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INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the research. The study of political discourse, its subject, features of political language and used discursive practices is the most important task of political science and political linguistics. It is known that the object of study of linguistics is speech activity aimed at promoting the emotional impact on the citizens of the country, the awakening of political activism. The development of new methods of analysis of political texts and their application make it possible to get adequate data on the state of public consciousness, dominant political attitudes on the current socio-political issues. In political communication, language becomes a tool of influence and manipulation, the most important means of categorization, and thus a tool of understanding political phenomena. It can be assumed that the neutral use of language in politics is impossible in principle. That is why the power in its abstract sense and if to take some particular officials often appears as the object of reflection, interpretation and criticism. Since any power creates its own speech practice, plays its own “language game”, it is important to analyze the “language of power” or “discourse of power” for the study of political discourse.

People with different power positions have different opportunities to master more advanced linguistic mechanisms, and a person who has the highest authority may at any time decide which linguistic mechanism is the most useful. Consequently, a person who has power determines the use and meaning of words and expressions (power tools) to a large extent. Speaking of language as a tool of social power, it is meant the inherent ability of language to structure and impact (choice of expressions carried out by the sender affects the understanding of the recipient). It is known that in some types of discourse there are certain genres that are available only for “professionals”, where “a customer” can’t be a subject like preaching for the priest, a lecture for the teacher, the sentence for judges, etc. These types include most of the genres of political discourse (public speech of a politician, parliamentary debate, program of the party, all genres of presidential rhetoric, etc.).
The relevance of this research is caused by the priority of studies in the field of political communication and discourse in order to findings processing and systematization of information on specifics, methodologies and techniques of communicative influence on public opinion and consciousness. A special place in this area is taken by the strategy of political discourse in the context of the message of the President to the Federal Assembly, the great keynote speech of the head of Russia. The stated positions of the Head of State on matters of domestic policy are taken into account by the parliament and the government in planning lawmaking activities, determining the positions of deputies on bills. Evaluation and priorities formulated in the message have a significant impact on public opinion in key areas of domestic policy.

Study of features of communication strategies in the political discourse on the example of the Russian President’s message to the parliament taking into account the comparative analysis of similar specificities of the same message of the American President will help to form in today's society the basic criteria of rational critical positions and ideologies on the language behavior of political leaders and will help to strengthen aspects of the political consciousness of the society as well as to modernize the methods of influence through political discourse in the public consciousness.

The choice of the comparison of Russian president’s message with the American is not occasional. Russian Federation and the United States are historically bound since the end of World War II., when Cold war started. This term is used to describe the relationship between America and the Soviet Union from 1945 to 1980. Neither side ever fought the other - the consequences would be too appalling - but they did ‘fight’ for their beliefs using client states who fought for their beliefs on their behalf e.g. South Vietnam was anticommunist and was supplied by America during the war while North Vietnam was pro-Communist and fought the south (and the Americans) using weapons from communist Russia or communist China. In Afghanistan, the Americans supplied the rebel Afghans after the Soviet Union invaded in 1979 while they never physically involved themselves
thus avoiding a direct clash with the Soviet Union. The Cold War was to dominate international affairs for decades and many major crises occurred - the Cuban Missile Crisis, Vietnam, Hungary and the Fall of Berlin Wall.

Thus, the language behavior of modern political leaders now is a specific, multi-dimensional phenomenon that requires special detailed study. Modern methodology of language impact allows us to study the linguistic phenomenon of communication strategies in close relationship with a political leader, his culture, a biography, way of thinking and political views.

It’s necessary to remember that the political message of the president or another important document on the instructions of the head can be made by a large group of professionals. However, making the text public or signing it the president takes responsibility for its contents. The recipients of the text are interested in the opinion of the President, but not his assistants, and possible criticism of the theses and assessments contained in the document, as well as ways of expressing it will be addressed to the President, but not to his assistants.

**Theoretical and methodological basis of the study** is represented by researches of Russian and foreign scientists in such fields of knowledge as:

- Political linguistics (Eduard Budaev¹, Lyubov Postnikova², Anatoly Chudinov³, Max Black⁴, Richard Carpenter⁵, Robert Gray⁶);
- The theory of discourse (Nina Arutyunova⁷, Leonid Makarov⁸, Elena Sheigal⁹);

---

Communication studies (Harold Lasswell\textsuperscript{10}, Roman Jakobson\textsuperscript{11});
Political Science and Sociology.

The review clearly shows that in spite of worked-out theoretical and empirical aspects of communication strategy, there are not enough political science papers on systemic and holistic analysis of the political discourse. Therefore, this aspect of the problem is of particular interest for the topic of this paper and is in the focus of author's intense attention.

**Overview and critical assessment of the problem.** Works of many foreign and Russian scientists (Gennady Belov, Michael Grachev\textsuperscript{12}, Valeriy Demyankov\textsuperscript{13} etc.) are devoted to the study of communication strategies in the political discourse, its meaning and function in various areas of public life.

From a sociological point of view political discourse was studied by such scholars as Giovanni Arrighi\textsuperscript{14}, Manuel Castells\textsuperscript{15}, Tatyana Ryabova\textsuperscript{16}, Francis Fukuyama\textsuperscript{17} and others.

The nature and role of communication strategies in the political discourse, its kinds have been studied by such foreign researchers as George Campbell\textsuperscript{18}, Alan Henriksen\textsuperscript{19}, Stewart Kingsbury, Wolfgang Mieder\textsuperscript{20}, John O'Loughlin, Harold Lasswell\textsuperscript{21} and others.

\textsuperscript{9} Elena Sheigal. Semiotics of political discourse. – M: Gnosis, 2004.
\textsuperscript{15} Manuel Castells. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. - M., 2000.
\textsuperscript{18} George Campbell. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. New York, 1873.
\textsuperscript{20} Wolfgang Mieder. Proverbs are the Best Policy: Folk Wisdom and American Politics. Utah State University Press, - Utah, 2005.
A special place is occupied by works where linguistic approaches are analyzed within the theory of political discourse. Here we can find works by such authors as Oksana Aleksandrova\textsuperscript{22}, Eduard Budaev\textsuperscript{23}, Lyudmila Konstantinova\textsuperscript{24}, Umberto Eco\textsuperscript{25}, etc.

So now in political science there is a need for an integrated study of the phenomenon of communication strategies in the political discourse, the processes of its formation and impact on the political and social life.

**The objective of this research** is to identify the communication strategies in the political discourse on the example of Obama and Putin’s messages to the Parliament.

This goal determines following tasks:
- to define the concept and nature of political discourse;
- to reveal the specifics of speech image of a political leader;
- to identify particular genre of President’s Message in the context of the communication strategy;
- to present the main features of the communicative strategy of the government in the political discourse of the American and Russian presidents Obama B.H. and Putin V.V. respectively to the Congress and the Federal Assembly;
- to analyze the political discourses of Barack H. Obama and Vladimir V. Putin from the point of reflection of their image;
- to show specific features of communication strategies in political discourse of Barack H. Obama and Vladimir V. Putin;
- to make a comparative analysis of the impact of the communicative tools in the speeches of Vladimir V. Putin and Barack H. Obama;


\textsuperscript{23} Eduard Budaev, Anatoly Chudinov. Modern political linguistics. - Ekaterinburg, 2006.


**The subject of the study** is the communications strategy in the political discourse, techniques of political interaction with society through the political discourse.

**The object of the study** is the message of the American and Russian presidents to the Parliament.

**The scientific method of research** is linguistic, descriptive discourse analysis theory is applied in the study of the topic.

The major sources of the research are:

1. Official documents - legal acts of the Russian Federation and the United States, which set procedures for the establishment and functioning of political parties and public associations, governing principles and rules of the electoral process, the organization and conducting of elections and referendums. These documents include: the Constitution of the Russian Federation, law “On Political Parties”, laws on public associations, elections and referendums, guarantees of electoral rights, mass media, presidential decrees, official regulations, orders of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Justice. These sources can detect the change of the legal framework of parties and electoral institutions.

2. Materials that reflect the political position, the activities of the Russian and U.S. presidents: publications on the sites of political associations, public speeches of leaders of nations.

3. Electoral statistics data of the election of the President of Russia and the United States, the number of votes for each leader, etc.

4. Mass media, including electronic ones. Special attention was given to federal newspapers, electronic resources, which contain articles of leading Russian expert researchers, the information on the websites of political parties and public associations.

5. Published sociological researchers. The important sources were the results of the survey of the fund “Public Opinion” (FOM), Yuri Levada’s Analytical Center, All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VZIOM), materials of the
center “Panorama” and the database "Labyrinth", the Regional Public Fund “Information Science for Democracy”. Comparative analysis and interpretation of the above studies have revealed the influence of the level of communication strategies in the political discourse of the Presidents on the public consciousness in Russia and the United States.

The work consists of an introduction, three chapters, conclusion and bibliography.

The first chapter represents the theoretical foundations of the study of strategy and tactics of modern political discourse.

The second chapter identifies communicative features of representation the main strategy of the government in the political discourse of the American president Barack H. Obama.

The third chapter reveals communicative features of representation the main strategy of the government in the political discourse of Russian President Vladimir Putin, also a comparative analysis of the impact of the communicative tools in the speeches of Putin V.V. and Obama B.H. is given.
CHAPTER I
THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STRATEGY AND TACTICS
RESEARCH OF MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1. The concept and nature of political discourse

“Discourse” is one of the most difficult concepts in the field of humanitarian sciences. However, it does not exist as a material substance, but it is “a real tool of cognition…. it is real epistemologically, not ontologically”\(^{26}\). The concept of “discourse” has now become extremely popular, what resulted in a multiplicity of its interpretations. So, Patrick Serio speaking of “discourse” within the understanding of French linguists identifies a number of meanings of the term: as a speech in the understanding of Ferdinand de Saussure, a text and a context, a conversation, etc.

T.A. Van Dijk, a famous researcher of discourse analysis, also writes about the difficulties of understanding of the term. “Unfortunately by analogy with the related concepts of “language”, “communication”, “interaction”, “society” and “culture”, the concept of “discourse” is very vague. It is often the case with terms denoting some complicated phenomena when in formulating the definitions we need a whole discipline. And in this case it is a new interdisciplinary research field of discourse (also called “discourse analysis”)\(^{27}\). “According to T.A. Van Dijk, the main difficulty in defining “discourse” is that the phenomenon under study is heterogeneous and tends to include different aspects of communication, what in its turn determines the interdisciplinary study of discourse. “... We have already identified three main dimensions [of discourse]: (a) the use of language, (b) statement of opinion (cognition), and (c) interaction in social situations. Taking into account the existence of these dimensions, it is not surprising that several


disciplines are involved in the study of discourse: linguistics (to study the language and its use), psychology (to study opinions and ways of expression) and social sciences (to analyze the cases of interaction in social situations)"28.

It’s important to note that difficulty of defining the concept of “discourse” is determined not only by the complexity of the phenomenon that it denotes, but also by school or direction which gives a definition. As mentioned above, “discourse” is a complex and vague concept and can be used by sociologists (eg, Foucault), by representatives of critical linguistics (eg, Fowler), and finally, by representatives of critical discourse analysis (eg, Van Dijk). All of them give different definitions of discourse according to their disciplinary and theoretical positions”29. Below there are some of the most popular interpretations of the term.

As a rule “discourse” is connected with the concepts of “situation” and “text”. This approach is suggested by Nina Arutyunova who figuratively describes the discourse as “a coherent text in conjunction with the extralinguistic - pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors; the text taken as an event; speech treated as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and their mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes). “Figuratively speaking, discourse is a “speech in life”30.

Sometimes, instead of situational aspect, activity aspect of discourse is stressed, “discourse is the language in action, and the study of discourse involves the study both of language and action”31.

In addition, discourse can be understood as the dynamic unfolding of the text. “A distinction between text and discourse is often made in linguistics. <...> We can use the term “text” to denote the observed product of interaction: a cultural object, and discourse to denote the process of interaction: cultural activities. <...> The discourse is not a product, it is a process. To analyze it, it is necessary to take into

---

account the actual text, and interaction, and the context in which the given text is placed”.

Vladimir Bogdanov has the similar point of view. He considers discourse to be a combination of two aspects - text and speech. As a result, discourse is understood as what is said and what is written, and there are inclusive attitude between text and speech on the one hand, and the discourse on the other hand:: text and speech are specific concepts in relation to discourse.

Mikhail Makarov speaks about the different definitions of the concept in terms of formalism and functionalism: from a formal point of view discourse is the language of higher level than a sentence or a word phrase. The functional approach involves an analysis of the functions of discourse in the social context and defines discourse as any use of language. Formally, the functional approach combines both above mentioned approaches and explores the language units and their contextual function.

A special place in interpretations of discourse is occupied by the concept of Michel Foucault, who defines discourse as “a set of anonymous historical rules, always determined in time and space, which set terms of the performing expression in the given period of time and for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic area”. It is “a set of statements”, belonging to a certain age. As a result, the discourse becomes not only and not so much situational but much broader situational and of great historical significance because discourse is also a socio-historical information, background. That is Foucault tends to philosophical understanding of the term rather than linguistic.

Despite the multiplicity of interpretations of discourse, the present work is based on Chernyavskaya’s understanding of the term who highlights two values of the studied concept. In the first case the discourse is a “specific communicative

---

event, fixed in written texts and spoken language, carried out in a specific
cognitive and typological communicative space”36. Thus, discourse is understood
as a single communicative event, analyzed individually, taking into account
situation, extralinguistic background - social factors. In this case we can speak of
discourse in Arutyunova’s understanding as “a coherent text together with
extralinguistic - pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors; the text
taken as an event; speech taken as a purposeful social action, as a component
involved in the interaction of people and their mechanisms of consciousness
(cognitive processes)”37. Here discourse is not opposed to the text, but also it is not
identical to the text. Discourse only leads to the formation of the text: “Specific
texts constitute the empirical basis for the description of discourse”38.

The second meaning implies that the discourse is “a set of thematically
correlated texts: texts that are grouped in a discourse addressed one way or another
to a common theme”. In this case, the “content of discourse is revealed not by one
single text, but intertextually in the complex interaction of many separate texts”39.
Thus, discourse is not an individual case, but a series of thematically unified texts.
In this sense we can talk about different types of discourse, such as economic, legal,
media, political, etc., where the same text can be related to various types of
discourse.

None of the presented values contradict the other; moreover one can imply
or enlarge the other. As a result, summing up the two approaches, we can conclude
that “according to the research objectives discourse indicates a single specific
communicative event in one case, in the other it implies a communicative event as
an integrative set of certain communicative acts which result in meaningful and

36 Valeria Chernyavskaya. Discourse of power and the power of discourse: the problems of speech influence. - M.
38 Valeria Chernyavskaya. Discourse of power and the power of discourse: the problems of speech influence. - M.
39 Ibid. – p. 77.
thematic unity of many texts”⁴⁰. So the raw material of discourse research will always be the text, a specific linguistic realization.

