Castro's regime in Cuba, which was established in 1959 (Bourne 1986) gained power with the help of the Soviet Union. Like President Harding's speech, here we find an image of revolution with a negative connotation and a reference to communism, which is its power.

President Nixon wasn't prone to refer to enemies often in his both speeches. The reference to an ideological enemy found in his first speech (1969) is unusual and doesn't correlate with the ones from previous addresses. He points out that the world is divided into hostile camps, but the divisive factor, according to him, is hatred, not ideological differences themselves: *"I have come to know the leaders of the world, and the great forces, the hatreds, the fears that divide the world ".* This position is uncommon, but fits with Nixon's policy of reducing tension between superpowers. The phrase "*divide the world*" was used previously by President Eisenhower who employed visual images to portray the division. To reach the same effect President Nixon prefers emotional images expressed by the nouns which denote extreme emotions in the plural: "*hatreds*", "*fears*".

President Ronald Reagan is the next president to refer to ideological enemies in his inaugural speeches sharing the formula of the presidents before Nixon, which coincides with a new outbreak of Cold war (Bates 2011). In his first speech (1981), President Reagan refers to the opposition between freedom and bondage. The phrase "*potential adversary*" in the middle of this speech refers to those who may support "*enemies of freedom*", or enemies of democracy and of American way of life: *"As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people"*. In the cited passage, the key noun is "*freedom*" which is also employed in Kennedy's, Eisenhower's and Truman's speeches. And all who are against freedom are called "*enemies*" and "*adversaries*".

In President Reagan's second address (1985) instead of the nouns "*enemy*" or "*adversary*" we come across an extended metaphor expressed by the phrase "*those who scorn our vision of human dignity and freedom*" related to enemies of freedom, who are hostile to American values: *"There are those in the world who scorn our vision of human dignity and freedom"*.

Moreover, Reagan is the first to name his ideological enemy directly and without metaphors by the proper name: *"One nation, the Soviet Union, has conducted the greatest military buildup in the history of man, building arsenals of awesome offensive weapons"*. This sentence follows the one with reference to enemies of freedom ("*those who scorn our vision of human dignity and freedom*"), so it's possible to conclude that Soviet Union is the name of that enemy.

The ideological confrontation of the Cold war era finds its denouement in the speeches of G.H.W. Bush and B.Clinton. President Bush admits that this confrontation leads to American victory expressed by the phrase "*the day of the dictator is over*" in the statement *"For a new breeze is blowing, and a world refreshed by freedom seems reborn; for in man's heart, if not in fact, the day of the dictator is over"*. He also claims that "*the totalitarian era is passing*", which means

that the ideological enemy is disappearing: *"The totalitarian era is passing, its old ideas blown away like leaves from an ancient, lifeless tree"*.

In his first speech (1993) President Clinton admits that *a world is warmed by the sunshine of freedom.* Truman and Eisenhower referred to communism and totalitarism as "*darkness"*, in Clinton's speech we have the image connected to "*light*" which denoted freedom in Truman's and Eisenhower's addresses. Another meaning concerns the rise of democratic regimes which proves the end of Cold war and a victory over the enemies of freedom, namely, communism and Soviet Union itself. He refers to tactile ("*warmed"*) and visual ("*sunshine"*) images to portray freedom and democracy as opposition between cold and warm proving that it is reference to the Cold war. There are no units to denote coldness in the text, but such images arise in the reader's mind subconsciously while reading the speech. The text of the speech indictes that there was a warming, so it is logical to assume that it was cold before.

In the second speech (1997) President Clinton even proclaims that the US is cooperating with former enemies: ideological ones are also included in this number, because the word "*adversary"* can refer to both war and ideological enemies: *"Instead, now we are building bonds with nations that once were our adversaries"*.

Ideological confrontation seems to be over, but in his first inaugural address President G.W. Bush (2001) again returns to the enemies of American freedom, or "*enemies of liberty",* as he puts it: *"The enemies of liberty and our country should make no mistake, America remains engaged in the world by history and by choice, shaping a balance of power that favors freedom"*. President Bush mentions "*enemies"* directly with the corresponding noun referring to *"liberty"* and "*freedom"* which are close in their meaning. "*Liberty*" is the characteristic quality or state of being free; "*freedom"* is *"*the absence of necessity, coercion, or constraint in choice or action*"* (MWD). This speech was delivered before the 9\11 terrorist attacks, so President Bush was unlikely to refer to terrorists. Therefore, the

ideological enemies these days are the remaining dictatorship regimes in the world. Again, in this section we can find the image of "*freedom",* which is almost universal, so we can make a conclusion that the resistance to the ideological enemies could be simplified to the resistance to enemies of freedom.

To conclude, references to ideological enemies are the most widespread in the inaugurals of the reviewed period: nine presidents refer to them and two of them – Truman and Eisenhower – build their whole addresses around this concept. The main confrontation unfolds against the background of American rejection of ideologies that restrict fundamental human rights and freedoms. The alien ideology in the discussed period is communism, and towards the end of this period inaugural speeches demonstrate that this enemy is defeated, but even after that there are references to such kind of enemies. The main and only ideological enemy in speeches of Harding, Truman and Eisenhower is communism. While Harding refers to the possibility of communists' uprising in the US, Truman's and Eisenhower's addresses were delivered at the time of the Cold war and contributed to this resistance. As for linguistic means the main images are visual expressed by the nouns "*light"* and "*darkness"* where "*light"* symbolizes all pros of Western democracy while "*darkness"* embodies all atrocities of communism. All presidents reconstruct the opposition of democracy in terms of light and freedom metaphors as well as darkness and lack of freedom metaphor for communism. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower use the collective image of communism as an enemy ("*false philosophy", "darkness", "regime with contrary aims"*) and emphasize the aggressive nature of the enemy ("*know no god but force"*). Adversative conjunctions oppose democracy and communism by President Truman and economic enemies by President Trump.

