



# Università di Genova

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE POLITICHE  
E INTERNAZIONALI

Corso di Laurea Magistrale in:  
Security and International Relations

*Rhetoric and Reality: A Comparative Analysis of Trump's and  
Biden's Speeches on National and International Security.*

LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND INSTITUTIONS OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING  
COUNTRIES

Relatore 

*Chiar.mo Prof. Francesco Pierini*

Candidata

*Dott.ssa Gaia Gambaro* 

**ANNO ACCADEMICO 2022/2023**



*To my biggest fan, "Bobo."*

*To my "Mamma," who cherishes my successes as her own.*

*To my "Nonna Giulia," who shared her energy before every exam and important moment.*

*To my "Nonna Tina," who appears whenever I need her.*

*To Brigitta and Sofia, who stood by me every step of the way.*

*To Alessia, who, though far away, is always by my side.*

*To Martina, for the sleepless nights studying together.*

*To Ludo, who has been a friend when I needed one.*

*To Sergey who loved me unconditionally.*

*To me, for my resilience.*

## *Summary*

Introduction.....	7
Chapter I - The Power of Rhetoric and Presidential Speeches.....	11
1.1 History and Importance of Presidential Speeches.....	11
1.2 The Role of Rhetoric in Forming National and International Policy.....	17
1.3 Methods of Speech Analysis: Tools and Techniques.....	19
Chapter II – Donald Trump’s Approach to Security: Rhetoric and Reality.....	23
2.1 Overview of Donald Trump’s Security Policy Approach.....	23
2.1.1 Trump’s Rhetoric on Domestic Security.....	25
2.1.2 Trump’s Stance on International Security.....	28
2.2 Analysis of Key Trump Speeches.....	35
2.2.1 The 58 <sup>th</sup> Inaugural Address.....	35
2.2.2 The Helsinki Summit: Press Conference with Vladimir Putin.....	40
2.2.3 Main Themes, Patterns and Recurring Topics.....	45
Chapter III – Joe Biden’s Blueprint for Security – Words and Deeds.....	47
3.1 Overview of Biden’s Security Policies.....	47
3.1.1 Biden’s Approach to Domestic Security.....	49
3.1.2 Biden’s International Security Agenda.....	52
3.2 Analysis of Key Biden Speeches.....	55
3.2.1 The 59 <sup>th</sup> Inaugural Address.....	56
3.2.2 The Withdrawal from Afghanistan Speech.....	67
3.2.3 Main Themes, Patterns and Recurring Topics.....	78
Chapter IV – A Comparative Analysis – Trump vs. Biden.....	80
4.1 Shared Themes and Diverging Priorities.....	80
4.2 Rhetorical Strategies: Similarities and Differences.....	84
Conclusions.....	85
Biography.....	89



## *Introduction*

In the contemporary political landscape, the pivotal role of leaders' speeches in shaping public opinion and influencing policy decisions stands as an undeniable truth. These orations serve as potent instruments, allowing political leaders to articulate their visions, convey policy intentions, and address critical national and international issues. Within this sphere, the study of political rhetoric and discourse analysis have ascended to prominence, offering invaluable insights into the strategies employed by leaders to effectively communicate their ideas. This thesis embarks on a detailed comparative analysis, scrutinizing the speeches delivered by two eminent American presidents, Donald J. Trump, and Joseph R. Biden Jr., with a particular focus on their discussions concerning national and international security.

The tenures of Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr.<sup>1</sup> mark a pivotal juncture in American modern political history<sup>2</sup>, characterized by distinctive approaches to domestic and foreign policies. A cornerstone of their leadership lies in the articulation of national security policies, a realm instrumental in shaping the nation's stance on global affairs, international relations, and internal security measures. Trump's presidency was distinguished by unconventional rhetoric and policy decisions, whereas Biden's administration ushered in a different tone and strategic direction, emphasizing diplomacy, alliances, and multilateral cooperation.

The significance of this comparative analysis of Trump and Biden's speeches on national and international security resonates on multiple levels. Firstly, it provides a nuanced understanding of the rhetorical strategies employed by these leaders to address security-related concerns, shedding light on their distinctive communication styles, tones, and priorities. Secondly, by juxtaposing these speeches, this study aims to unveil the underlying ideological disparities and policy orientations of the two administrations, thereby offering valuable insights for scholars, policymakers, and the general public. Furthermore, the concerned analysis holds relevance in gauging the impact of political rhetoric<sup>3</sup> on public perception, international relations, and the formulation of security policies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Donald Trump served as the 45th President of the United States from January 20, 2017, to January 20, 2021.