According to Valeriya Chernyavskaya, “two approaches are complementing each other, and in the practice of linguistic analysis of discourse and illustrating texts we should consider both”⁴¹.

The political discourse is one of the best known and most thoroughly studied species of discourse. Such popularity of political discourse is connected with the fact that the subject of its study is one of the most important spheres of human activity – politics as we face it every day.

The given concept - politics - is a very heterogeneous phenomenon. Researchers have identified a number of levels of the term:

1. *Politics as a management of society*. Politics is an activity of the administration of any public processes. In terms of content this activity is presented as a solution of all problems, except for moral ones, as authoritative allocation of values, as a means of conflict resolution.

2. *The substantial level* indicates the essence of politics, emphasizes its direct relationship with the government. Politics is either control using power, or the struggle for gaining and maintaining power.

3. *Institutional level* suggests the existence of organizations that materializes power (various government institutions).

4. *Sociological level* considers society as a structure which consists of a variety of groups with their own interests and needs, where the main tool of realization is power. The policy in this case is the way of action of social groups to defend their interests and meet their needs.

5. *Teleological level* indicates the policy as a special form of human existence, associated with the personal goal-achievement and self-organization.

Politics, therefore, involves several aspects which superimposed on each other and organize the complex structure of relationships and interdependencies.

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 77.
Altogether these aspects are an integral part of society and make research in the framework of political linguistics complicated.

It is believed that political communication is carried out using a special version of the language which is possible to allocate as a separate, political language. Other researchers on the contrary hold the opinion that political communication does not go beyond the norms of language and is carried out by native speakers. Thus, the separation of political language in a separate subsystem is not justified.

Here Anatoly Chudinov fairly notices that the term “political language” has the right to exist, as the terms “spoken language”, “scientific language” have the same features as political language, however, they do exist. Therefore “political language is a variant of national language focused on the political sphere”42.

Elena Sheigal agrees with this point of view and adds an element of “sub-language” to the formula “discourse= text + context”. So the final formula is following: “the political discourse = sub-language+text + context” which captures the essence of the concept of “political discourse”43.

The intentional base of political discourse Elena Sheigal considers the struggle for power. According to this there are five main functions of political discourse:

- Integration and differentiation of group participants in the political process;
- Agony and harmonization of relations between participants in the political process;
- Function of action (in politics “to talk” means “to do”);
- The function of interpretation (the creation of the “linguistic reality” of politics);
- The supervisory and regulatory functions (manipulation of consciousness and control of actions of politicians and the electorate)44.

44 Ibid. P. 11.
There is no doubt that all the functions of political discourse are defined by specificity of the political sphere, which it reflects. As can be seen, political discourse is able simultaneously to integrate and differentiate between political actors (political leaders, members of the electorate, etc.) depending on the rhetoric of these participants, what affects in its turn on harmony or agony of relations within the discourse. The communicative orientation of discourse is also stressed as any act is done through communication. Communication can even replace the activity or can be the only expression of activity. In addition to it, political discourse can track the behavior of its members, indicating who uses this or that tool of influence to gain popularity.

The fact is that the political discourse not only reflects the political sphere, but also forms its specific characteristics:
- The predominance of mass destination;
- The dominant role of emotive factor;
- A significant proportion of real communication (often it is more important not the message, but the fact that it is uttered);
- The semantic uncertainty associated with some phantom denotations (the significance of the moment of faith as a display of irrational political discourse);
- Esoteric, which is shown as a pragmatic category, what leads to the use of such strategies as euphemization and deliberate evasiveness;
- Mediate of political communication by mass media. Its members play the role of a mediator, which is expressed in the following functional options: a repeater, a storyteller, an entertainer, an interviewer, a pseudo-commentator and a commentator;
- The theatricality of political discourse;
- The dynamics of political language due to topicality of reflected realities and unsteadiness of the political situation\footnote{Elena Sheigal. Semiotics of political discourse. – M., Gnosis, 2004. - p. 12.}.

The researchers also note the interacting component of political discourse. The “impact” is understood as a socio-psychological activity “aimed at people and
groups in order to change the psychological characteristics of the individual, group norms, public opinion, attitudes and experiences”

So the political discourse is a special kind of discourse that implies the investigation of the political sphere of society and complicated by purely linguistic difficulties and peculiarities.

The current direction of political discourse linguistics exists in two versions: a critical discourse analysis and descriptive analysis. Representatives of critical discourse analysis have an active social position. Their work aims “to explore the ways with the help of which social power realizes its dominance in society”, to figure out “how social inequality is prescribed and reproduced through communicative activities”.

“Critical discourse analysis pays special attention to the interdisciplinary study of discourse, which is the link between linguistic and social studies, and considers “social” as something more than just contextual background texts. <...> A critical discourse analysis, therefore, is engaged in a wide range of social issues, calls to such external factors as ideology, power, inequality, etc., and is also based on the social and philosophical theory to analyze and interpret written and spoken texts”. The main representatives of critical discourse analysis are N. Fairclough, R. Wodak, T.A. van Dijk, R. Fowler, E. Lassan, J.N. Guards, etc.

The descriptive discourse analysis, based on the fact that scientific research should be objective, tries to avoid a subjective assessment, tries only to describe and explain the analyzed phenomena, avoiding its own ideological evaluation. Representatives of this school are M. Atkinson, W. Berghsdorf, D. Grieswelle, P.B. Parshin, etc.

At this point descriptive line splits into descriptive rhetorical and descriptive meaningful. The first one is based on the works of the great orators of antiquity and studies the language behavior of politicians: an analysis of linguistic means,

---

The manipulative techniques they use in their speeches. The second line analyzes the content side of the text. A critical approach investigates the problem of social inequality expressed in political discourse\textsuperscript{49}.

In the above mentioned interpretations of the term “discourse” understanding of this phenomenon invariably relies on the “text”. For this reason, it is important to define the concept in order to outline more clearly the scope of understanding of “discourse” for this study.

Traditionally the “text” is defined as “a unified semantic connection sequence of the units, the basic properties of which are continuity and integrity”\textsuperscript{50}. By “units” we usually understand verbal signs, and text analysis examines the external formal features of the text itself, and it also ends in them. Discourse analysis on the contrary allows “to focus not only on the external formal attributes of the text, but on a number of extra-linguistic factors accompanying the formation and updating, and it is very important”\textsuperscript{51}.

Thus, the concept of discourse significantly enhances text description, emphasizing the importance of study of extra-linguistic factors accompanying communication. “The discourse is not limited only by the scope of language. It also examines the entire contents of communication: who, with whom and why is communicating, what social status they have, and what socio-historical situation is like, what channels are used, how involved types of communication interact with each other”\textsuperscript{52}.

The fact that discourse studies extralinguistic context, of course, complicates the understanding of the “text”. To have as an object of study the political discourse is even more difficult.

The current political discourse is very closely connected with media environment: “... politics, media and publicity has been always viewed as a macro-


\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.


Structural phenomenon, and theoretical interpretation of such fields of knowledge as sociology, advertising and political communication have explained the relationship between them”\(^\text{53}\). Politics and media are in relations of “symbiosis”. Most part of politics is “hidden” and only some part of it open to the public. At this point politics and mass media come to contact. Politicians are often accused of using media as a tool of influence, and media is accused in denying of playing the role of an independent observer and a critic of the political sphere, as well in having an entertaining nature of giving information.

Besides, political discourse and media have rather complicated relations. Gerda Eva Lauerbah and Anita Fetzer, in their book “Political Discourse in the Media: Cross-cultural Perspectives” view political discourse as a phenomenon mediated by the media. “Political discourse in the media is viewed as a complex phenomenon: an institutional, media and mediated political discourse. As an institutional discourse, it is different from everyday conversation by the subject of institutional goals and procedures. As media discourse it is different from other types of institutional discourses mainly by the fact that it is a public discourse addressed to the media audience. It distinguishes political discourse from other types of institutional discourses such as medicine, law or education. As mediated political discourse it is the result of a collision between two different institutional discourses - political and media”\(^\text{54}\). Thus, the political discourse appears, on the one hand, as an independent institutional discourse, and on the other hand as the media discourse. When different types of discourses are met, political discourse mediated by the media is formed, which implements its institution by means of another institution – mass media. Elena Sheigal also stresses the fact of jointing the political discourse and the discourse of the media: “discourse of the media plays a special role in the existence of political discourse, which is the main channel of political communication in modern time”\(^\text{55}\).


\(^{54}\) Ibid. – p. 14.

For this reason there are broad interpretations of discourse and texts which interpret them as phenomena of mass media. T.A. Van Dijk writes that discourse can be interpreted in a broad semiotic sense. “It implies the existence of such visual structures as a scheme, a written or printed font or text, as well as gestures, facial expressions and other semiotic signs of oral speech. This concept [discourse] can include a combination of sounds and images in many mixed media discourses, such as films, television, mobile phones, the Internet and other media and channels of communication”\(^{56}\). The text in the current researches increasingly gets the prefix “media” and is viewed through the prism of its relations with the media., the Alan Bell, a famous explorer of media language, in his book “Approaches to Media Discourse” writes: “The definition of the media text goes beyond the traditional view of the text as a sequence of words printed or written on paper. The concept of the media text is much broader: it includes voice qualities, music and sound effects, visual images - in other words, the media texts actually reflect the technologies used in their production and expansion”\(^{57}\). Thus, the text in the media discourse is treated as “a sequence of any signs, not only verbal ones”\(^{58}\).

Of course, the described above approach to political discourse as an institution mediated by mass media expands and complicates the understanding of the text and discourse. However, it appears that nowadays only the understanding of these terms can be considered adequate; it fully meets the challenges of the scientific and technological progress and fits the appropriate level of social development. Otherwise, a number of current issues on political linguistics will be excluded from the field of research.


1.2. Special aspects of political leader’s speech image development

Recently the concept of the image has become very popular. Such word combinations as “the image of a man”, “corporate image”, “the image of the country” are more often met today. In general sense the image is the form that for some reasons is to replace the real object or represent some person or some other entity for people. Usually the reason that a certain object or subject needs to create a certain image, is the need to ensure its viability and success of its activity in society.

The subjects of this article are image-forming communication strategies and tactics, as well as means of forming speech image. One of such means is a speech act (SA) of self-presentation. According to the taxonomy of John Searle, SA of self-presentation refers to assertiveness or representativeness, the purpose of which is to fix the responsibility (in different degrees) for reporting about some certain situation, for the truth of the expressed opinion. For SA of self-presentation this purpose is to form a listener’s definite opinion or an idea about the speaker, “some things” that are individual characteristics of the speaker, which are the most advantageous for gaining the purpose at the moment.

Participants share a common communicative context, which consists of such components as place and time of the conversation, the cause of its initiation, individual expectations, and representations of speakers about its potential development. Naturally these views of the speakers do not necessarily coincide, however if one of the communicants knows the ropes in the current communicative situation, he is able to predict the expectations of others and can build his verbal behavior according to them, then the illocutionary goal of SA of self presentation is achieved very easily, and the hearer gets that very idea about the identity of the speaker, which was intended to get by initiating the act. Thus, the strategy of

forming the speech image refers to a type of pragmatic strategies, as the speaker acts according to the situation of communication.

To create his own image the speaker usually chooses a role or roles and the corresponding speech “mask”. This choice is based on the prediction of the audience, its expectations and, in fact, it is a communicative strategy of self presentation. Methods or communicative steps chosen to realize it are called speech tactics\(^61\). To describe such speech behavior addressee chooses roles and “labels” them, he gives them names which represent the most important components of the image of the speaker. As a rule, image-making roles are communication roles which are used in the communicative situation to achieve some practical purpose: “Cheery fellow”, “Straight man”\(^62\) etc.

It is known that political discourse is the area of the most active and purposeful image-making process due to the direct dependence of the position and status of the official from public opinion.

It allows analyzing patterns of creating the speech image and its structure more clearly.

There are some major components of verbal behavior which are necessary to get the positive image of a political leader or speaker by the listeners (and readers) and which allow the subject of speech to be in a favorable light of such categories as literacy, erudition, expertise, democracy, influence\(^63\).

1. The first requirement to political speaker’s speech is literacy, adherence to all the rules of language: pronunciation, accent, word usage, etc. Abnormalities in verbal and nominal structures, syntactic organization of speech, orthoepy errors, breaking of word-formation rules, semantic errors in the choice of words make doubt in speaker's literacy; greatly reduce the effectiveness of the performance. If the speaker doesn’t know the precise meaning of the word, the negative effect of the speech is enhanced not only because of the intolerable expressions which are


contrary to the canons of statutory, but also in connection with the logical absurdities, which often occur. It is well known that the accuracy of the language is closely connected with the culture of thinking, it shows how deeply the speaker has studied the subject of speech; even the most insignificant uncertainty inevitably leads to confusion in the words and structures.

2. A major weak point of public speaking is also its excessive use of books and means of the written language. Excessive using of books leads to the saturation of text with abstract vocabulary, words of high stylistic coloring, special terminology. Thus, in the study of population it is quite appropriate to use some terminology structures but in oral public speech they reduce its effectiveness.

3. If the speech is full of borrowings what is known to become a hallmark of modern political rhetoric, then negative attitude is sure to appear. Realizing that the interpenetration of separate individual elements of different cultures cannot be stopped, that socio-political changes in Russian society inevitably activate the processes of borrowing words, the abuse of this lexicon in Russian politicians’ speeches is marked. It can be explained by several reasons of such particular speech behavior, not good for the speaker: devotion to all foreign things, the desire to show off, to demonstrate one’s erudition; to hide one’s poor language using fine words. The consequences of such usage of the language are ambiguity and even unavailability to understand the content, listeners’ estrangement from the speaker.

It should be noted, however, that recipients whom a political leader addresses the message to are not under very puristic mood: if the borrowing is used appropriately, if specific situational factors or semantic necessity is taken into account, then there is no problem. For borrowings of this kind the following words are usually referred: the farmer, the design, the sponsor, consensus, management, marketing, broker, business, etc. Speaker’s unwillingness to take care of the plainness and simplicity of the speech can be understood as a lack of desire to be with the listeners and prejudice of his democratic image.

4. The majority of listeners have also negative reaction if the speech is full of “clerk words” (“kantselyarism”, the term was introduced by Korney
Chukovskii\textsuperscript{64}). Possible signs of such words are displacement of the verb by a participle, a gerund, a verbal noun, many nouns in objective cases, using passive constructions instead of active ones, too long phrases, poor vocabulary, stamps and idiomatic expressions, business clichés, the words of desolate semantics which have pseudo-scientific color etc.