2.2.2. War enemies. An enemy in the context of war is *"*a country, or the armed forces of a country, that is at war with another country*"* (Cambridge Dictionary).

The war enemy is the most prototypic image of an enemy. If an ordinary person were asked about their idea of an enemy, it would, certainly, be someone or something who is an aggressor or threatens a normal peaceful existence. References to war enemies seem to be an inevitable part of inaugural addresses, because in the period under discussion the US took part in two bloodiest wars in the history of mankind and many smaller conflicts, but at the same time their amount is lower in comparison to the battles with ideological enemies (Benjamin 1991). This tendency is not coincidental, because ideological resistance between the US and the Soviet Union continued nearly a half of a century as a continuous process, while wars, even World wars lasted no more than six years.

The first to refer to war enemies in the discussed period is President Wilson. He turns to them in his second address (1917), which took place during World War I, but a month before the US joined it. The enemies are denoted by the word combination "*organized wrong*" at the end of the following utterance: *"As some of the <u>injuries</u> done us have become intolerable we have still been clear that we wished nothing for ourselves that we were not ready to demand for all mankind— fair dealing, <u>justice</u>, the <u>freedom</u> to live and to be at ease against <u>organized wrong</u>"*.

The phrase "*organized wrong*" implies an organization or even organized crime. In the given context it is supposed to be a military alliance opposing America. We have to admit the use of medical metaphor expressed by the noun "*injury*" to refer to damage done by the enemy and references to "*justice*" and "*freedom*" which previously occurred in the section about ideological enemies in speeches of presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Clinton. It is the evidence that for American presidents ideological and war enemies are similar. "*Some intolerable injuries*" are mentioned in the statement above, which mean secret treaty between Germany and Mexico regarding potential Mexican invasion to the United States, The next sentence refers to the activities of German submarines, which waged unlimited warfare and sometimes attacked American vessels: *"<u>We have been</u>*

deeply wronged upon the seas, but we have not wished to wrong or injure in return; have retained throughout the consciousness of standing in some sort apart, intent upon an interest that transcended the immediate issues of the war itself " (Wilson, 1917). The phrase *we have been deeply wronged upon the seas* refers to multiple sinkings of American ships committed by German submarines, these sinkings are described by the medical terms "*injure*" and "*consciousness*", so the damage from German submarines is compared to physical harm.

In the very last line of the text, President Wilson uses metaphors to refer to Germans as war enemies comparing them with shadows and darkness: *"The shadows that now lie dark upon our path will soon be dispelled, and we shall walk with the light all about us if we be but true to ourselves—to ourselves as we have wished to be known in the counsels of the world and in the thought of all those who love liberty and justice and the right exalted"*. The cited example contains visual images depicting enemies as "*shadows*" and "*darkness*" in contrast with the image of "*light*". *"The shadows that now lie dark upon our path"* is a metaphor for the enemy. Positive images of "*freedom*" and "*justice*" are used by his successors throughout the 20th century.

In general, when we talk about images of enemies in inaugural addresses of American presidents, Wilson's speeches are unique, because he provides completely different sets of images in the two addresses: the first contains reference to social issues and economic problems, or internal enemies to oversimplify the need of reforms in the country, while the second deals with the war enemies and direct military confrontation.

Reference to a hypothetical war enemy is evident in President W. Harding's post-WWI speech. Of course, there was no real enemy. The hypothetical war enemy is denoted by the noun "*menace*" in the statement *"Our eyes never will be blind to a developing menace, our ears never deaf to the call of civilization"*. In his speech it is impossible to understand who or what was taken into account, unlike the communism in post-WWII speeches. The word combination "*the call of*

civilization" lets us suppose that it could be an aggressive regime like Germany in WWI as a potential enemy of the civilized western world denoted by the word combination "*a developing menace"*. To construct the image of a prospective external enemy, President Harding uses adjectives "*blind"* and the "*deaf"* that denote problems with human perception.

The next to mention war enemies was President F.D. Roosevelt, but during his four terms he refers to them very obliquely, rather hints at them. Only in his fourth address (1945) he uses phrases with the meaning of armed resistance to an external enemy. In the following statement the only references to the war are made by the phrase *fight for total victory in war*: *" In the days and in the years that are to come we shall work for a just and honorable peace, a durable peace, as today we work and <u>fight</u> for total <u>victory in war"</u>.*

The Second World War is hardly represented in the inaugural speeches, especially in the time when it occurred because until the official entry into the war, the United States maintained neutrality, and Roosevelt's speech in 1945 was delivered when the victory was near: "*total victory in war"*.

President D. Eisenhower's speech (1957) was rich in references to ideological enemies by the units "*darkness", "communism", "menace"* which render readiness for a military conflict: *"The divisive force is <u>International Communism</u> and the power that it controls. The designs of that power, <u>dark</u> in purpose, are clear in practice. It strives to seal forever the fate of those it has enslaved. It strives to break the ties that unite the free. And it strives to capture—to exploit for its own greater power—all forces of change in the world, especially the needs of the hungry and the hopes of the oppressed... Thus, may the nations cease to live in trembling before the <u>menace</u> of force"* (Eisenhower, 1957). Alongside the ideological enemies, his speech also refers to war enemies denoted in his first speech by the noun communists which emphasize the aggressive nature of the enemy who intends to attack first: *aggresso*r (*...to placate an <u>aggressor</u> by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security*) and the word combination *forces*

of aggression (...*the strength that will deter the <u>forces of aggression</u> and promote the conditions of peace*). Those units denote communist forces as war enemies, because in the same speech that was delivered at the time of Korean war communism is portrayed as an ideological enemy.

President Eisenhower assures his allies that the United States is ready to protect them against possible war enemies denoted by the noun "*threat*": *"We wish our friends the world over to know this above all: we face the th<u>reat</u>—not with <u>dread</u> and <u>confusion</u>—but with <u>confidence</u> and <u>conviction</u>".* At the same time he admits that the USA couldn't be associated with aggressors as primarily they choose defensive strategy in the resistance ("*we <u>face</u> the <u>threat</u>*", not threaten someone): *"Abhorring war as a chosen way to balk the purposes of <u>those who threaten us</u>, we hold it to be the first task of statesmanship to develop the strength that will <u>deter</u> the <u>forces of aggression</u> and promote the conditions of peace ".*

In the extract cited above, we come across a kind of preparation for confronting the possible war enemy. The direct reference to enemies is performed by the noun "*threat*", which combines with the units "*dread*" and "*confusion*" denoting negative emotions. Further in the sentence these emotions are denied by the President with antithesis expressed by the nouns "*confidence*" and "*conviction*". We can also find the indirect reference to potential war enemies by the phrase "*those who threaten us*".

President Johnson's speech goes beyond what was set by his predecessors, especially in the pre-war period, in terms of where and how Americans should participate in the war. His war enemy is no longer an invader who threatens Americans directly, his war enemy is the one who violates American interests around the globe.

In his address war enemies are denoted by words "*terrific dangers*" and "*troubles*". In the phrase "*terrific dangers*" the adjective "*terrific*" denotes the emotion of fear, similarly to "*dread*" and "*threat*" in President Eisenhower's address: *"<u>Terrific dangers</u> and <u>troubles</u> that we once called foreign now constantly*

live among us. If American lives must end, and American treasure be spilled, in countries we barely know, that is the price that change has demanded of <u>conviction</u> and of our enduring <u>covenant</u> ". Like President Eisenhower, Johnson uses the noun "*conviction*" which proves that both presidents resort to similar imagery to refer to war enemies.

External and internal enemies are combined once again by the phrase "*our enemies*" with the external enemies belonging to the war adversaries, because when President Johnson talks about these defeated enemies, he mentions the noun *war*: "<u>*Our enemies*</u> *have always made the same mistake. In my lifetime—<u>in depression and in war</u>—they have awaited our defeat. Each time, from the secret places of the American heart, came forth the faith they could not see or that they could not even imagine. It brought us <u>victory</u>. And it will again*". In the cited paragraph the phrase "*our enemies*" is related to the nouns "*depression*" and "*war*", which suggests that it refers not exclusively to war enemies, but they are included. To define which exactly war enemies are mentioned by President Johnson we have to pay attention to two meanings: the communists in Vietnam and the Axis forces in WWII.

The Vietnam war took place at the time of Johnson's presidency and he refers to "*countries we barely know*". WWII is indicated by a couple of units in the second quote, namely, the phrases "*in my lifetime*" and "*in depression and in war*". President Lyndon Johnson was born in 1908, so WWI occurred in his early childhood and WWII in his maturity. Besides, the noun "*war*" comes after "*depression*" referring to the Great Depression in 1930s.

Like his predecessors from Truman to Kennedy, President Jimmy Carter returns to the image of a war enemy inspired by the Cold war. His reference denotes possible full-scale warfare between the US and the Soviet Union who have access to nuclear weapons. These enemies are denoted by the unit "*potential adversaries*" with the adjective "*potential*" meaning non-involvement in an active conflict at the moment of speech since *potential* means *"*existing in possibility;

capable of development into actuality*"* (MWD): *"The world is still engaged in a massive <u>armaments race</u> designed to ensure continuing equivalent strength among <u>potential adversaries</u>"*. At the same time, President Carter is seeking to avoid military confrontation with this potential war enemy due to the probability of a global disaster because of nuclear arms which means that the noun "*adversary"* denotes the Soviet Union. Additionally, the phrase "*armaments race"* connects this passage both with weapons and war.

The last to mention war enemies among the US presidents was Barack Obama. In his first and second addresses he refers to America's former war enemies. Former war enemies and former confrontation (*heirs to those who won the peace and not just the war*) are denoted by the units "*former foes"* in the utterance *"With old friends and <u>former foes</u>, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet"* and *sworn enemies* in the statement *"But we are also <u>heirs to</u> <u>those</u> who <u>won the peace and not just the war</u>, who turned <u>sworn enemies</u> into the <u>surest of friends</u>, and we must carry those lessons into this time as well"*. It should be born in mind that America's WWII enemies – Japan and Germany – have become the country's allies while the former ideological enemy, the Soviet Union, impersonated by contemporary Russia still remains a hostile force for the US. Obama refers to "*enemies"* and "*foes"* and even strengthens the image of "*enemies"* by the attribute "*sworn",* but in general the whole sentence is a long antithesis which denotes much better relationship with those who used to be enemies. Similar rhetoric is found in President Clinton's speech about ideological enemies: *"Instead, now we are <u>building bonds</u> with <u>nations</u> that once <u>were</u> our <u>adversaries</u>"*.

To conclude, reference to war enemies is a widespread practice in the reviewed period. Presidents refer to First and Second World War foes, Vietnam enemies, Cold war adversaries. WWI, Cold war and Vietnam war opponents were mentioned during the active resistance while WWII enemies were portrayed as defeated adversaries. As for the linguistic means used to denote this kind of

enemies, the presidents use regular units such as "*enemies*" and *"adversaries"*. The tendency of opposing concepts such as *freedom* and *liberty* to their absence is found with ideological enemies. War enemies are portrayed as aggressors ready to attack the USA which is proved by the use of a number of linguistic means: "*aggressor", "threat", "forces of aggression"*.

2.2.3. Terrorists as enemies. Terrorism has become a serious danger in the 20th century and still continues threatening the world. The US has been a victim of numerous terrorist acts, so references to terrorists as enemies have been reflected in the speeches of American presidents (Hodges 2011). In this section I am going to analyze lexical units which refer to terrorists in presidents' speeches from the reviewed period. To explore references to terrorists in the speeches we have to discuss their definition in dictionaries firstly.