5. Such “clerk words”, these standard stamps in oratorical practice often coexists with other “evil” of speech – a “new language”, which is defined by linguists as a sub-language, which appeared in the offices of politicians as a reflection of official and semi-official picture of the world by language means\textsuperscript{65}. This “new language” has recently become the subject of specialists’ study and the study is needed to be continued. But the obvious damage that this “new language” brings to a speaker is evident. It forms the static picture of attitude with the system of compulsory evaluation dictated by authorities, destroys the creative and personal principles in the use of language and, therefore, in thinking. Linguists have identified the main features of the “new language”: the lack of personal principles in the text, its impersonality, universality of addressing. These features are manifested in certain language signals; widespread constructions without subject as well as all kinds of passive forms in which a real actor is hidden in the background; prevalence of imperfective verbs\textsuperscript{66}, etc.

Thus, “new language” reduces the effectiveness of speaker’s speech and the image of a political leader loses such characteristics as democratic features and capability of influence.

6. There are some characteristics of the speech image which enhance the attractiveness of the political speaker. Evaluative logical registers in the structure of the text, using special language features implementing such important communication skills as expressiveness, and in some cases emotionality, keep

\textsuperscript{64} Clerk words (“kantselyarism”) are the invasion of official style in the sphere of political rhetoric, journalism.


attention and interest of the recipients. The characteristics of the speech image which enhance the attractiveness of a political orator and potential expressiveness are proverbs, aphorisms, quotations, comparisons, emotionally estimated and conversational vocabulary, and also special techniques that introduce elements of artistry in public word: trope (a metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, etc.), allusions, rhetorical syntax (rhetorical question, plurality of enumerations, syntactic parallelism, antithesis, etc.), diversity in the use of syntax, idioms.

Indeed, the expressiveness as a characteristic of the speaker's speech, including a political one, relies primarily on these linguistic and paralinguistic means: it defines not only the degree of impact of the speech, but also highlights such traits of the speaker's personality as high level of culture, erudition.

7. Much attention is given to the stylistic tone of communication, which is always set by the speaker. There are some tones of communication: dry-formal, intimate, informal, solemn, familiar, literary, and conversational. So, conversational tone of communication is interpreted in most cases as the beginning of a dialogue, live chat, which is expressed in the principal oratory by using conversational vocabulary, other colloquial signals, for example, using emotional vocabulary and phraseology as synonyms of strict terms and concepts. Conversational tone helps to make communication unofficial, more natural, helps to keep in contact with the audience, “ascribes” openness, democracy, and interest in listeners to the image of the speaker.

8. It is necessary to keep strictly social and ethical norms of the language, to bar from “non-parliamentary” expressions - insulting labels, swear words, roughly-evaluated statements towards political opponents. The absence of such words and phrases in the speaker's speech, the ability to replace them with euphemisms, emotionally neutral words and phrases, is regarded by the audience as a sign of objectivity, consistency, correctness, high level of culture.

Thus, there is a certain standard of public speech in the field of political oratory in the minds of the mass audience nowadays. The specific nature of the formation of the political leader’s image is reflected by such categories as neatness, appropriateness, expressiveness, vivid personal principles, willingness to communicate with the audience, required literacy. Using stamps, diffusiveness, impersonal structures, too many literary words and phrases, various kinds of speech errors are always directed against the speaker, reducing his oratory and personal image, weakening the effectiveness and influence of his speech.

1.3. Genre characteristics of President’s Message in the context of communicative strategy

The effectiveness of political communication in modern Russia is invariably associated with the emergence of new political speech genres. “The President’s Message to the Federal Assembly” is one of them.

From the speech of the President members of the Federal Assembly and Russian citizens receive information on the activities of government agencies. The most important result of almost two decades of existence of the Message as a political genre in Russia is that Russian citizens trust their leader. In modern Russia the popularity and effectiveness of this genre is obvious and is evidenced by high ratings of the President Vladimir V. Putin and the party “United Russia”, according to media reports.

“The President’s Message to the Federal Assembly” is in fact a report of the President on the situation in the country, achievements, success and failures, problems of Russian society. In addition, the Message has a scheduled plan for the government and its departments for the next year, tasks are set and priorities for further development are identified. The Message of the President is a monologue, interrupted in some cases by applause. It is broadcasted live by leading Russian TV and radio channels, and the speech gives accessibility of ideas and directions of the governmental program as an evidence of clarity of the government work and its
intentions. Citizens have the impression of involvement in political issues and problems of Russia; they get a sense of participation and responsibility.

Among many other goals and objectives for any politician it is important to make a good impression on the voters and hence to keep generally accepted standards of behavior, to pay attention to his verbal and nonverbal behavior. Image of politicians and their prestige among their colleagues and the electorate depends mostly on their speeches\textsuperscript{68}. The speech is one of the main components of politician’s personality. It is on the basis of politician’s verbal behavior a voter makes his conclusions about trust to the candidate, on the effectiveness of authorities and even about the level of his own well-being.

To achieve the desired goal, speaker’s thoughts and ideas should be defined. In other words, we must organize, build our speech. Different secondary communicative units (SCU) help to fulfill this task. They include a variety of speech signals, remarks which help the speaker to make out his idea, to build a logical message, to place the emphasis on the fragments of his speech, to enter a dialogue, to soften what is said, to express one’s attitude, to emphasize, to address the audience and etc.

The use of these units is characterized by certain reflexivity. They appear so organically in speech that we do not notice them. However, in the political discourse every detail is important - a single word, an intonation and an accent. Therefore, a competent politician must consider the role of different communicative means, including aids of communication as their role in the impact on the recipient is significant.

Of course, the primary role in any kinds and forms of communication belongs to the main forms of communication. SCU form a kind of extra communicative level, which seems not to be necessarily a part of the communication process. However, the absence of such units in the speech gives the impression of “inchoate”, fuzzy, blurry or excessive rigidity of speech. Besides

the absence of such speech units can create problems for the speaker connected with human relations, speech ethics, politeness, communicative competence, and as a result can prevent the achievement of his communicative purpose.

It can be said that the specific use of SCU largely determines the manner of speech behavior of a speaker. The addiction to certain “buzzwords” or types of units of supporting character creates a certain image: hard and strong politician, a liberal-democrat, judgmental though, “our fellow”, etc.

SCU are different in structure and use. Among all their diversity there are two large groups of units: communicative words and discursive words. Communicative words are used as a reaction to the speaker’s speech or the situation and basically represented in non-predicative constructions. Communicative words function as signals of getting the information, which provide feedback between the speaker and the listener, as informative responses yes or no, their analogues, and also as fillers of pauses (hesitative) and the etiquette formulae (for example, greetings, farewells, thanking). Communicative words can be used by a speaker and by a listener. Discursive words “regulate the flow of discourse”, they carry out compositional, structural, logical, cohesive, regulatory and subjective-modal functions (for example, I believe, surely, you see, so, yet, finally, probably). Their task is to shape the text, make it easier for understanding and perception. Discursive words refer to SCU of the speaker, although they may appear in the response as well, but are typical for making up a monologue.

The genre of "The President’s Message to the Federal Assembly" appears, on the one hand, as a result of a specific interpretation of the Soviet tradition (the report of the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at their congresses), and on the other hand, under the influence of these genres in the Western political culture. In the United States genre of President’s Address to Congress (“State of the Union”) has been traditional since 1790, since the first President George Washington.

The genre is conventional, that is it has a number of relatively stable
parameters\textsuperscript{69}: linguistic, textual, composite, notional, etc. In addition, the genre has a certain set of intentions and meanings that vary depending on the communicative situation and the position of addressee. Our task is to analyze the conventional and intentional features of the Message genre in order to identify vectors of adaptation and variation of linguistic resources to the conditions of functioning.

The President’s Message to the Federal Assembly is a document asserted by the Constitution of the Russian Federation (Chapter 4, article 84)\textsuperscript{70} as a report of the head of the country in front of the government officials. The Message of the President refers to the secondary genres of political discourse, as it is based on the genre of appeal.

**Terms for functioning of the document.** This parameter is represented in the text by etiquette forms of appeal and self-presentation, by performance of status characteristics of the author and the recipient of the Message (*Dear Colleagues, Dear deputies and members of the Federal Assembly, Dear Friends*), by protocol elements of its announcement (fixed in Constitution of the Russian Federation with the instructions of time and place of the publication of the Message).

**Cognitive structure of the Message.** A significant sign of conventionality of Messages is their inclusion in document circulation of government and political institutions: the government, both houses of the Federal Assembly, parties, and regional administrations. Interdiscursive and intertextual relations between the texts are provided by the retransmission of cognitive structures: concepts, frames, gestalts. Fragments of each Message are reproduced in the form of quotations, precedent texts and situations, other text transformations in the texts of various discourses: administrative, legal, media, PR, advertising. The structure of this cognitive formation includes our ideas, assumptions and knowledge (speculative or proved by documents) on the activities of the President, the Prime Minister and their teams.

\textsuperscript{69} Michail Grachev. Political communication: theoretical concepts, models, vectors development. – M., 2004. – p. 266.
Domination of informing strategy. As for organization of texts, this tendency is realized through hierarchy of microtexts, which is built from the point of significance of topics and sub-topics. Key positions in the text are occupied by thematic components: the problem of domestic policy (changes in political, social and economic spheres, issues of national projects), foreign relations, which are displayed by a set of sub-topics. Sub-topics are presented by compositionally semantic blocks (CSB) - groups of microtexts which have the same type of organization: identification of the subject of speech, opinion of the problem, problems needed urgent solution. Each microtext has its own communicative pragmatic characteristics, determined by a type of predicative propositions units.

So the factors which realize conventional aim of the Message genre are: communicative conditions, interdiscursive relations, composition, communicative and logical semantic organization of CSB. The enumerated features realize authentic nature of the Message, but the text has intentionally significant elements which adapt the text to the conditions of the functioning. Special attention should be paid to the directions in which a process of adaptation of linguistic resources takes place while realizing its discursive intention - the influence to the audience:

1. Realization of the impact strategy. At the organization level of compositional structure of the text the impact is actualized through the proposition of characterization.

2. The use of persuasive means. Tools of dialogues are used as an additional means of impact: inclusive pronouns we, our, joint action verbs let us decide, let's discuss; formula involving decision-making, question-answer constructions. The impact is also carried out by means of the contrast between “our” – “their”. The tactics of identification “their” and tactics of discrediting an opponent are based on the mechanisms of creating the negative, repulsive image. Defamation is the dominant tool of discrediting tactics. Major labels which are used to generate this negative collective image (thieves, liars, Nazis, the enemies of the people), also can be neutral evaluating real political opponents (some politicians, bureaucrats), that acquire negative connotation in that concrete context.
3. **Use of means of subjective modality.** Means of deontic modality are used to express the prescriptive sense: strict prohibition, permission, order \(^{71}\)(*it is prohibited, it is allowed, it is required*). Elements of alethic modality realize the senses, which can’t be expressed in categorical terms. Means of logic modality (*should*) have here the meaning of threat which aims at influencing the listener.

Thus, the specificity of the Message is determined by the interaction of conventional and intentional text parameters. Their comparisons have revealed vector changes of logical syntactic and composite parameters of author’s intention, such as proposition of characterization, subjective modality, persuasiveness, author's individual communicative competence. The main adoptive vector of the Message is actualization of author’s intentions and pragmatic orientations at all levels of the text organization.

CHAPTER II
COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY METHODS OF REPRESENTING THE MAIN STRATEGY OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF BARACK H. OBAMA

2.1. Communicative strategy of the USA in public speeches and State of the Union Address to Congress of Barack H. Obama

Barack Obama, according to the opinion of the number of researchers, is considered to be one of the most outstanding orators of modern politics. In what follows is the attempt to make an analysis and reveal the main tendencies of the United States strategy in the inaugural speeches and State of the Union Address to Congress of Barack H. Obama.

1) The problem of racial inequality in the USA

As long as Barack Obama is the representative of Afro-American society, the problem of racial inequality has its special significance.

The American president is trying to develop a many-sided approach to the problem, covering not only Afro-American people, but Asians, Latin Americans and others, giving his own opinion to the subject. The issue of racial inequality is reviewed in details in his books as well as in political reports, inaugural speeches and annual messages to Congress.

– I had grown accustomed, everywhere, to suspicion between the races.

– The emotions between the races could never be pure; even love was tarnished by the desire to find in the other some element that was missing in ourselves. Whether we sought out our demons or salvation, the other race would always remain just that: menacing, alien, and apart.

As is clear from the statements, the problem of coexistence of different races is seen from the position of their inequality and from the position of personal experience.

Barack Obama writes a lot about difficulties, which black population of the


\(^{73}\) Ibid. – p. 143.
United States is coming across everywhere. In his book «The Audacity of Hope» there is a chapter called «Race» which is fully devoted to the problem. In course of time his look at an issue becomes more and more mature: «Statistically, the number of African Americans who occupy the top fifth of the income ladder remains relatively small. Moreover, every black professional and businessperson in Chicago can tell you stories of the roadblocks they still experience on account of race. Few African American entrepreneurs have either the inherited wealth or the angel investors to help launch their businesses or cushion them from a sudden economic downturn. Few doubt that if they were white they would be further along in reaching their goals» [Obama 2006: 285].

In this abstract we can observe that president Obama is talking not about the estrangement of African Americans, but about real problems of the US black population, about their economic backwardness in comparison with the white people.

Above all, in that very book racial problematics is expanding covering difficulties concerning people of other races, living on the territory of the USA. Here Barack Obama proceeds from the first principles of American democracy, reflected in the Declaration of Independence, which proclaims the equality of all people: «We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness» [Obama 2006: 64].

This motive of equality is also present in his book, where Mr. Obama gives the example of personal experience: «I met a Mexican woman who spoke no English but whose son was in Iraq; I recognized a young Colombian man who worked as a valet at a local restaurant and learned that he was studying accounting at the local community college. <...> I was reminded that America has nothing to fear from these newcomers, that they have come here for the same reason that families came here 150 years ago – all those who fled Europe's famines and wars and unyielding hierarchies, all those who may not have had the right legal documents or connections or unique skills to offer but who carried with
them a hope for a better life. <...> America is big enough to accommodate all their dreams» [Obama 2006: 317-318]. Barack Obama comes to the conclusion that every newly arrived citizen of other country or representative of other nation, regardless his ethnic origin, as well as any other citizen of the United States of America, has a right to life and freedom.

Similar background of racial inequality can be found in inaugural speeches of Barack Obama and his annual messages to Congress: «But race is an issue that I believe this nation cannot afford to ignore right now» [Obama, 2008].

Barack Obama points out not only the fact of estrangement of the Afro-American society, but its consequence – lower results of academic performance of black graduates: «But we do need to remind ourselves that so many of the disparities that exist in the African-American community today can be directly traced to inequalities passed on from an earlier generation <...> Segregated schools were, and are, inferior schools: we still haven't fixed them, fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education, and the inferior education they provided, then and now, helps explain the pervasive achievement gap between today's black and white students» [Obama, 2008].