According to Cambridge dictionary, a terrorist is *"*someone who uses violent action, or threats of violent action, for political purposes. It can be an individual, a group of individuals, an organization or even a state*"* (Cambridge Dictionary).

Terrorists as enemies are mentioned in speeches of Presidents Ronald Reagan and G.W. Bush. In President Reagan's first address (1981) the phrase *those who practice terrorism* denotes terrorists in the extract *"It is a weapon that we as Americans do have. Let that be understood by those who practice terrorism and prey upon their neighbors"*. We have analyzed this phrase in context of ideological enemies and found a link between it and the Soviet Union, but nothing stops us from supposing that President Reagan could compare the whole state to a terrorist organization. In this quote the enemy is depersonalized by the demonstrative pronoun "*those*" like the case with criminals in President Coolidge's speech of 1925. It can be the evidence of vilification of terrorists to such an extent that their names have to be omitted.

In his second speech (2005) President Bush refers to terrorists, who performed the 9/11 act, and to the terrorist regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq referring by the following phrases:

- *mortal threat* in *"For as long as <u>whole regions</u> of the world simmer in <u>resentment and tyranny</u> - prone to <u>ideologies</u> that feed <u>hatred</u> and <u>excuse murder</u> - <u>violence</u> will gather, and multiply in <u>destructive power</u>, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a <u>mortal threat</u> ";*

- *emerging threats* in «*<u>violence</u> will gather, and multiply in <u>destructive power</u>, and cross the most defended borders* and my *solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people against further attacks and <u>emerging threats</u>».*

The noun "*threat*" denotes terrorists, the phrase "*whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny*" refers to countries with dictator regimes ("*tyranny*") which sponsor terrorism. The phrase "*ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder*" characterizes beliefs of terrorists.

President Bush combines images of terrorists and dictatorships by the units "*resentment and tyranny*" depicting the latter as the reason for the first (terrorists). In his concept of "*terrorist*" the word "*violence*" is in the centre, because the quotations from his speech given above are fulfilled with units which denote violent actions ("*hatred*", "*murder*") and danger ("*destructive*", "*mortal*", "*emerging*").

President Bush also assures the audience that he will prevent further attacks on American people, which could be a reference to the 9/11terrorist attack: *"my solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people against further attacks and <u>emerging threats</u>.*

President Trump in his speech (2017) also referred to terrorists, but not as a threat. He defined them as a potential target to destroy in the context of his external policy: *"We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones – and unite the civilized world against <u>Radical Islamic Terrorism,</u> which <u>we will eradicate completely</u> from the face of the Earth ".*

To recap, in inaugural speeches terrorist are depicted as a contemporary enemy which is still to be defeated. We can conclude that terrorism is one of the newest enemies and this topic will be referred to in the future due to a current situation in the world. Terrorists are portrayed in the same way as ordinary domestic criminals (pronoun "*those*"), but their much higher danger is emphasized by the phrse "*emerging threat*". Both Presidents, Reagan and Bush, do not refer to terrorists as independent entities, but name states that support them. The key characteristic of terrorists is violence and brutality expressed by the units "*hatred*", "*murder*", "*violence*", "*destructive power*".

2.2.4. Global threats as enemies. Some of the enemies are not only those of the United States as a country but they are a threat to the whole civilized world. These enemies are common for the whole mankind. Of course, some of them, such as the threat of possible nuclear war, of climate changes are mainly the result of technical progress of the 20th century, but such enemies as ethnic hatred, poverty, diseases have been dogging society since its foundation. Presidents Kennedy and Clinton referred to weapons of mass destruction, president Carter mentioned poverty, president Obama turned to climate change.

The first to refer to global enemies such as weapons of mass destruction in 20th century was John Kennedy. He considered nuclear weapons as an enemy, which can destroy the planet: "*...both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the* <u>*deadly atom*</u>*, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war*". The phrase "*deadly atom*" denotes nuclear arms in a metaphorical sense. The word *"atom"* itself is a reflection of nuclear weapons, it is an induction from the whole, i.e. hyperonym. The ordinary atom which is part of everything in the world is not dangerous for people, but it has lethal qualities of nuclear weapons, so it is denoted by the adjective "*deadly*". President Kennedy calls for an end to mutual intimidation with nuclear weapons, because not only America but everyone else can fall victim to this enemy that will put an end to

human existence which is expressed by the word combination "*mankind's final war"*. This phrase denotes here a nuclear catastrophe, which was fearful at the time when the speech was delivered.

In the middle of the speech, he refers to nuclear weapons again by the phrase *dark powers* which presents them from a hostile perspective: *"Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our <u>adversary</u>, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the <u>dark powers</u> of <u>destruction unleashed by science</u> engulf all humanity in planned or accidental <u>self-destruction"</u>.* To be sure that it denotes nuclear weapons we have the remark that they are "*unleashed by science"*. The idea denoted by the phrase "*final war"* at the beginning of the speech is related to the noun "*self-destruction"* used in the extract above.

In addition to this new enemy, President Kennedy mentions the enemies of society which were not defeated at the time the speech was delivered. President Kennedy refers to these global opponents as *"common enemies",* he mentions "*tyranny", "poverty", "disease"* and *"war"* as enemies of mankind. meaning that all the nations and peoples of the world must make an effort to overcome them, because these enemies are universal: *"Now the trumpet summons us again--not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need--not as a call to battle, though embattled we are-- but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"--a struggle against the <u>common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself</u>"* (Kennedy, 1961).

President Carter refers to phenomena, which make the life of people unbearable, and presents them as a common enemy using nouns *poverty, ignorance, injustice*: *"We will be ever vigilant and never vulnerable, and we will fight our wars against <u>poverty</u>, <u>ignorance</u>, and <u>injustice</u> – for those are the <u>enemies</u> against which our forces can be honorably marshaled"*. He says that Americans are the force, which can solve these problems and overcome that common enemy ("*fight our wars"*).

In his second speech (1997) President Clinton refers to weapons of mass destruction as the enemy of mankind by the noun "*threat*" denoting possible use of such weapons: *"Our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons"*. It's interesting that President Kennedy referred to weapons of mass destruction by the phrase "*deadly atom*" during the Cold war when several nuclear crises occurred. However, President Clinton's speech was delivered after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and he still promises to get rid of this threat. It seems like trying to play on old feelings rather than the prediction of future resistance between possessors of such weapons.

The next to mention weapons of mass destruction as an enemy is G.W. Bush, who promises to fight it until its elimination: *"We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors "*.

Time proves that even in the 21st century this problem is still topical, because President Obama also points out that world nations have to unite to cope with this enemy: *"With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat... "* (Obama, 2009).

Even in the beginning of the 20th century presidents referred to excessive use of natural resources which President Wilson mentioned in his 1913 address. President Barack Obama was the first to talk about environmental problems as a global enemy. This issue is one of the main subjects of his both addresses. In the first speech (2009) he refers to a *warming planet* which means Global warming: *"With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet"*. Besides he speaks about the need to confront it: *...and roll back the specter of a warming planet*. President Obama says that the problem is so serious that it's necessary to cooperate with those called "*foes"*. The phrase "*roll back a specter"* invokes fear as the "*specter"* is *"*an evil ghost with specter meaning something that haunts or perturbs the mind*"* (MWD).

In President Obama's second speech (2013) the word "*threat"* refers to the natural disaster caused by the global warming, because it is used in an extended phrase "*threat of climate change": "We will respond to the <u>threat of climate change</u>, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations"*. As a known fact, President Trump is not a supporter of the fight against global warming nor of nuclear disarmament, so for now the topic of global enemies is not wide-spread in the inaugurals.

To sum up, starting with Kennedy the presidents turned to nuclear weapons, poverty, injustice, ignorance as enemies of mankind named by the unit "*common enemies"*. Nuclear weapons named by the unit "*deadly atom"* are discussed as a danger independent of their owners being capable of destroying the whole world if used carelessly. Currently, the topic of combating climate change is gaining popularity ("*threat of climate change"*).

Conclusions to Chapter Two

This part of the paper finds that inaugural speeches of American presidents from President Wilson to President Trump refer to two global categories of internal and external enemies. The former are subdivided into economic issues, criminals, social issues while the latter fall into ideological and war enemies, terrorists, global threats.

The main economic problems depicted as the enemy are the Great Depression that took place in the United States during the time of President F.D. Roosevelt who concentrated on it during three inaugural speeches of 1933, 1937 and 1941 using the word "*evil"*.

In addition to Roosevelt, Presidents Clinton and Trump refer to economic enemies. President Clinton describes the enemy by units "*challenges"* and "*issues"* because there was no serious crisis within the state like the Great Depression. President Trump describes the economic situation using adversative conjunctions.

Gangsters are seen as enemies by presidents who were in power during the dry law in the United States, namely Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover. They depict enemies in a depersonalized form, giving them the traits of savages, characterizing the crime itself as an internal disease by the units "*insidious disease*", "*barbarian*"," *defective*".

Criminals and drug traffickers are referred to by Presidents Bush and Trump by the disease metaphor denoted by the units "*deadly bacteria*", "*scourge*".

Presidents Harding, Johnson, and Clinton addressed social foes by the word "*enemy*", metaphorical images referring to scourge, units describing backwardness and medievalism.

As for external enemies, the main place among them is occupied by ideological adversaries referred to by a number of American presidents: Harding, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Reagan, and Clinton. The trend is characterized by comparing ideological enemies to darkness while freedom is presented by the metaphor of light. Ideological enemies are depicted as adversaries of freedom by the units "*darkness*", "*enemies of freedom*", "*false philosophy*". "*Darkness*" is a color conceptual metaphor, "enemies of freedom" could therefore be summarized to be a hostile group with its armed forces that harms or weakens the power or right to act, speak, or think as one wants and is a general metaphor, "false philosophy" is a conceptual metaphor which denotes a heretic study and refers to communism in the speeches.

War enemies of the United States include the opponents in World War I, World War II, Vietnam War, and the Cold War. President Wilson referred to US opponents in the First World War by the word "*shadows*" which is a metaphor. World War II was mentioned by President Roosevelt in the context of a defeated enemy with phrases *"total victory in war"* and *"at fearful cost",* and almost 70 years later by President Obama in the context of past enemies by the phrase "*former foes*". Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson call military enemies by the noun *aggressors*, and the confrontation between freedom and totalitarianism is just

as tendentious, because military confrontations during the presidency of these leaders occurred with the ideological enemies of the United States. The ideological enemies are depicted by the words referring to communists: "*aggressor", "menace", "threat"* and *"forces of aggression"*.

Terrorists appear as enemies in the last quarter of the 20th century in the speeches by Presidents Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. However, Reagan and Bush have completely different terrorists in mind: President Reagan refers to the Soviet Union as terrorist ("*those who practice terrorism "*) while Bush refers to Middle East terrorists by the units "*destructive power", "mortal threat"* avoiding the word "terrorist" directly. As in the case of criminals, terrorists are depersonalized, given the characteristics of excessive cruelty by the units "*excuse murder", "violence"*.