As the result, Barack Obama concludes that every race, every member of the American society equal and important: «My country has been greatly enriched by migration from Mexico. Mexican Americans form a critical and enduring link between our nations. And I am committed to fixing our broken immigration system in a way that upholds our traditions as a nation of laws but also as a nation of immigrants» [Obama, 2010].

(1) «Black, white, Hispanic, native American, Asian, Democrats and Republicans, young and old, rich and poor, gay and straight, disabled and not disabled, all of us have something to contribute» [Obama, 2009].

(2) «... problems that are neither black or white or Latino or Asian, but rather problems that confront us all» [Obama, 2008].

Barack Obama argues that Mexican culture enriched the American one (my country has been greatly enriched by migration from Mexico), quote (1)
balances the rights of different races and social groups in the context of their importance to the country; quote (2) claims equality of different nations in front of common problems and dangers.

Thus, the problem of racial inequality finds meaningfully and verbally vivid and absolutely identic realization in the autobiographic books as well as inaugural speeches and annual messages to Congress.

2) The problem of American education

The problem of American education and, more precisely, its quality and costs, is also one of the key issues that Barack Obama raises in his inaugural speeches and adresses to Congress: «The third challenge we must address is the urgent need to expand the promise of education in America» [Obama, 2009].

«The source of America's prosperity has never been merely how ably we accumulate wealth, but how well we educate our people» [Obama, 2009].

From the understanding of the importance of the problem (The source of America's prosperity <...> how well we educate our people) President Obama continues with the problem of high prices and necessity to make it available: «It's an investment that will create a new $2,500 annual tax credit to put the dream of a college degree within reach for middle class families and make college affordable for seven million students, helping more of our sons and daughters aim higher, reach farther, and fulfill their God-given potential» [Obama, 2010].

3) The problem of Health care in America

In Obama’s opinion, health care, as well as education, functioning leaves much to be desired. It is inefficient and too expensive: «We will restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost» [Obama, 2009].

«Our health care is too costly; our schools fail too many; and each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet» [Obama, 2010].

4) Power economy and alternative sources of energy

An important aspect that requires special attention of the United States is
the problem of energy security: «At a time of such great challenge for America, no single issue is as fundamental to our future as energy» [Obama, 2009].

It is characteristic that Obama argues about the necessity of new politics in the sphere of energy supplies not only from the point of view called national interest, but taking into consideration other countries of the world society and global environmental problems: «And then, I would like to see us in the United States take the lead on a new approach to energy – because none of the developed countries are going to be able to sustain their growth if we don't start using energy differently, and the world cannot survive all countries using energy in the same ways that we use it» [Obama, 2009].

5) Unity of the Nation

The motive of unity of the nation that is closely connected with many other problems of American society, with racial inequality at first, runs like a golden thread through Barack Obama’s discourse. The politician is eager to prove that the USA are a united country and a united nation, nevertheless it consists of a huge variety of ethnic groups and considered to be the “nation of immigrants”.

In his speeches Barack Obama relies on the quotations from one of the core documents of American democracy, the Constitution: «We the people, in order to form a more perfect union» [Obama, 2008] – where the key words are «a more perfect union», they allow President Obama to put his discourse inside the frame of the main political doctrine of the USA. Later he expresses the same idea of the unity of the nation with his own vocabulary: «They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions; greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction» [Obama, 2009].

«There is not a black America and white America and Latino America and Asian America – there's the United States of America» [Obama, 2004].

The following abstract of Obama’s speech pronounced in 2004 is later published in his book «The Audacity of Hope»: «And we are bringing together Democrats and Independents and Republicans; blacks and whites; Latinos and Asians; small states and big states; Red States and Blue States into a United States
of America» [Obama, 2008].

This example proves the intentions of the president to unite in his discourse the representatives of all social circles, races and political groups in one notion “The United States of America”. We can also clearly notice the close connection between political speeches and autobiographical books of Barack Obama.

6) Family

Speaking about the family one can observe some kind of duality in Obama’s discourse: on one hand, Barack Obama has in mind his own family (3); on the other hand, he talks about family in general (4).

(3) «I would not be standing here tonight without the unyielding support of my best friend for the last sixteen years, the rock of our family and the love of my life, our nation's next First Lady, Michelle Obama. Sasha and Malia, I love you both so much, and you have earned the new puppy that’s coming with us to the White House» [Obama, 2008].

(4) «It begins with a young family – maybe in Mesa, or Glendale, or Tempe – or just as likely in suburban Las Vegas, Cleveland, or Miami. They save up. They search. They choose a home that feels like the perfect place to start a life. They secure a fixed-rate mortgage at a reasonable rate, make a down payment, and make their mortgage payments each month. They are as responsible as anyone could ask them to be» [Obama, 2010].

Remarkable fact is that Family theme in the president’s discourse is firmly linked with the previous motive of Unity of the Nation: the politician takes close kindred ties and makes projection on America in general («one American family»), what helps Family topic to become particularly significant in his discourse: «It is that promise that has always set this country apart – that through hard work and sacrifice, each of us can pursue our individual dreams but still come together as one American family, to ensure that the next generation can pursue their dreams as well» [Obama, 2009].
7) The problem of the youth

The typical characteristic of Barack Obama political discourse is his careful attitude towards the young generation of the Americans. No wonder, that the focused attention to the problems of the given age category is visible in his speeches where they often meet with the problems of family and education. Example (4) illustrates the difficulties which young families come across.

2.2. Political discourse as a reflection of the Obama’s political image development

Presidential elections in the United States may be seen as one of the most vivid examples of image development in the American political discourse\(^{74}\). The analysis of pre-election speeches of Mr. Obama reveals that the image of candidate for presidency consisted of some communicational roles, mediated by SA of self presentation. The realization of these acts led to emphasis of the modified individual characteristics and specialties. These characteristics were chosen as image-generating not only due to their domination in Obama’s personality, but on the basis of particular led managed features, which are welcomed and indorsed in the society following established national tradition and acquired historical experience.

The dominant component of the political image is communicative role “Patriot”, which assumes the demonstration of the following traits of character: self devotion and fidelity to the people, defense of the country’s national interest, capitulation of personal ambitions to the good of the state. Self presentation, within the context of this communicative role, avoids crude affirmation of the fact, for example: *I am a patriot!* When this occurs, the situation lacks cogency and forfeits power of conviction. Thus, the typical SA of self presentation is exercised through the indirect verbal expression of patriotic feelings:

• Love to the country: Throughout my life, I have always taken my deep and abiding love for this country as a given. It was how I was raised; it is what propelled me into public service; it is why I am running for President. The following word markers becomes the expression of the feeling: ... my deep and abiding love <...> as a given... Parallel constructions, which compose stylistic gradation, help SA to gain strong emotional patriotic overtone. Combination of the word country and demonstrative pronoun this gives evidence that the speaker includes the subject of statement in the field of his direct perception testifying its significance.

• Pride in his people’s achievements in the world history: Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted for those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things – some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom. Stating oppositions are role forming here: the faint-hearted: the risk-takers, those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame: the doers, the makers of things. They demonstrate admiration and adoration of the speaker before his nation, present Obama’s patriotic mood essential for this communicative role.

• Memories, connected with slow staged personal perception of the belonging to the great nation: I remember the cheers and small flags that people waved, and my grandfather explaining how we Americans could do anything we set our minds to do. That's my idea of America. Using of the first person plural subject pronoun and tail piece we Americans shows that the speaker consider himself a full competent member of the American society, who possesses typical traits of American national character. As is well-known, the United States of America has several variants of denominations, acquired in the society: the United

---

75 Barack Obama, http://www.usliberals.about.com
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States of America, the USA, the United States, the US, America. The last one sounds less formal, more “en famille” and appears to be original. Thus, Barack Obama displays his warm feelings towards the country with its prominent history, dating back to the discovery of the continent.

Communicative role “Host” is inherent constituent of the candidate for presidency image. The political leader should have a good handle in the country affairs; know what is indispensable for its development and prosperity. This “mask” splits into two other communicative roles, at first sight, opposite to each other, - “Representative of the Nation” and «Individualist». However, these roles reflect two key skills important for a politician – listen to others opinion and make his own balanced decision on the basis of the received and analyzed information: If the commanders tell me that they need X, Y and Z, in order to accomplish the very narrow mission that I’ve laid out, than I will take that into consideration.

The communicative mask “Representative of the Nation” is characterized by the open self-presentation: I’m a US senator, representing American people. He knows public interests, understands all social problems and needs and carries on a constant dialog with the country nationals with the view of correct decisions on current matters: ... a strategy’s not going to be formed in a vacuum and we’re going to have to listen to the actual troops in the field.

In the role of «Individualist» the speaker appears as a strong decisive personality with his firm believes, high level of self-assurance to bring the country to a better living. This mask wearer shows the skill to stand against apolitical or anti-national opinions, moods, and deeds in his environment. This constituent of the political image has cultural and historical basis and is the true ingredient of American character. It is connected with individualistic type of Western culture, where the art of informed decision-making is highly appreciated.

In SA of the role «Individualist» there are many markers of different degree of categoricity, representing personal opinion of the speaker, for example: I

---
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fundamentally disagree...., I’m absolutely sure...., my first step would be...., my job is to...., I would prefer that we start this process now, I do think... etc. It stands to mention that in Barack Obama’s pre-election campaign communicative role “Representative of the Nation” in his political image dominates over the role “Individualist”, it deals with the obvious problems left after a quite authoritarian presidency of George W. Bush, whose image was prevailed by the mask “Individualist”.

Communicative role ”Self sufficient Leader” also belongs to the hierarchy of image generating roles of President Obama as his ethnic origin is taken into account. The wearer of this mask always feels confident relying on his unique intellectual skills:

– *I was never lacking in ... In confidence that my particular background would not be a barrier to me running*\(^81\).

Special communicative tactic is exercised here, originally it has psychological basis. The practice of this strategy is realized by taking handicaps and transforming them in potential advantages: *I can be a more effective messenger for some of my policy ideas because I’ve lived in another country, because my father came from a small village in Africa. I think that allows me to communicate these ideas more effectively and I think that the world will take in what I have to say with a more open mind*\(^82\).

Communicative role “Strategist” should also be mentioned in the structure of political leader’s image development. SA of self-presentation in the context of this particular mask constitutes the model of behavior in a certain situation: *I’m not going to set up our troops to failure and I’m not going to do something half-baked.* SA, demonstrating this role, often enumerates methods of a plan realization: *We have a very narrow list of things that we want to accomplish: protecting embassies, protecting civilians and counter terrorism in contrast to counter insurgency*\(^83\).

Communicative role “Strategist” is commonly accompanied by the role

---

\(^{81}\) Barack Obama, http://www.rollingstone.com

\(^{82}\) Barack Obama, http://www.youtube.com

\(^{83}\) Barack Obama, http://www.nytimes.com
“Realist”, introduced by the following introductory words and turns of speech: ...realistically speaking, That’s precisely why..., that’s exactly what.... I don’t get too high, I don’t get too low.84

The trust of the voters is the key to election win, and to gain their confidence is possible only in case if the electorate has no doubt in candidate’s honesty. The next communication role which deserves attention is called “Honest Man”. The wearer of this mask demonstrates open-heartedness, directness, frankness and responsibility for the things said: I’ll be honest with you, The truth is..., No one’s going to deceive people...85 etc. SA that serve this communication role include marker words related to the category True/False. The tactic of contrast is popular here as well; the speaker describes and judges the acts of others showing the rightness of his policy: She (Senator Clinton) accepts money from PACs and lobbyists. I don’t accept that politics has to be driven by those special interests and lobbyists. <...> Not only is it offensive to me personally, but I think it's bad politics for me. That's not who I am. That's not what my supporters are looking for.86

And the last important communicative role in the speech image of Barack Obama is so called “Fighter”. As well as “Individualist”, it demonstrates typical American personality trait – never give up and always move on despite fear, tiredness and hesitation: I had to think about this long and hard at the beginning of this process and say, 'Are you deluding yourself? Or do you really think that you can do all those things? And I decided, you know, I might just be able to pull it off. And so a year a later, it turns out that, you know, the jury is still out. But we seem to be stirring things up pretty good.87

Thus, the speech image of the 44th American president during his pre-election campaign was carefully planed and well prepared, the keynote of which was the role “Patriot”. The realization of all communication roles in the majority of cases was exercised implicitly by using different speech tactics:

85 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
– Pronoun *We* instead of *I* for the demonstration of solidarity, involvement, immersiveness and unity;

– Possessive pronouns *my, our* in combination with objects which don’t belong to the speaker in reality. It is done to show his special positive attitude towards these objects: *our kids, my country*;

– Parallel constructions, which compose stylistic gradation, for the expression of specified emotions, feelings and state of mind of the speaker.

– Opposition, contrast to display personal position of the speaker on some occasion;

– Transformation of handicaps into potential advantages in the eyes of others.

It is noteworthy that pre-election image of Barack H. Obama was constructed on the principle of happy medium\(^88\). All the qualities which were demonstrated by Obama as the future leader of the country build a very balanced image of harmonic personality in rapport with himself and others which represents stability.

**2.3. Communicative strategy characteristics in the political discourse of Barack H. Obama**

Political discourse of Barack Obama covers a lot of communicative developments of American political life, which are connected with each other. All of them are constituted into one political discourse, have the same Addressant and Recipient, and are realized in the same cultural, political and social environment (context).

Barack Obama is the author of two autobiographical books, «Dreams from My Father» (1995) and «The Audacity of Hope» (2006), which, in the opinion of many researchers, are of a great importance for the discourse analyzed.

In point of fact, the most distinguished feature of Obama’s discourse is its autobiographic nature. There is a direct, expressly underlined thematic and ideological connection between the facts from the life of the president and his political discourse.

Autobiographical texts serve as the main texts in the discourse of Barack Obama. They reflect a variety of big issues concerning American nation and, in fact, the main standings of the discourse are concentrated in his autobiographical books. Messages to the Parliament include only a few of them.

The main issues discussed in the books are listed in the names of the chapters: racial inequality, health care and education, alternative sources of energy, family, youth problems, the problem of nation disunity, religion, politics, and world outside the United States. The fact that the topics cited predominate not only in the autobiographical editions, but in all texts of the president’s discourse, is proved by computerized quantitative analysis of recurrence lexicon in Obama’s discourse and phased comparative analysis of autobiographical texts and speeches of the political leader.

Autobiographical works that have artistic merit fulfill esthetic function in the discourse of Barack Obama, which the researchers determine as follows: “Formerly esthetic function dealt primarily with art, fiction as a special unique sphere of human existence expression. Literary text influences on the reader rationally as well as emotionally-sensuous; relaying on artistry, beauty, i.e. esthetic constituent of information”\(^{89}\). Autobiographical nature of Obama’s discourse shows the aspiration of the president to aestheticization of his discourse; wish to dress the semantic content of the message in attractive form.