The last of the external enemies are global threats. Presidents Kennedy and Clinton refer to the weapons of mass destruction by the words "*dark powers", "deadly atom"*. World poverty and disease as enemies are depicted in President Carter's speech by the units "*poverty", "ignorance", "injustice"* while global warming is depicted in president Obama's speech by the word *"threat"*. President Kennedy refers to nuclear weapons as a deadly human creation that can kill humanity by the unit "*mankind's last war"* while President Clinton also calls weapons of mass destruction a threat, but only in the context of the enemy's past by the unit "*will sleep free of the threat"*. President Carter names poverty, disease, and ignorance as enemies which have to be defeated in cooperation with worldwide community ("*fight our wars"*). President Obama is calling for unity against climate change as a common enemy, calling it a dangerous specter ("*roll back the specter"*).

As for main tendencies, in the early 20th century, the principal enemies were clumsy governments and Germany, in the 1920s, when organized crime broke out, they were criminals, and in the 1930s, the main enemy was the Great Depression, i.e. the economic enemy. The topic of World War II was poorly covered during its

course. Almost throughout the entire second half of the 20th century inaugural speeches were occupied enemies with ideological enemies represented by the Soviet Union and the Communists. Today, social inequality, drugs, terrorism and climate change remain the most relevant images of enemies in inaugurals.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The American inaugural speech has a long history - from the first president, George Washington, who initiated it, the tradition has never been interrupted for more than 200 years. The speeches are epideictic and mark the arrival of the new president, his social contract with the electorate, in which he lists his friends, enemies and problems he will face during his term.

Enemies referred to in the inaugurals form a hierarchy: at the first levels they are divided into internal and external. At the second level internal enemies fall into economic, criminal, drug trafficking and social issues while external families include ideological, war-time, terrorist and global threats.

The main economic enemy is the Great Depression characterized by President Roosevelt by the following means: the nouns *"evil"* and "*fear*", the medical metaphor of "epidemic", and the biblical metaphor of "locust".

Criminals, as enemies, are depersonalized in the inaugurals of Presidents Coolidge and Harding by the demonstrative pronoun "those", related to emotions by the adjectives "barbarian" and "defective", the noun "danger", the medical metaphor "insidious disease".

Drugs as enemies are referred to by the conceptual metaphors "deadly bacteria" and "scourge". In speeches of Presidents Bush they are named by the medical metaphor "deadly bacteria" and the biblical metaphor "scourge" as well as by the direct name "drugs" in President Trump's address.

Social problems as enemies are discussed in the speeches of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Johnson, Carter, and Clinton. Wilson's reference to imperfect governments is rendered by the word "evil," Johnson's attitude to social inequality is depicted by the noun "enemy," Carter's perception of Watergate scandal is portrayed by the phrase "national nightmare," and Clinton's perception of intolerance is characterized by the biblical metaphor of "scourge."

External enemies are divided into ideological, war-time, terrorists and global threats.

Among ideological opponents the main enemy is communism. It is refrred to in speeches of Presidents Harding, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Nixon, Reagan, Bush and Clinton. The main means is the antithesis of communism and democracy, which is revealed through the metaphors of "darkness" and "light" and "freedom" and "slavery". In addition, communism is described by the noun "evil", the phrase "enemies of freedom", and the metaphor of "false philosophy".

War enemies include adversaries of the USA in World War I, World War II, the Vietnam War, and Cold War. President Wilson refers to the Germans as "organized evil" in WWI. President Eisenhower names the communists whom he fought in Korea - "aggressor" and "threat", and "danger". President Johnson calls World War II opponents and the Vietnamese side "our enemies" while President Obama refers to the World War II opponents as "former foes".

Terrorists as well as criminals as enemies are depersonalized. With that in mind President Reagan refers to terrorists by the demonstrative pronoun "those" in the phrase "those who practice terrorism and prey upon their neighbors". President Bush characterizes them by the noun "threat" with addition of adjectives "destructive" and "mortal" though avoids the unit "terrorist".

Global threats include weapons of mass destruction, global famine, social injustice, and global warming. President Kennedy refers to weapons of mass destruction as an enemy by the phrase "deadly atom" as well as the "dark powers" metaphor while he names world poverty, tyranny, disease and war by the term "common enemies". Conversely, President Carter addresses them by the word "enemies". Presidents Clinton and Obama call the weapon of mass destruction by the word "threat." The problem of climate change is metaphorically compared in President Obama's speech with a "specter", or violent ghost.

Regarding the prospects of the study, it should be noted that the collected material and conclusions can be the basis for its expansion into a wider

chronological period or narrowing with the aim of concentration on a single president or several presidents of a short historical period.

RESUME

Магістерська робота на тему "Вербалізація образу ворогів в інавгураційних промовах американських президентів" присвячена дослідженню лексичних одиниць, які позначають ворогів у промовах американських президентів XX-XXI століть, починаючи від президента Вудро Вільсона і закінчуючи президентом Дональдом Трампом.

Робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів, висновків до них, загальних висновківи, списків використаної та ілюстративної літератури.

Актуальність роботи зумовлена величезним впливом інавгураційних американських президентів на світ, особливо в аспекті диференціації друзів і ворогів американської держави.

Об'єкт дослідження – інавгураційні промови американських президентів XX-XXI століть, а предмет – словесні образи ворогів, створювані в інавгураційних виступах американських президентів вказаного періоду.

У дослідженні визначено функції, ролі і теми інавгураційних промов американських президентів, виокремлено мовні засоби англійської мови на позначення внутрішніх і зовіншніх ворогів.

Дослідження дозволило встановити, що президенти формують образи внутрішніх і зовнішніх ворогів. До внутрішніх ворогів вони зараховують економічні та суспільні проблеми, злочинців, а до зовнішніх – ідеологічних противників, ворогів воєнного часу, терористів і глобальні загрози.

Методи дослідження включають: індукцію та дедукцію; дефініційний та компонентний аналіз; контекстний аналіз; теорію концептуальної метафори.

Ключові слова: інавгураційна промова, президенти Сполучених Штатів Америки, ворог, концептуальна метафора.

REFERENCES

Alter, J. (2003). *The Defining Moment: FDR's Hundred Days and the Triumph of Hope*. Simon & Schuster.

Ambrose, S. (1983). *Eisenhower: Soldier, General of the Army, President-Elect (1893–1952).* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ambrose, S. (1984). *Eisenhower: The President (1952–1969)*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bates, T. G. (2011). *The Reagan Rhetoric: History and Memory in 1980s America* (1st ed.). Northern Illinois University Press.

Bendat, J (2008). *Democracy's Big Day: The Inauguration of Our President 1789-2009.* New York: iUniverse Star.

Benjamin, J. (1991). Rhetoric and the Performative Act of Declaring War. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 21*(1), 73-84. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/27550664

Berg, S. (2013). *Wilson*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bimes, T., Michael A. Genovese. *Encyclopedia of the American Presidency*.

Blattberg, C. (2009). Political Philosophies and Political Ideologies. Patriotic Elaborations: Essays in Practical Philosophy. *Public Affairs Quarterly* 15 (3), 193-217. Accessed at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1755117

Bourne, P. G. (1986). *Fidel: A Biography of Fidel Castro*. Kentucky: Dodd Mead.

Cambridge Dictionary (2020). Accessed at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/terrorist

Campbell, K., & Jamieson, K. (1985). Inaugurating the Presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 15(2), 394-411. Accessed at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27550215

Cesari, J. (2013). *Why the West Fears Islam: An Exploration of Muslims in Liberal Democracies (Culture and Religion in International Relations)*. Dublin. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chang, F. (2011). Reagan Turns One Hundred: Foreign Policy Lessons. *The National Interest* 5, 3-9.

Clements K.A. (1992). *Presidency of Woodrow Wilson*. Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Dallek, R. (2004). *Lyndon B. Johnson: Portrait of a President*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society* 17 (3), 359–383. Accessed at https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

Ecclesiastes 11:2. (2016). Ecclesiastes 11:2. Accessed at: https://www.bible.com/bible/compare/ECC.11.2

Encyclopedia of the American Presidency (2009). Washington: Facts on File.

Ericson, D. (1997). Presidential Inaugural Addresses and American Political Culture. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 27(4), 727-744. Accessed at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27551797

Fisher, J. (2007). *On the Philosophy of Logic*. Miami: Thomson Wadsworth.

Free Dictionary. Accessed at: https://www.thefreedictionary.com/

Gorodnia, N. (2009). Globalization: Emergence and Evolution. *Global South* 5 (2). Accessed at http://sephisemagazine.org/current/current.html.

Griffin, D. R. (2004). *God, Power, and Evil: a Process Theodicy*. Westminster: Wiley.

Gruber, H. (2013). Genres in political discourse: The case of the 'inaugural speech' of Austrian chancellors. *Analyzing genres in political communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 29-72.

Hodges, A. (2011). *The "War on Terror" Narrative: Discourse and Intertextuality in the Construction and Contestation of Sociopolitical Reality (Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics)* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.

Holsti, O. (1996). *Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ingram, P. O. & F. J. Streng (1986). *Buddhist-Christian Dialogue: Mutual Renewal and Transformation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Kesavan, V. & J. Sidak (2016). The Legislator-In-Chief. *William & Mary Law Review* 44 (3), 42-47.

Ketcham R. (2003). *James Madison: A Biography.* American Political Biography Press.

Köker Ph. (2014). Comparing inaugural addresses of Central & East European presidents: Putting the country first? *Presidential Power*. Accessed at: https://presidential-power.net/?p=1678

Landesco, J. (1932). Prohibition and Crime. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 163, 120-129. Accessed at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1017691

Langston, T. (2012). Ideology and Ideologues in the Modern Presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 42*(4), 730-753. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/41684541

Legal Dictionary. Accessed at: https://dictionary.law.com/

Liu, F. (2012). *Genre Analysis of American Presidential Inaugural Speech. Theory and Practice in Language Studies.* Accessed at: 2.10.4304/tpls.2.11.2407-2411.

Mark 7:20-23 *(NIV)*. (2016). Bible Gateway. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Mark%207:20-23&version=NIV

Matthew 5:21-22 *(ESV)*. (2016). Bible Gateway. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%205%3A21-22&version=ESV

Matthew 5:27-28 *(NIV)*. (2016). Bible Gateway. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%205:27-28&version=NIV

Mills, W. C., & T. Gitlin. (2000). *The Sociological Imagination* (40th anniversary ed.). Oxford University Press. Accessed at: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/The_Sociological_Imagination.html?id=UTQ6OkKwszoC&redir_esc=y

MWD (2020). The Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Accessed at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/adversary

Öhman, A. (2000). Fear and anxiety: Evolutionary, cognitive, and clinical perspectives. In M. Lewis & J.M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.) *Handbook of emotions*, 573–93. New York: The Guilford Press.

Old Order. (2020). *TheFreeDictionary.Com*. Accessed at: https://www.thefreedictionary.com/Old+Order

Olsson, A. & E.A. Phelps (2007). Social learning of fear. *Nature Neuroscience* 10 (9), 1095–102. Accessed at: doi: 10.1038/nn1968. PMID 17726475. S2CID 11976458

Plato, 1871. Contributors to Wikimedia projects. (2018, April 25). *Gorgias*. Wikisource, the Free Online Library. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Gorgias

Potapenko S.I. (2020). Communicative strategies as a two-faceted phenomenon: a cross-linguistic study of inaugural addresses. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету* 23 (1), 71-83.

Prados, J. 2011. *How the Cold War Ended: Debating and Doing History*. Washington. Potomac Books.

This Day in History. A&E Television Networks. Accessed at: https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/this-day-in-history/id1436763904

Tobin J. (2014). The Man He Became: How FDR Defied Polio to Win the Presidency. Simon and Shuster.