Autobiographical nature of the discourse causes the change of the politician’s attitude to some traditions of the American political discourse. The researches speak about so called “Civil religion”. It means the existence of faith not only in God, but in endless possibilities of governmental system. Americans

are a very religious nation\textsuperscript{90}, and their faith is closely connected with pragmatism and honesty. Max Weber, in his work “The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism”, notices that believe in God and membership in one of the churches are always considered as “absolute guarantee of ethic qualities of a gentlemen, and first of all, his business qualities”\textsuperscript{91}. Speaking about American religiosity, an American sociologist Robert N. Bellah comes to the conclusion that in spite of obvious religiosity of American political discourse, it is deprived of any certain confession. God is understood non-traditionally. In the words of Bellah, “the God of civil religion to a greater degree ties into order, law and justice than salvation and love”. Hence, we can see the substitution of terms, which is common with American lingvocultural society: “God” here is a new social order. Belief in “God” doesn’t mean the faith in transcendental substance, as it is supposed to be, but more like the consequence of this faith (following ethic norms and rules), and also the faith in new life conditions, democracy and liberty. Civil religion changes the referent of religious notions, adapting them to the needs of new democratic society.

American political elite avoids appellation to Christian motives and characters, replacing them with lexical items “God”, “Lord” etc. Instead of divine nature these words mean order, legitimacy and fairness. Using of lexical items “Jesus”, “Christ” as well as retelling of Christian stories is rather critical. By all means, Barack Obama follows all these lingvocultural principles. As well as his precessors, president often refers to “God” in his oral practice. Many of his speeches finish with the following quote: «Thank you, God bless you, and may God Bless the United States of America» [Obama, 2010].

«Virginia, let’s go change the world. God bless you and God bless the United States of America» [Obama, 2008].

In this case, lexical item “God” can be discussed in its usual meaning: «the spirit or being who Christians, Jews, Muslims etc pray to, and who they believe

created the universe» [LDCE]. Nevertheless, in some contexts the rendering of the given lexical item can be dual. It can be used to mark the spiritual entity (5) or social order (6).

(5) «We should never forget that God granted us the power to reason so that we would do His work here on Earth – so that we would use science to cure disease, and heal the sick, and save lives» [Obama, 2009].

(6) «It’s the idea that while there are few guarantees in life, you should be able to count on a job that pays the bills; health care for when you need it; a pension for when you retire; an education for your children that will allow them to fulfill their Godgiven potential. That’s the America we believe in. That’s the America I know» [Obama, 2008].

In the example (5) lexical item “God” surely refers to the spiritual entity, who endows a human-being with intelligence. In the example (6), on the contrary, “Godgiven potential” means not only God given capabilities, but also the possibilities that American society harbors. This becomes clear from the last two sentences of the quote that have local conjunction with the USA: «That’s the America we believe in. That’s the America I know».

Dual understanding of the notion “God” is considered to be normal in the Americal lingvoculture and raise no eyebrows in the society. Such implication of the lexical item has already become a part of cognitive base, which is interpreted here as “a carefully structured aggregate of compulsive knowledge and nationally-determined and minimalized perceptions of some lingvocultural society, which every carrier of a nationally-cultural mentality is armed with” 92.

Thus, one of the communicative strategy building methods in the discourse of Barack Obama is continuation of traditional civil religion and matching with the prescribed cognitive base, as soon as the lexical item “God” in his discourse covers two levels: religious and civil – as a God of American democracy.

In some speeches of Barack Obama one can observe the opposite tendency. As soon as the semantics of the lexical item “God” is modified, it’s logical that it

can’t be replaced by traditional religious words “Jesus”, “Christ”. Above all, the established tradition of political ethic according to which a politician should avoid speaking about his religious confession. Nevertheless, in the speeches of Barack Obama we can see address to “Christ” and “Jesus”, that contradicts the traditions of civil religion.

«You need to **embrace Christ** precisely because you have sins to wash away – because you are human and need an ally in this difficult journey» [Obama, 2006].

He talks about himself as a committed Christian, stating that not only he himself sees Christian in Barack Obama (7), but others who practice Christianity recognize him as one of them (8).

(7) «It was in these neighborhoods that I received the best education I ever had, and where I learned the true meaning of my **Christian faith**» [Obama, 2009].

(8) «I was working with churches, and the **Christians** who I worked with recognized themselves in me» [Obama, 2010].

This kind of unusual and unnatural for American lingvocultural society situation has its inner reason that comes from the unique and fundamental characteristic of Obama’s discourse – its autobiographic background. President Obama makes his speeches a narrative text about his own experience in life. He not just mentions Jesus Christ in his speeches, but tells the story of his own way to Christianity: «I was not raised in a particularly religious household. <...> My father, who returned to Kenya when I was just two, was born Muslim but as an adult became an atheist. My mother, whose parents were non-practicing Baptists and Methodists, was probably one of the most spiritual and kindest people I’ve ever known, but grew up with a healthy skepticism of organized religion herself. As a consequence, so did I. It wasn’t until after college, when I went to Chicago to work as a community organizer for a group of Christian churches, that I confronted my own spiritual dilemma» [Obama, 2010]. For Barack Obama making
mention of the Christ is not a single case, but a regular well-formed part of his discourse strategy, based on autobiography.

Thus, there are two bidirectional tendencies in the political discourse of Barack Obama regarding civil religion: 1) following canons of American civil religion which is expressed in substitution of the lexical item “God”; 2) breaking canons of American civil religion by appellation to Christian motives and characters and revelation of his own religious confession.

Another special feature of Obama’s Message is its slogan nature and relying on so-called “words-amoebas”: in the period of intensive information system development linguistic structure has been getting de-etymologizated and political ideas getting condensed in slogans and key “words-amoebas”, “transparent, not really connected with the life context of the words”. Such lexis is also called “phantom” words. “Politicians don’t like concrete terms, what becomes the reason for tendency to dilute words semantically, adopting them to their own ideologies and policies by all means. This is the display of disrespect to the biography of the word, and to culture in general. Notions democracy, nation, rule of law, market reforms, European choice belong to “phantom” words. The peculiarity of the listed nominations is their referential diversity.93

The practice of using short linguistic formulas is definitely far from new, nevertheless, the given political discourse is characterized by its own selection of this kind of language units. Barack Obama often practices the usage of the following phantom lexical items: «democracy», «change», «opportunity», «progress», «challenge» and some other language units with close meanings. For example, the word «democracy» loses its dictionary meaning and changes denotation depending on the context. Moreover, it gains a new and more understandable, earthly definition: «We spend so much time talking about democracy – and obviously we should be promoting democracy everywhere we can. But democracy, a well-functioning society that promotes liberty and equality

---

and fraternity, a well-functioning society does not just depend on going to the ballot box. It also means that you're not going to be shaken down by police because the police aren't getting properly paid. It also means that if you want to start a business, you don't have to pay a bribe. I mean, there are a whole host of other factors that people need to – need to recognize in building a civil society that allows a country to be successful. And hopefully that will – that approach will be reflected not just in my administration's policies but in the policies that are pursued by international agencies around the world» [Obama, 2009]. American variant of democracy, as president Obama sees it, is the most correct and right one. The leader expresses hope that the functioning of all international organizations will be realized according to the principles of American democracy.

The noun “change”, an important pre-election slogan of Obama’s campaigne, has a very abstract interpretation. In his political discourse this word gains the meaning different from dictionary definition (the process or result of something or someone becoming different [LDCE]).

Now America has arrived at a crossroads. Embedded in American soil and the wind and the sun, we have the resources to change [Obama, 2009].

It’s that we are putting Americans to work doing the work that America needs done in critical areas that have been neglected for too long – work that will bring real and lasting change for generations to come [Obama, 2010].

I work for the American people, and I’m determined to bring the change that the people voted for last November [Obama, 2010].

In the examples above the lexical item “change” doesn’t have a concrete meaning. It’s clear that this language unit describes developments, but in a blurry way, it remains misty what sphere these changes will touch: political, social, economic, religious or all together? The political discourse of Mr. Obama doesn’t give the answer to this question.

There is one more remarkable example: «We are the ones we’ve been waiting for. We are the change that we seek. We are the hope of those boys who have
little; who’ve been told that they cannot have what they dream; that they cannot be what they imagine. Yes they can» [Obama, 2009].

Obama says that Americans themselves are the change they are waiting for. It means that there is no need to wait for some global changes coming from outside. The power is hidden in the nation; it does have strength to bring changes, the only important thing left is to sincerely believe in this possibility. In the opinion of Svetlana Ivanova, language unit “change” transformed from an ordinary lexical item into a cultural sign: «Call for changes of Barack Obama » is directly connected with another American cultural archetype – intention to constant development, progressive moving forward, discovering new spaces»\(^94\). Herewith, it often happens that together with “change” goes a lexical item “reform” used in a close meaning, which multiply reinforces the unit “change”.

Slogans used in Obama’s discourse are also worth noticing and deserve attention: «Change we can believe in», «Yes, we can», «One voice can change the world», «Change can happen», «Organizing for America», «Vote Obama» etc. The main one which is repeated like mantra is the motto «Yes we can»:

\(<\ldots\> Ann Nixon Cooper is 106 years old. She was born just a generation past slavery.

\(<\ldots\> And tonight, I think about all that she’s seen throughout her century in America – the heartache and the hope; the struggle and the progress; the times we were told that we can’t, and the people who pressed on with that American creed: Yes we can.

At a time when women’s voices were silenced and their hopes dismissed, she lived to see them stand up and speak out and reach for the ballot.

Yes we can.

When there was despair in the dust bowl and depression across the land, she saw a nation conquer fear itself with a New Deal, new jobs and a new sense of common purpose. Yes we can.

America, we have come so far. We have seen so much. But there is so much more to do. to reclaim the American Dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth – that out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism, and doubt, and those who tell us that we can’t, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes We Can [Obama, 2008].

Here we see the quintessence of the cult of the American nation about its boundless possibilities. «Yes we can» is a world outlook credo of the American lingvocultural society. Besides all, the importance «Yes we can» is supported by stylistic organization of the speech: the politician uses epiphora to stress the motto, putting it on a “shooting” position at the end of every paragraph.

Above mentioned lexical item “change” also becomes a part of mottos in Obama’s discourse: «That’s the choice in this primary. It’s about whether we choose to play the game, or whether we choose to end it; it's change that polls well, or change we can believe in; it’s the past versus the future» [Obama, 2008].

«And if a voice can change a room, it can change a city, and if it can change a city, it can change a state, and if it can change a state, it can change a nation, and if it can change a nation, it can change the world» [Obama, 2009].

«Virginia, let’s go change the world. God bless you and God bless the United States of America» [Obama, 2009].

«That’s the promise we need to keep. That’s the change we need right now. So let me spell out exactly what that change would mean if I am President» [Obama, 2010].

The notion «change» truly becomes one of the core motifs in the president’s campaign. The word is used in a very different situation and means changes on any scale. It belongs to many-valued lexis and appears to be “word-amoeba”.

Motto «Organizing for America», contained in Obama’s discourse, is based on the biography of the political leader, who had been a small community
organizer before entering Harvard University. Thus, his present job is perceived as the old one, but on a completely different scale.

Consequently, for the verbal filling of Obama campaign slogans’ often stand lexical items, characterized above as “words-amoebas”. They are the key words belonging to recurrent lexis that permeate the discourse. Slogan nature of the discourse, de-etymologization of linguistic structure of the quotations, dictates the transformation of expanded sentence into a simple one (Yes we can; Change we can believe in; Change is possible). The result is the mottos that long enough to signal a message and short enough to memorize them quickly. Many of them represent an elementary modal-predicative nexus, which is brought to the audience and gets a measurable suggestive effect. One can observe a frequent alternation of information delivery structures: long and expanded sentences are switched with short constructions with the predicative nexus only. So, the usage of “words-amoebas” (democracy, progress, opportunity etc.) and phantom words with faded meaning gives a metered flow of presented information.

It is important that the message in Barack Obama’s discourse is characterized by the usage of a great number of decisional phenomena, “phenomena, 1) known to the majority of lingvocultural society representatives; 2) currently in-demand in cognitive (perceptual and emotional) sense; 3) which given lingvocultural society representatives in their speeches appellate to”95. As a experienced and skilled political leader, Obama often uses typical for American lingvocultural society decisional phenomena:

(9) The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness [Obama, 2009].

(10) Of course, the answer to the slavery question was already embedded within our Constitution – a Constitution that had at is very core the ideal of equal citizenship under the law; a Constitution that promised its people liberty, and justice, and a union that could be and should be perfected over time [Obama, 2010].

(11) ... and a **King** who took us to the mountaintop and pointed the way to the Promised Land [Obama, 2009].

(12) ... and together, we will begin the next great chapter in America's story with three words that will **ring from coast to coast; from sea to shining sea** – Yes. We. Can. [Obama, 2008].

(13) *We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the stars and stripes, all of us defending the United States of America* [Obama, 2004].

Barack Obama appellates to the important documents of the American history, as Declaration of Independence (9) and U.S. Constitution (10). In (11) president refers to famous activist, the leader in the African-American Civil Rights Movement Martin Luther King and to the Bible motif (pointed the way to the Promised Land). Quote (12) comprises a part from the popular patriotic song «America the Beautiful» and quote (13) sends us to adjuration to American flag (pledging allegiance to the stars and stripes).

All the examples above demonstrate the intention of the political leader to instill his discourse with uniting national lingvocultural content. Barack Obama follows a well-established tradition of American political discourse. But his using of decisional names in comparison with other decisional phenomena has its own specific features.

Decisional names deal with “a well-known text. <…> it is a sort of a complex sign, using which the appellation to a number of differential characteristics of the given decisional name, not to the denotation itself takes place". So the choice of decisional names in Obama’s discourse is not occasional. At first, appellation to decisional names gives a possibility to define his position on

---

the political arena, avoiding direct statements by using associations with legendary persons of America. Secondly, decisional names are the element of American lingvocultural society cognitive base, this helps Barack Obama to cast himself as “a friend, not foe” in the given society. It is important to note that “cognitive base” here is “in a certain manner structured collection of necessarily obligatory knowledge and nationally-determined ideas of some national-lingvocultural society that belong to all carriers of some nationally-cultural mentality” 97.

In his discourse Barack Obama often appellates to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Martin L. King and Abraham Lincoln. Speaking about President Roosevelt, Barack Obama identifies himself with the 32nd President of the United States in the conditions of world financial crisis, on the peak of which Mr. Obama was elected, drawing a parallel between the Great Depression and successful egress from it by President Roosevelt. Barack Obama also notices the fact that he and Franklin Roosevelt are the members of one political party: «We are the party of Roosevelt. We are the party of Kennedy. So don’t tell me that Democrats won’t defend this country» [Obama, 2008].