Turner, J.C. (2006). Tyranny, freedom and social structure: Escaping our theoretical prisons. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 45: 41-46. Accessed at: doi:10.1348/014466605X79840

Vicente, L. (2010). On the syntax of adversative coordination. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 28* (2), 381-415. Accessed at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40856169

Wang, J. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1 (3), 254-261.

Wells, S. F., Jr. (1979). Sounding the Tocsin: NSC 68 and the Soviet Threat. *International Security* 4 (2), 116–158. Accessed at doi:10.2307/2626746

Why does God allow evil? Accessed at: https://newimageministries.net/why-does-god-allow-evil-in-the-world/

Williams, B.W. (2017a). Presidents change, Inauguration Day stays the same. *CNN.* Accessed at: https://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/16/politics/inauguration-day-events-traditions/index.html

Williams, B.W. (2017b). William Henry Harrison's killer inauguration speech. CNN. Accessed at: https://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/05/politics/tbt-inauguration-william-henry-harrison/index.html

Wilson, J. Q. (2010). Crime and the great recession. *City Journal* 21 (3), 24-37.

YourDictionary. (2020). YourDictionary. Accessed at: https://www.yourdictionary.com/enemy

Zakaria F. (2008). *The Post American World*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Пильгун, Е. В. (2013) *Концептуализация инаугурационного дискурса президентов США* [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://elib.bsu.by/bitstream/123456789/57428/1/pilgun_Aktyalnie_vop-rosi.pdf

Хома Н.М. (2018). Американський президенціалізм: інститут глави держави в США у персоналіях від зародження до сьогодення. *Біографічна*

енциклопедія / О. В. Бабкіна, С. М. Дерев'янко, М. П. Требін та ін.; за наук. ред. Н. М. Хоми. Львів: Новий Світ-2000.

SOURCES CITED

Bush, G. (1989, January 20). Inaugural Address of George Bush. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/bush.asp

Bush, G. W. (2001, January 20). Inaugural Address of George W. Bush. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/21st_century/gbush1.asp

Bush, G. W. (2001, September 20). President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the nation. *Washington Post*. Accessed at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/gdpr-consent/?next_url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.washingtonpost.com%2fwp-srv%2fnation%2fspecials%2fattacked%2ftranscripts%2fbushaddress_092001.html

Bush, G. W. (2005, January 20). Inaugural Address of George W. Bush. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/21st_century/gbush2.asp

Carter, J. (1977, January 20). Inaugural Address of Jimmy Carter. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/carter.asp

Clinton, W. J. (1993, January 20). First Inaugural Address of William J. Clinton. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/clinton1.asp

Clinton, W. J. (1997, January 20). Second Inaugural Address of William J. Clinton. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/clinton2.asp

Coolidge, C. (1925, March 4). Inaugural Address. *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed at: https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/inaugural-address-50

Eisenhower, D. D. (1953, January 20). First Inaugural Address of Dwight D. Eisenhower. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/eisen1.asp

Eisenhower, D. D. (1957, January 20). Second Inaugural Address of Dwight D. Eisenhower. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/eisen2.asp

Harding, W. (1921, March 4). Inaugural Address of Warren G. Harding. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/harding.asp

Hoover, H. (1929, March 4). Inaugural Address of Herbert Hoover. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/hoover.asp

Jefferson, T. (1801, March 4). Jefferson's First Inaugural Address. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/jefinau1.asp

Jefferson, T. (1805, March 4). Jefferson's Second Inaugural Address. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/jefinau2.asp

Johnson, L. B. (1965, January 20). Inaugural Address of Lyndon Baines Johnson. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/johnson.asp

Kennedy, J. F. (1961, January 20). Inaugural Address of John F. Kennedy. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/kennedy.asp

Madison, J. (1813, March 4). Madison's Second Inaugural Address. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/madison2.asp

Nixon, R. M. (1969, January 20). First Inaugural Address of Richard Milhous Nixon. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/nixon1.asp

Nixon, R. M. (1973, January 20). Second Inaugural Address of Richard Milhous Nixon. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/nixon2.asp

Obama, B. (2009, January 20). Inaugural Address of B. Obama. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/21st_century/obama.asp

Obama, B. (2013, January 21). Inaugural Address by President Barack Obama. *Whitehouse.Gov*. Accessed at: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/21/inaugural-address-president-barack-obama

Reagan, R. (1981, January 20). First Inaugural Address of Ronald Reagan. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/reagan1.asp

Reagan, R. (1985, January 20). Second Inaugural Address of Ronald Reagan. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/reagan2.asp

Roosevelt, F. D. (1933, March 4). First Inaugural Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/froos1.asp

Roosevelt, F. D. (1937, January 20). Second Inaugural Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/froos2.asp

Roosevelt, F. D. (1941, January 20). Third Inaugural Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/froos3.asp

Roosevelt, F. D. (1945, January 20). Fourth Inaugural Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/froos4.asp

Truman, H. S. (1949, January 20). Inaugural Address of Harry S. Truman. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/truman.asp

Trump, D. J. (2017, January 20). The Inaugural Address. *The White House*. Accessed at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/the-inaugural-address/

Washington, G. (1789, April 30). Washington's First Inaugural Address. *National Archives and Records Administration*. Accessed at: https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/american_originals/inaugtxt.html

Washington, G. (1793, March 4). Second Inaugural Address of George Washington. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/wash2.asp

Wilson, W. (1913, March 4). First Inaugural Address of Woodrow Wilson. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson1.asp

Wilson, W. (1917, April 2). Wilson's War Message to Congress. *World War I Document Archive*. Accessed at: https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Wilson's_War_Message_to_Congress

Wilson, W. (1917, March 4). Second Inaugural Address of Woodrow Wilson. *Lillian Goldman Law Library*. Accessed at: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson2.asp