Abraham Lincoln led the United States through its greatest constitutional, military, and moral crises - the American Civil War - preserving the Union, abolishing slavery, strengthening the national government and modernizing the economy. Obama sets the same goal – to make the representatives of all social groups united and reanimate the American economy: «As Lincoln said to a nation far more divided than ours, “We are not enemies, but friends... though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection”. And to those Americans whose support I have yet to earn – I may not have won your vote, but I hear your voices, I need your help, and I will be your President too» [Obama, 2009]. Solving the pivot problem in unity remains one of the dominant in the president’s discourse.

Analyzing communicative strategy formation in the political discourse of Barack Obama led us to some conclusions. Autobiographic nature of his discourse

---

97 Ibid. p. 61.
makes the speeches complete and coherent, lifts its esthetic value. This feature breathes new life in the interpretation of the term Civil Religion. Above all, Obama’s communicative strategy is characterized by tendency of using decisional phenomena and “words-amoebas” which is important in referring his discourse to its cognitive base and making it unique from the other side.
CHAPTER III
COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY METHODS OF REPRESENTING THE MAIN STRATEGY OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF VLADIMIR V. PUTIN

3.1. Communicative strategy of the Russian Federation in State of the Nation Address to the Federal Assembly of Vladimir V. Putin

Experts, making comments on Vladimir Putin's Address of 2012, considered speech of the president to be a program. Especially they pay attention to such subjects as demography, national question and returning compatriots to the country. "The next years will be critical for Russia and the world, and the one who will take the lead, will depend on the will of each nation and its inner energy rather than on economy", – the president of Russia Putin noted, making the message to the Federal Assembly.

"Citizens of the Russian Federation are to be more numerous, and they have to be better in order to make Russia sovereign and strong", – Vladimir Putin believes. "If the nation isn't capable to preserve itself and reproduce itself, if it loses vital reference points and ideals, there is no need in any external enemy. It will collapse itself. To make Russia sovereign and strong, we are to be more numerous, and we have to be better in moral, in competences, in work and in creativity", – the president claimed.

Vladimir Putin emphasized that today the share of young and employable able-bodied population in Russia is one of the highest among the developed states, nevertheless, in 20 years the number of this category of age can decrease by 1.5 times. "If doing nothing, such tendency will proceed", – the Russian president noticed. In his opinion, three children have to become the norm for a Russian family.

The head of the country also noticed that society has "obvious deficit in spiritual sense" – that is, mercies, compassions, sympathy. "Deficiency of the
qualities that had made us stronger at all times that we used to be proud of. We have to support entirely institutions which are carriers of traditional values", – he proclaimed.

Putin believes that current situation turned out to be the consequence of the rejected ideological foundations some 15-20 years ago. "Unfortunately, then many moral reference points were absolutely lost. In the sense of throwing out the child along with the bath", – Vladimir Putin said.

He also made a statement for need of revival in Russia of the provincial intellectuals as the moral support of the country. "Moreover, I want to emphasize the existing problems of social sphere. For the professionals working here, a formal definition – "state employees (byudzhetniki)" was fixed. Nevertheless, these people are those who have good education, qualification, and according to the content of their work, cultural requirements, their social activity, they are the part of a so-called "creative" class". – Putin noticed. He added that "creative" class is traditionally called “intelligentsia” in Russia. "They are school teachers, doctors, teachers of higher educational institutions, scientists, cultural workers. And these people work in each region, each settlement, and each city. We will support revival of the provincial intellectuals which was at all times a professional and moral support of Russia", – the president stated.

In the Nation Address of 2012 the signal to political elite and society, concerning where our country in foreseeable future needs to move, sounded quite clear and accurate. According to experts, the emphasis of the message was made on valuable and moral constituent of life, on the necessity to strengthen this sphere and to be engaged in it in every aspect, both in spiritual and material senses. Therefore, it is necessary to create the necessary basis and environment where citizens can realize themselves in civil relations, thus, creating the strongest society.

For the safe development of the country, first of all, it is necessary to make a focus on ourselves and to set certain tasks: "The most important task has already been solved and now only the specifics remain: work of the federal government, also work in regions, and work of public figures, but most important is the work of
ordinary citizens, their everyday responsibilities and implementation of civil duties”. The main point mentioned by the president is a high-quality transition to simple life “for yourself” (it was the task which was implemented during the previous period and it was directed on restoration of elementary bases of integrity of the country) and now transition to some civil duties of national scope.

In the Address to the Federal Assembly the distinct position on the urgent Russian problem (national one) was formulated. The model comprised in the message of "family of the people" has nothing in common with American "melting pot" and is closer to the Soviet model of interethnic relationships.

The next basic point of the message is considered to be an “intellectual layer” of the country and government’s attentive attention to it. The majority of young emigrants in Russia are well educated intellectuals, so called “brain drain” is a real problem, and in his message Vladimir Putin not only talked about it, but also suggested a developed program of practical actions.

Recent mass protests were partly connected with the absence of demand for intellectuals and the intelligence in the country. In the Address Putin showed that the government is able to analyze the content of the protest and is capable to respond, to give the society answer to it. Governmental servants distinguished not only the actors of the protest, but also the essence of the message provided by them.

Vladimir Putin’s Address also outlined the strategy of political transformations. For example, the president suggested coming back to the mixed system of vote in the State Duma – according to party lists and one-mandatory districts. However, this idea was not welcomed by everybody.

Putin also discussed the question of returning to the elective legislation of electoral blocs. "Let's think over the matter. It is necessary to be discussed", – the president proclaimed. Vladimir V. Putin also initiated to give the members of the Federal Assembly – deputies of the State Duma and members of the Federal Council – the right of legislative power for Legislative Assemblies of their regions.

Then Putin suggested vesting right in ruling party and parliamentary opposition to put forward candidates for a post of the chairman, the deputy and
auditors of the Audit Chamber (AC). "It would be correct, having in mind special features of this kind of activity, to limit the duration of it (chairmen of AC) to two terms in a row. We are waiting from this institution for more results in productivity and professionalism", – the Russian president said.

The president pointed out that the authorities would continue the fight against corruption. For example, the president and members of the government, parliamentarians and heads of state corporations should be obliged to report to the government about the expenses. Besides, Vladimir Putin demanded to pass the bill forbidding civil servants to have financial bank accounts abroad. He claimed to increase personal responsibility of governmental officials, up to their temporary disqualification. "It means that a careless official not only has to be discharged of his post, but he can’t be authorized to be engaged in this kind of activity for some time, – Putin made an assumption.

Vladimir Putin also noted that for Russia there is no other political choice except democracy. "However the Russian democracy has to rely on the traditions, instead of accepting standards imposed from the outside", – the president emphasized.

Putin reminded that the democracy is also opportunity to inspect the government. "We have to come to direct democracy – directly to democracy", – the president said. Thus, he made the statement that political competition, in his opinion, is the benefit, but it has to be conducted by honest rules. "The sovereignty of Russia is a must. Direct or indirect intervention in our internal processes is unacceptable. Officials, having income abroad, can't be politicians in Russia", – he assured.

The president also reminded that in politics there is no place for crimes, and noted that dialogue is possible only with those who act in a civilized way and within the law.

Moreover, Vladimir Putin touched upon a question of returning Russian compatriots from other countries back to the homeland. The Russian president felt indignant by the fact that people wishing to obtain Russian nationality face
bureaucratic delays. "I assign to work at the advanced order of granting the Russian citizenship to compatriots – native speakers of Russian language and representatives of Russian culture, to lineal descendants of those who was born in the Russian Empire, and in the USSR who want to get permanent residence in Russia, having renounced the citizenship of other country", – he noted.

At the same time the head of the country considered it necessary to toughen a visa regime for natives of the Post-Soviet countries, for example – since 2015 to forbid entrance to Russia on the basis of national, instead of international passports. Kazakhstan and Belarus will become an exception because of their membership in Russian Customs Union.

Vladimir Putin also expressed the idea to assist Russian-speaking schools in the CIS. "Quality education in Russian has to acquire a global character. Furthermore, the presence of Russia should be expanded within the world humanitarian and cultural space", – president Putin said.

Modern process of privatization shouldn't be similar to mortgage auctions having practiced in the nineties. "It has to be the privatization based on honest, transparent and open sale of state property at the fair, real price", – Putin assured. He also assigned a task to the government to create a system of Russian economy escapement from the offshores. "I assign the government to make the relevant complex suggestions on the matter. To build a system of measures for "deoffshorization" of our economy" is essential to us", – Putin proclaimed.

The president of Russia cited as an example the estimates of some experts according to which nine from ten bargains driven by large Russian companies, including companies with state ownership, are not regulated by domestic laws.

"But what is necessary to do and is fair to do is to impose extra taxes upon so-called prestigious, demonstrative consumption. I remind the government of the need to implement so-called tax on luxury, in the first half of 2013 already, which includes elite real estate and expensive cars as well, even though it is hard to accept", – president Vladimir Putin noted.
According to Putin, the proper development of the Russian Federation requires the annual growth of GDP not less than 5-6% "in the next decade". "We can't accept the situation when the Russian budget, the social sphere are highly dependent on monetary and raw markets. One-sided raw economy, we spoke about it a lot, is vulnerable for external shocks, the main thing – it doesn't provide development of human potential, isn't capable to give the chance to the majority of our people to find the opportunity to realize their talents, therefore, generates inequality. And at last – the reserves of raw model are exhausted", – he reminded.

So making comments on the present Nation Address of the head of the country, we agree in opinion that it is presented as a "program" with obvious led managed spirit, emotionally expressed in the speech.

3.2. Political discourse as a reflection of the Putin’s political image development

For the Nation Address of Putin to the Federal Assembly, it’s not about the aspiration to formulate complete ideological model, but the motivation of creation the image of power, underlining special cultural and speech status of the addressee, and also a problem of legitimating the country’s current policy. New meanings (for political discourse) are verbalized, first of all, according to standards of speech culture of the Soviet period. In program texts of the leader of the state are reproduced not only ways of thinking and understanding of the world, but also speech techniques of the 30-80th years of the XX century. Wide use of methods of political hint, the hidden promise, and dispute with possible opinions of the imagined opponent are prevailed. Standards of the Soviet political discourse are reproduced at the level of stylistics and speech stamps. Language, ideology and images of the Soviet era adapt to problems of an explanation and formation of new political reality.98

Vladimir Putin's performances also rely on speech practice of the 90th years. They are characterized by more rich figurative and symbolical row, than it is characteristic for speeches of Soviet times. The way of speech action is different from the ritual speech of the Soviet leaders: presence of the addressee is initially supposed, texts are based on dialogues, though the objections are not expected. In sense of discourse specifics here dominates politically oriented function of the program text.

In most cases key ideas of performances are shown at the very beginning of Putin’s speeches. Further they are fixed in consciousness of the addressee by various, including associative repetitions, i.e. here we talk more about indoctrination than persuasion. Orientation on explanation and development of the main thoughts, as a rule, is absent, or is connected with emotional impact on the audience. The developed ideological argumentation sometimes is used by the speaker, but as a whole is not a characteristic feature of the speech. It is admissible within a formed genre canon more likely, but isn't its obligatory component. The task of verbalization of political and ideological reference points, significant for political discourse participants, has a priority rather than tasks of audience persuasion.

At all functional dissimilarity with ritual speeches of the Soviet leaders texts they are still oriented on active approval and compliance. Problems of a re-persuasion, inducement of skeptically adjusted addressee are not included into a logical speech plan. Such addressee is deleted from a political context and even becomes object of speech aggression.

Framework of the discourse is set not by a set of rules and traditions of public political action, but by judgmental content of the main speaker statements. There is "positioning" of political discourse of the dominant government/political party, promoting it as a nationwide, fully ignoring other political and ideological opponents.

---
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Orientation on persuasion (within positively adjusted audience), as well as in the 90th years, is present as a possible, but still optional component of a genre canon. This orientation is realized through elements of figurative and emotional speech, and also by means of rhetorical "forcing the passions". It is noticeable not only in the Appeal concerning events in Beslan in 2004, stylistically issued as speech of a wartime, but also in Messages and Addresses which are, as a result, far from canons of the initial genre of political report which has been developed in the Soviet period.

The antique (rhetorical) canon of oral public speech in this case has a noticeable impact on styilities of performances, significantly alters the initial genre standard. The leader directly addresses to emotions of national audience, seeks to cause reciprocal feelings: thanks to pathos of the speech, possibility of dialogical perception of the program text is provided.

Speech techniques of Vladimir Putin’s speeches in certain cases borrow receptions from Western commercials. It is noticeable at the argumentation level where characteristic reasoning to pathos predominates (in the form of threat and hidden promise to prevent it). This is how modernity of discourse realization of genre reveals.

Development of genre canon of program performance in Vladimir Putin's texts is notable for its dynamism. It was revealed in improvement of speech techniques (periodic articulation of speech, receptions of contextual and semantic saturation of statements and stress accentuation are skillfully used in the Addresses of 2003-2004), and in active rhetorical judgment of key ideas of political discourse.

The established axiological and mobilization constructs of official ideology by virtue of its specifics caused evolution of program speeches stylistics of Vladimir Putin towards bigger impact and monumentality of oral performance. This kind of sophisticated cultural speech suits the status of the speaker and, most likely, is a stylistic norm of the corresponding genre canon (within this concrete "party" discourse).
Development of political communicative genre of program performance of the state leader is following not rhetorical, but more politically ideological logic. Logos of program performance keeps its politically oriented functions. As a result, the function of social reflection and self conception is expressed insufficiently that blocks dialogical perception of speech.

Style of key texts of Vladimir Putin is determined by independent development of specific speech culture of Russian ruling power, where the rhetoric is of instrumental, not methodological importance. Rhetorically determined models of communicative interaction are present; however don't dominate in the discourse. Dynamics of genre development shows the decrease of importance of persuasion methods in favor of suggestive verbalizations and manipulative influences at the level of frames of mass consciousness.

Purposeful directives of speech are primarily connected not with the search of new meanings (argumentation and reasoning), but with the needs of effective translation of models which have been already developed in the given political discourse. The range of speech methods and techniques allowed by the genre is unlimited. Traditional means for this genre (direct valuation, hint, mythologize, dramatization, etc.), alongside with the new ways of speech implementation of meanings (elements of metaphorical modeling, Western commercials techniques, contextual and semantic methods of stress accentuation) are used by the president. Ritual speech is actively practiced, however, in comparison with genre standards of Soviet period, it is not the main, but supportive means of texts creation.

Modern political space is conceptualized by the politician in terms of national interest, unity, state, strategic partnership. In the system of Vladimir Putin’s political views economic values predominate.

Such adjectives as strategic, key, effective serve as favorite epithets in relation to the phenomena and subjects of modern history. The following phrases are considered to be political markers of modern history: key task, strategic partnership, effective state, strong Russia, regular citizen.
In relation to negative demonstrations of modern realities Vladimir Putin chooses to use definitions with the prefix *not* - marking medium term on the "good-not good; not bad--bad" axis. In other words, Putin prefers not to dramatize a situation by softening the categoricalness of negative estimation of the actions of some political and economic actors.

At the lexical level Vladimir V. Putin seeks for distinct presentation of this or that attitude or configuration. In this regard there takes place a tendency to the continuous use of definitions: *accurate, clear, real, concrete, and certain*.

Distinctive feature of the Russian president’s discourse is the practical absence of words with stylistic label "high". Vladimir V. Putin rarely quotes the works of Russian classical literature, giving preference to proverbs and sayings. The new knowledge is represented in the discourse of the politician in a small degree; there is no specialization of concrete value.

Characteristic features for Putin's discourse portrait are represented by the following stylistic methods: *the categorical imperativeness, the complicated repetitions, quotes, strengthening of the rational argument, parceling, etc.* Distinctive feature of his speeches is their formal and rational character.

Logicality of statement is essential for the discourse of the Russian president, so-called intellectual expressivity which is displayed in rare use of synonymous, and also wide representation of subordinate clauses in a compound sentence, the use of quantitative adverbs, coherence of statements (first ..., in summary, …) are specifics of Putin’s speeches.

Vladimir Putin adheres conceptual attitude towards global processes happening in the world with a relish of abstractness and impersonality. The president preserves an imperious way of thinking; it is supposed that the audience predeterminedly agrees with policy guidelines which are proclaimed by the leader. In Putin's discourse conceptualization of reality is realized by verbal nouns formation (*transformation, control, development, targeting, etc.*). The verb transforms into the noun which designs a subject as though it is a real, material phenomenon. Orientation on using hyperonyms is definitely reflects modern
conceptual thinking which develops in the system of reality overloaded with "ideas", ideologically incompatible, irreducible to each other, mutually inconsistent. The evidence of this phenomenon can be the present state symbolic and the state holidays of New Russia.

3.3. Communicative strategy characteristics in the political discourse of Vladimir V. Putin

The annual State of the Nation Address of the Russian president Vladimir Putin carries out informative function; information mostly concerns a present day situation which is, however, compared to the past: The number of the unemployed nowadays is about 5 million people; it was reduced by 2 million in comparison with the peak of the crisis. This is the essential achievement. The size of the national debt is minimized. Today's level of the international reserves of Russia (and it is about half-billion dollars) is higher than this indicator was at the end of the last year.

As a whole in this message dominates imperative function, which is revealed in use of modality of necessity: It is necessary to provide technological modernization of children's clinics and hospitals, to increase qualification of their employees. It is necessary to pay a special attention to preventive vaccination, accessibility of children and teenagers to qualitative medicines and early diagnosis of tuberculosis, cancer and other dangerous diseases. It is also necessary to devote funds for these purposes realization. For families with three and more under age children it is necessary to grant additional tax preferences. Thirdly, for children who do not attend kindergartens, it is necessary to create pre-school groups at general high school.

However, more frequent feature for this genre of Putin’s speech is its modality of must-do: Local administrations, as well as supervisory authorities have to in advance, that is almost now, take care of a preparation to the next summer season. These problems have to be solved by Children rights...
commissioners; we have them in 58 regions of our country. However, both regional and municipal bodies have to provide their financial support. In given examples the obliged subject is announced. In other cases there can be no notification who has to execute the following: Tax privileges and government financing of research activity have to be delivered to all who does have ideas and who corresponds to the established criteria. As a result of such measures the role of regional power and municipalities in solving key social and economic problems has to increase.

In similar cases, as well as in examples with modality of necessity, by using passive constructions with the exclusion of the agent, the statement acquires the declaration status, lacking concrete problem description. Moreover, some statements of the Russian president are aimed obviously not at the right addressee: Within this year it is necessary for every school to create a “project of the future” – vision of how an educational institution can be developed. The development of such projects is, of course, the task, first of all, for teachers, student and their parents. It is told to members of the Federal Assembly that building of the “schools of the future” is a challenge for teachers, students and parents, not saying a word about governmental servants. Therefore, the federal authority can simply exonerate itself from any kind of responsibility for the problems existing in the educational sphere.

Besides, one can find a motive of assignation presenting in the President’s Address: I assign the Government not less than a half of fixed expenses economy, and also a part of the extra income of federal budget, to ride at support the priorities of modernization... Since this year I assign to conduct standard medical examination for children... I assign the government to take this recommendation into account... I assign the heads of the regional Government to prepare concept offers on the subject. I assign to heads of the Russian states to provide annual reports on ecology in their regions. Vladimir Putin's assignments are of a very abstract character, they have no accurately formulated tasks and dead-lines.
The motive of promise isn't that popular in the text of the Addresses of president Putin. There is one example that can be interpreted as a promise: *I will continue to control the execution of these instructions personally by my own.*

It was already mentioned that texts of the Messages and Addresses of the president are written by a group of specialists. Nevertheless, the president takes on the responsibility for the contents of every signed political document, as Alexander Chudinov claims. The researcher makes a suggestion to call these phenomenon texts with superseded authorship. For addressees of the political communication the significant point of view is the opinion of the president, not his assistants, therefore, the text is perceived proceeding directly from the president.

In the Address of 2007 Vladimir Putin actively uses means of open evaluation: *Russia had not only overcome long period of production decline, but also came into the ten largest economies of the world.*

President Putin builds the direct composition, it is important for him to track a vector of country’s development. To achieve this purpose he uses finite clauses in three timing templates: last (pays a tribute to the memory of Boris Yeltsin, the era when "the foundation for future changes was laid"), present ("spiritual fellowship of people and moral values uniting us" in its basis) and future (the realization of strategic plans: "the formation of capable civil society, the construction of the effective state ensuring safety and worthy life of people, the maintenance of free and socially responsible entrepreneurship, the fight against corruption and terrorism, modernization of Armed forces and law enforcement authorities, this is, at last, significant strengthening of the role of Russia on the international arena"). All three timing templates are closely interconnected in the speeches; the tendency of "construction of bright future" "all together with the world". Abstract nouns as homogeneous parts of sentences enhance the impact on the audience.

The State of Nation Address is the main message to the national audience. The president speaks on behalf of the highest power institutions. Using personal
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pronouns, the president with a special trustworthy intonation fixes attention on the problems of the country which are also significant personally for himself. For example, Vladimir Putin talking about the housing stocks issue: "I remember when we started the whole thing, at first, there were in 2004, 300 million, in my opinion, then a billion has been devoted, this year – a billion again". Elements of informal style strengthen Putin's trustworthy intonation.

Powerful tools of evaluation are paradigms "we - inclusive" and "we - exclusive". Inclusion of the political subject/event in one of them instantly marks the subject/event, relegate them to the "camp" of "friends" or "foes", "good" or "bad".

According to Vladimir Putin "We - inclusive" camp includes the government ("We consciously made this, in fact, revolutionary step, finally brought democratic spirit to electoral system", "With all our strength until the last minute of our legitimate constitutional rights we have to effectively use the time which life gave us to serve Russia"), Russian people ("Thus we understand that we are, of course, just on a trailhead, and it is a difficult journey, a journey to the genuine revival of our country. And the more united our society will be, the quicker we will be able to pass this way"). The gradational range gives an impression that the members of the Federal Assembly and people of the Russian Federation are synonyms. Mythologize of public conscience takes place here, where idealized cliché corresponds to imaginary denotatum\(^{101}\).

Vladimir Putin includes two groups of "enemies" in "We - exclusive" camp. He places actions of all of them in the area "very bad" on gradational scale. First of all, it is internal enemies (the representatives of former elite): "I will put it straightforward: not everybody is pleased with forwarding stable progressive development of our country. There are also those, who are tricky using pseudo-democratic phraseology (i.e. using a cliché), would like to return the recent past with only two purposes – to sack and plunder national wealth, to steal from people

and the state, or to deprive the country of economic and political independence" (the values fixed by the Constitution): "There are those who doesn’t the dirtiest technologies, trying to kindle in our multinational democratic country international and interreligious discord.

Secondly, it is external enemies: "The stream of money from abroad, used for direct intervention in our internal affairs, grows as well".

The inherent in the Russian culture orientation on collectivity\textsuperscript{102} found reflection in Vladimir Putin's discourse: he adverts to the search of Russian idea, making reference in this context to the economy development perspectives, so-called "Putin's plan". As soon as the term "Russian idea" has no strict definition, Vladimir Putin defines it in his own way, associating it with the economic plan estimated as "very good": \textit{However, there is something that unites us all without an exception: we all want changes for the best. But not everybody knows how to achieve it. And we, those who gathered today here, in the Kremlin, are not only obliged to know it – we are obliged to make everything to develop the practical plan of specific actions. We have to make everything to convince the vast majority of our citizens in efficiency of this plan and to make them real associates of the whole creative process.}

Vladimir Putin avoids using linguistic constructions with direct evaluative lexicon, there are rare exceptions though, which mean the high degree of emotional reaction of the speaker and, thus, become special means of content "promotion". The personal assessment "very bad", given by president Putin to a current state of housing and communal services of Russia, becomes a vivid example: \textit{"The absence of government attention to these problems I consider immoral at all"}. Putin takes the group of words, related to ethics of communication and opposes it to the semantic layer connected with the governmental tasks and problems. Creating the effect of unexpectedness and enhancing contrast, Vladimir Putin puts together the word government and colloquial idiom at all. Trustworthy spirit is created in the

speech by inversion use. From the morphological point of view, nouns dominate in
the sentences; stratification of the casal constructions testifies "criminal" inactivity
of the government.

As any political discourse, modern official political rhetoric is constructed
on the basis of oppositions: old/new, own/others, true/false which represent a
special case of functioning of lexical item point "to approve". Political process
represents a commitment of various interests that is explaining the prevalence in
political discourse of the verb "approve", its synonyms and antonyms. Used in
Message of the President to Parliament, this lexical item point symbolizes the
absence of social parity and official form of communication.

Vladimir Putin makes an act of approval, firmly insists that his opinion is
right and urges the audience to rally to it. Putin uses a verb (I agree with this
suggestion), a full adjective ("the coordinated work of executive and legislative
branches") and a derivative pretext ("according to which"). Verbal forms are
represented by a verb of imperfect type of past tense: "Russia has been
coordinating all the actions with its partners" – in this sentence Vladimir Putin
emphasizes the process, the duration of action. By using the verb of third person of
future time: "I think, many of you will agree with me, that..." Putin acts in a role of
the prophet, predicting future, estimating subjects, and also using verbs of
imperative mood: "Let’s agree that it is just impossible to look easily at the
collapsing bridges".

The synonyms to the verb "approve" are used in the discourse as well, such
as the verb "accept". In officially formal and ideological communication there are
fixed templates of the language formulations reporting about the decision made. It
is the following pattern "the modal word + infinitive with semantics of intension"
("it is necessary to accept the appropriate program", "It is necessary to
immediately accept investment programs on development of the Russian harbors"),
full and short participles in passive voice ("accepted upon the initiative of
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president Yeltsin", "as a result of the measures taken in recent years") and nouns ("the issue of special program adoption on airport network development").

The verb "to accept" in official communication is closely connected with the performative "ask": "I ask to advance the adoption of amendments in legislature". In official political communication the verb "ask" is some kind of euphemism: except denotative meaning of actually a request, there is added a connotative meaning of obligation to execution.

One more model, synonymous to the construction with the verb "approve" is the model with the verb "confirm". Here we can observe syntax parallelism with the constructions described above. So, Vladimir Putin in his speech uses the scheme "modal word + infinitive" ("I consider it essential to confirm the program of road network development"), includes the modal word in the structure of nominal predicate ("It has to be confirmed by the government").

Vladimir Putin often uses in his speeches synonyms of the lexical item point "approve", but carefully avoids its antonyms, prefer to give negative evaluations in impersonal form. Verbs with the semes of confidence, persuasion are used as methods of influence, they are meant to give audience the opinion of the politician which he shares with the listeners using confidential intonation. Thus, Vladimir Putin uses the verb "convince" five times in his speech in the form of “to be sure": if our citizens ...will be sure that efforts of the government are directed on protection of their vital interests"), of a noun ("I can tell with confidence") and of a comparative adjective ("the quicker and more surely we will be able to pass this way").

Vladimir Putin uses in the Address many rhetorical methods: effect creation of "nation-wide opinion", labeling, reliance on gravitas, double standards method, and presuppositions usage.

To emphasize expediency of some action, Vladimir Putin creates effect of "nation-wide opinion" by generalization of the subject of action. So, in Putin’s

---

speech there are models with passive voice: "the issue of continuity of state policy will be resolved", "the foundation for future changes was laid”. The effect of "wide-nation opinion" is also created by demonstrative pronouns: uncertain pronouns ("Someone doesn't shun even the dirtiest technologies"), embodiments ("The stream of money from abroad, used for direct intervention in our domestic affairs grows).

On using the method of reliance on gravitas Vladimir Putin quotes Dmitry Likhachev. Putin addresses to tradition, speaks about the proportion of the state sovereignty and cultural orientation of the nation and relies on Likhachev's authority: "State sovereignty is defined by cultural criteria as well".

In his discourse president Putin also uses also so-called pragmemes: "fashionable" ones are popular for his speeches, he replaces them with synonyms more relevant in the context though, that testifies the expansion of word sequencing. Putin introduces embodiments into the text: "to start the mechanism of creation of associations of efficient housing owners ". Pragmemes participate in the use of metaphors: "work on these projects [one more example of language fashion: the pretext "on" instead of necessary "over"], requires a special administrative scheme, or as we now often say, "manual" management". Besides, here the word is a part of the meta-language statement.

The pragmeme “real” also expanded its meaning in Vladimir Putin's speech: not only "real threat of safety" and "the real income", but also "real democracy". The pragmeme protracts within the text: "Speed of Union State construction depends only on intension and real – real – depths of integration processes".

Stability is one of the main values in the political discourse of Vladimir Putin: "Political and economic stability", "stable forwarding development of our country", "to stabilize a material situation in the creative environment", "maintenance of macroeconomic stability".

The pragmeme “development” that becomes fashionable in modern political discourse expanded its combinability in Putin’s speeches: "Government
support is received by those vectors of development which are connected with the use and introduction of most advanced technologies".

The pragmeme “democracy” carried its positive evaluation during the Perestroika era, in Putin times it has acquired a negative connotation: democratic rhetoric “has already bored everybody to death”. Vladimir Putin built the discourse of "a strong hand" on the contrast with the "chaos of the 90s": "today they add democratic slogans to their poor arsenal”.

Speaking about the pragmeme “unity”, Vladimir Putin successfully actualized it: "the spiritual unity of people", "is base for strengthening the country’s unity and sovereignty".

All in all, president Putin uses five pragmemes, actualizing them by word compatibility expansion. In the phrase "capitalization of development institutes" Putin uses two pragmemes at once: institutes and development.

The pragmema of “innovation” in Vladimir Putin's speech also possesses wide compatibility: "competition of innovation universities".

The pragmema “intelligence” by the president in the traditional field of compatibility: "based on intelligence and knowledge of economy".

Pragmema is a way of open evaluation and is the fastest way of fixing of necessary meaning in the language fashion and its actualization in the discourse.

Top of estimation scale is metaphor 107– "the most widespread figure of speech, based on the principle of similarity, analogy, is more rare – contrast of the phenomena”108. The metaphor is the kernel of hidden evaluation. The metaphor in the political discourse carries out special value-oriented function: the creation of bright, visible image which is formatted in the imagination of addressee and influence the decision-making.

Metaphors investigation is possible on the example of metaphorical models. The metaphorical model is an existing in consciousness of native speakers communication scheme between conceptual spheres which can be presented as a

certain formula: "X is Y"\textsuperscript{109}. It is important to note that the conceptual political metaphor reflects national consciousness and ideas existing in this country of structure of public administration. In particular, a president of Western world can be presented as commander-in-chief, prizefighter (professional boxer); but president for Americans is not the monarch, the sacred or sovereign governor of the country, but kind of General Manager employed by the people"\textsuperscript{110}. In the Russian political discourse (by Alexander Chudinov) the important place in system of images is taken by the conceptual metaphor "the president is a tsar"\textsuperscript{111}.

In the President’s Address of Putin to the Federal Assembly there are quite little metaphors that emphasize the seriousness of genre, its intentional severity. At the same time, all four categories of typical Russian political metaphor outlined by Alexander Chudinov are present in the Addresses\textsuperscript{112}.

The metaphorical model of sickness belongs to the category of anthropomorphous metaphor: "\textit{first of all, it is necessary to punch financial clots formed in the national economy}". The negative emotions connected with the model of sickness are transformed into positive one in the medical model as an active process of curing the illness.

The metaphorical model of insect belongs to the category of the metaphor of nature: "\textit{instead of looking for fleas on the former Soviet Union territories}". This metaphor used within the paradigm "We - exclusive", Vladimir Putin emphasizes insignificance, irrelevance of “enemies” problems.

The metaphorical model of house, belonging to the category of artifact metaphor is one of the basic in culture and language; it in the natural way represents organization of world order. The design of the house includes the slot of fundament without which it is impossible to build a good quality house. The frame of construction is especially popular in Putin’s discourse: "\textit{The speed of construction of the Union State}".


\textsuperscript{111}Anatoly Chudinov. Metaphorical mosaic in modern political communication – Ekaterinburg, 2003, p. 248.

\textsuperscript{112}Ibid.
Metaphor in the political discourse means a way of judgment of changing reality, a way of fast, hidden intrusion of evaluation, sometimes escaping the consciousness of the addressee. Vladimir Putin uses metaphors, referring to the category of nature, causing a negative evaluation of activity of actants from a paradigm "We - exclusive". He addresses to the category of artifact metaphor as a very simple one, clear to every citizen of the country.

Thus, summing up the features of creation of communicative strategy in Vladimir Putin's political discourse, it is possible to make the following conclusions:

Vladimir Putin chooses different means of evaluation – both opened, and hidden. He frequently uses synonyms of the lexical item point "approve", but carefully avoids its antonyms, prefers to give negative evaluations in personal form. The president prefers personal verbal forms. Pragmemes in his speeches reflect the fast change of situations evaluation and other phenomena of political discourse. Pragmemes are the fastest way of fixing of necessary meaning in the language fashion and its actualization in the discourse.

In the Address to the Federal Assembly Vladimir Putin avoids the excessive use of metaphors as the way of hidden penetration in the consciousness of addressee. He prefers a traditional metaphorical model for political discourse – the model of house. At metaphorical level Putin's discourse is perceived as an extremely dynamic and even aggressive: "instead of looking for fleas on the former Soviet Union territories".
CHAPTER IV
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF BARACK H. OBAMA AND VLADIMIR V. PUTIN.

Vladimir Putin chooses different means of evaluation – both opened, and hidden. He frequently uses synonyms of the lexical item point "approve", but carefully avoids its antonyms, prefers to give negative evaluations in personal form. The president prefers personal verbal forms. Pragmemes in his speeches reflect the fast change of situations evaluation and other phenomena of political discourse. Pragmemes are the fastest way of fixing of necessary meaning in the language fashion and its actualization in the discourse.

In the Address to the Federal Assembly Vladimir Putin avoids the excessive use of metaphors as the way of hidden penetration in the consciousness of addressee. He prefers a traditional metaphorical model for political discourse – the model of house. At metaphorical level Putin's discourse is perceived as an extremely dynamic and even aggressive.

The image of democratic leader, the head government servant, who appellates to Constitutional values, is not popular in the Russian political discourse yet. We still preserve the image of the tsar, the emperor with a strong will, which is especially important in the situation of global crisis. The expectations of the audience are connected with charismatic, non-standard, characteristic reflection in the language.

In Barack Obama's discourse “personal” always presented more widely, than in the speeches of Vladimir V. Putin. First, it is connected with the special features of English language. In English, unlike Russian, the use of mononuclear sentences and missing personal pronouns is impossible. In consequence, the politician always uses a pronoun. This fact corresponds to individualistic, active nature of the American culture. In the speeches of the American president we can see the reflection of American linguistic culture which is personally oriented.
There is an obvious accent on the use of the “personal” in the texts of State of the Union Address to Congress. In the amount of 20 thousand words Barack Obama uses 233 pronouns:

*So I know the anxieties that are out there right now. They're not new. These struggles are the reason I ran for President. These struggles are what I've witnessed for years in places like Elkhart, Indiana; Galesburg, Illinois. I hear about them in the letters that I read each night* [Obama, 2010].

*But when I ran for President, I promised I wouldn't just do what was popular – I would do what was necessary* [B. Obama, 2010].

In these examples the use of pronouns promotes revelation of identity of the speaker. Verbs of cognitive activity and perception *know/witnessed/hear/read* tell the audience about Obama's personal experience.

The display of “collective” in the language is realized by the personal pronoun *we*. The usage of the marker *we* is typical for Russian political discourse. It creates feeling of common involvement (the speaker and the audience) in a situation.

The prevalence of “collective” over “personal” is a peculiar feature of Russian political discourse: society and collective is more important than personal and individual. President, the representative of government, announces not only the interests of the government, but of the nation as a whole entity:

*The more important question is: what kind of world we want to construct and what kind of world we will leave for future generations. If we look at the problem from this point of view, then we will understand that if we want the world to be more...* [Putin, 2003].

In State of the Nation Address to the Federal Assembly Vladimir Putin uses personal verbal forms with pronoun *we* to state the result of joint activity for the passed year: *we strengthened the government, we improved, we significantly promoted*. The form *we together* emphasizes “collective” that strengthens value of collectivity and compatibility of efforts.
The main difference of the ratio “personal” and “collective” in Russian and American political discourse is that in both cases “collective” is presented more widely than so-called “personal”. In Obama's speeches “collective” is almost identical in all genres, but the most “personal” are texts of the Addresses.

Concerning temporary forms in American and Russian political discourse, we can see that important difference is that forms of past tense in the speeches of Barack Obama are presented more widely, than in the discourse of Vladimir Putin, especially concerning the expression of “personal”. “Personal” in past tense in Putin’s Addresses makes 14%, Obama has 22% accordingly. Individualistic line is clearly observed in American language culture with obvious prevalence of past “personal”. Barack Obama speaks about his personal experience, past activity of the government and achievements much more than Vladimir Putin, the result of his policies is more illustrative:

That's a promise I've made to you. I remember, more than two years ago, in Montana, I visited the Crow Nation – one of the many times I met with tribal leaders on the campaign trail. You may know that on that trip, I became an adopted Crow Indian. My Crow name is «One Who Helps People Throughout the Land. And my wife, when I told her about this, she said, «You should be named 'One Who Isn't Picking Up His Shoes and His Socks'. [Obama, 2010].

The present “personal” is almost equally represented in the speeches of the heads of Russia and the USA: 57-66%. It is more likely to be caused by norms of the genre. Future tense is more widely presented in Vladimir Putin’s discourse: 21% and 14% in Obama’s speeches accordingly. Putin more oriented to the future as Russia is one of the “BRIC” countries and is in the process of rapid economic development. The president is eager to install people’s confidence in the bright future of the country.

In Vladimir Putin's discourse strong-willed verbs are rarely found. Barack Obama uses them a way more frequent. In the Addresses to the Parliament Putin’s strong-willed verbs make up to 7%, while Obama’s Message to Congress contains 34% of them. It characterizes American president as an active figure and the
discourse as dynamic and vigorous, which is dictated by American linguistic culture.

The second group of verbs, needed to pay attention to is verbs of cognitive and intellectual activity. They introduce opinion, thoughts, telling, ideas, hopes, emotions and feelings (*I consider, I think, I believe, I know, I remember, etc.* This group can comprise not only verbs, but also their short adjectives like: *sure, convinced*, which prevail in Russian political discourse. Cognitive verbs are almost always used in present tense.

Vladimir Putin in his Addresses prefers the verb *think* to other cognitive verbs (46%), its semantics is sometimes blurry or even empty. Its purpose is to soften flatness and let space for a different opinion:

*Also I think, as for us, and for these partners it is important not to lose this special status of economic relationship, and such threat, while the accession to the EU, exists because of some certain rules and restrictions in foreign trade* [Putin, 2003]

*We consider, and I think in order to make these actions further effective, they have to be primarily coordinated. And building assumptions and guesses on what the United States intend or not intend to do, is, I think, not what I have to be engaged in* [Putin, 2002].

The verb phrase *I think* acts as filler of pauses, it allows speaking to stop and gives time to formulate the further statement.

Barack Obama uses the phrase I think much less than the Russian president, this fact shows that Russian political leader is more likely to express his own opinion and beliefs, but in certain cases expression of some thought allows to submit the statement not as the fact, and only as the assumption of the speaker:

*No, I don't think that we have to change strong U.S. support for Israel* [Obama, 2009].

The biggest percentage of verbs in Putin’s Addresses are taken by the verbs of speech activity.
In English language material verbs like *ask, say, tell, thank, propose, etc.* are the examples of verbs of speech activity.

The fourth group of verbs is presented by modal predicates *has to, can, is compelled*. These modal personal predicates are used almost in all Addresses of Vladimir Putin, his personal duty and opportunity (I can) is expressed everywhere:

*I, of course, can judge and has to judge the new prime minister of Italy not on the basis of five-minute conversation on the phone, but on the basis of those political and economic directives, on the views he declared publicly during the election campaign* [Putin, 2001].

**I have to say that all our discussions** with the President Bush were and are very productive [Putin, 2002].

The fifth group of verbs expresses intensions and desires the speaker: *I want, I would like*. The form *would like*, dictated by etiquette, is becoming more and more typical for Russian political discourse and already perceived as norm of speech.

The analysis of frequency predicates in present tense shows that Vladimir Putin on the first uses the phrase *I consider*, on the second place - *I suggest*. And the construction *I ask* is also displayed in his discourse:

**I ask** to finish development and adoption of the relevant federal law in shortest terms [Putin, 2007]. *I ask* acts as the neutral analog of *I require*, besides with emphasized politeness.

Vladimir Putin often chooses predicates expressing opinion: *I think*, and *I know*, which shows more confidence:

**I know that the work given was not easy, I know how difficult it was, and let's put it straightforward, I know, how many conflicts, and disputes it caused** [Putin, 2001].

Sometimes the president emphasizes his own confidence in the situation, instead of thoughts and assumptions by using *I am sure*, which expresses high degree of the feeling:
I think that such statements (not only I think – I am sure) are groundless and have no reasonable bases [Putin, 2007].

In speeches of Barack Obama we can more likely find such frequency predicates as I want and I believe, the American leader prefers cognitive verbs.

The Russian language culture prefers finite verbs of speech, and American – strong-willed. The usage of cognitive verbs doesn’t depend on language culture, they are inherent both in the discourse of the head of Russia and the president of the USA.
CONCLUSION

On basis of the conducted research the following conclusions are made:

Political discourse is one of the most intimately examined sorts of discourse. Its popularity is connected with the subject of research – special sphere of human activity – politics, with different forms of which we face every day.

There is a determined well-established model of public word in the sphere of political oratory in the mass minds. Specifics of speech image formation are expressed by such essential categories as cleanness, propriety, conciseness, vivid personal principles, “dialogueness” - adjustment for communication, contact with the audience providing literacy and skillfulness. Using hackneyed or blurring phrases or clichés, depersonalization, excessive bookishness, slips of the tongue are always directed against the speaker, lowing his rhetoric and personal image, weakening the effectiveness and influence of his performance.

Efficiency of political communication in the modern world is permanently connected with the appearance and development of new genres of political discourse. President’s Message to the Parliament is one of them.

Specificity of Message genre is predicated by cooperation of conventional and intentional text parameters. Their comparison revealed vector changes of such logical syntax-oriented and compositional parameters of the author intention as characterization propositions, subjective modality, persuasiveness, individually-authorial communicative competence. The main vector of Message genre adoption is actualization of speaker’s intention and pragmatic statements on every level of text organization.

Annual President’s Message to the Parliament takes a special place in the genre structure of political discourse as it is a historically formulated form of cooperation of legislative and executive branches of the government in the countries with presidential regime.

The communicative strategies applied in Obama’s Message revealed in its structure, which includes the following elements:

– compulsory frame components: a) appellation to the Addresse –
members of Congress; b) conclusion where Barack Obama traditionally apppellates to God;

– main points: a) introduction part, not big in size, where the president sideway underlines his status speaking of his responsibility as the head of the state to deliver a Message to the Parliament; b) retrospective part where Obama turns to the past emphasizing historical meaning of the moment; c) making a statement devoted to achievements of the last year and problems of the future; d) recommendation part which is as a rule the biggest one and includes information about suggested measures; e) inspirational part which goal is to unite the audience.

The components listed above not necessarily go in the given order, moreover, they are usually mixed with each other during the whole speech.

The analysis of compositional structure of the main part of the Message approves that this genre is characterized by three processes closely connected with each other: thinking about real values, staging and evaluating the important problems and political recommendations. The texts of speeches of president Obama are oriented on modeling the program “from the past through the present to the future”.

Thus, the following genre characteristics, which distinguish annual Message to Congress from other genres of epidictic rhetoric, can be drafted: 1) marking out the main tasks and aims for the next year; 2) uniting the listeners in one nation (the Message is addressed to governmental officials, but in fact looks to wide audience); 3) appealing to the past as a source of traditional values of the nation and its reconstruction to describe the future.

State of the Nation Address to the Federal Assembly is a special and very typical genre for Russian political discourse, where the president draws conclusions on the annual work of the government and allots strategic and tactical tasks for the next year. The process of actualization of the determined semantic and lexical layer, introduction and fixation of changes in the active vocabulary of the

society take place. The genre of Address appeals to originality, uniqueness, the Message intends to be memorable, the used linguistic constructions should be potentially “fashionable” and become popular. The traditional continuation along with language innovations in the political discourse are expressed by the means of evaluation.
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