Joe Biden assumed office as the 46th President of the United States on January 20, 2021, and is still in office.

<sup>2</sup> The term "modern political history" typically refers to the period after World War II, starting from the mid-20th century to the present day. Modern American political history encompasses the presidencies from Harry Truman to the current president as of the knowledge cutoff date in January 2022, Joe Biden.

<sup>3</sup> Political rhetoric refers to the use of language and communication strategies by politicians and political actors to persuade, inform, or influence audiences regarding political issues, policies, or events. It involves the deliberate use of words, symbols, and narratives to shape public opinion, mobilize support, or discredit opponents.

This study is guided by several central research questions:

1. How do Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr. frame national and international security issues in their speeches?
2. What rhetorical strategies do Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr. employ to convey their security-related policies and priorities?
3. What are the key rhetorical differences and similarities in the national and international security narratives presented by Trump and Biden?

The primary objective of this thesis is to conduct a meticulous textual analysis of selected speeches delivered by Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr., elucidating their distinct rhetorical choices, and examining the implications of said choices on public opinion and policy formulation.

Acknowledging the significance of contextual boundaries, it is imperative to recognize the limitations of this study. The analysis is focused on a specific set of speeches, chosen for their relevance to national and international security issues. By embarking on this comparative analysis, this thesis aspires to enrich the existing body of knowledge on political rhetoric, national and international security discourse, and the communication strategies of political leaders.

The first chapter of this elaboration delves into the historical trajectory and evolution of presidential speeches concerning national and international security worldwide and specifically in the United States of America. By tracing the roots of these speeches, this section aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how the rhetorical landscape has transformed and evolved over time. This historical contextualization sets the stage for the in-depth analysis of Donald Trump's and Joe Biden's speeches, allowing for a nuanced comparison that accounts for the evolving nature of presidential rhetoric on security matters. An important focus will be on the pivotal role that rhetoric plays in shaping not only public perceptions but also tangible policy outcomes in the realms of national and international security. It investigates the intricate interplay between presidential discourse and policy formulation, elucidating how persuasive language and strategic communication, serve as instrumental tools in the hands of political leaders. By scrutinizing the impact of rhetoric on policy decisions, this chapter illuminates the nexus between words spoken and actions taken, providing a foundation for subsequent analyses. An indispensable component of this study outlines the rigorous methodologies employed to analyse the speeches of Presidents Trump and Biden. Utilizing established tools and techniques in discourse analysis, rhetorical criticism, and communication studies, this chapter elucidates the systematic approach undertaken to deconstruct the speeches. Through the use of precise methods, this study ensures a robust and objective analysis, allowing for an unbiased evaluation of the rhetorical strategies employed by the two presidents in the domain of national and international security.

The following chapter initiates the works by providing a comprehensive overview of Donald Trump's security policies dissecting his strategies concerning both domestic and international security, offering a detailed exploration of his administration's priorities and approaches in these areas. By delineating the key elements of Trump's security agenda, this chapter sets the stage for a focused analysis of his speeches, enabling an understanding of the context within which his rhetoric on security matters unfolded. Subsequently, pivotal speeches delivered by President Trump will be addressed, therefore conducting a meticulous analysis of context, delivery, and rhetorical techniques employed. By examining speeches such as the 58<sup>th</sup> Inaugural Address<sup>4</sup> and the Press Conference with Vladimir Putin in Helsinki<sup>5</sup>, this chapter dissects the nuances of Trump's rhetoric. It explores the settings, audience dynamics, timing, themes, and rhetorical strategies employed, laying the groundwork for an in-depth evaluation of the impact of his speeches on actual policies and actions. Building upon the analysis of Trump's speeches, I will assess the tangible repercussions of his rhetoric on both domestic and international fronts further exploring the influence of his speeches on law enforcement, immigration policies, alliances, treaties, and conflicts. By connecting rhetoric to real-world outcomes, this chapter provides insights into the effectiveness and implications of Trump's security-related speeches, offering a holistic perspective on the relationship between presidential discourse and policy implementation.

The third chapter will dissect Joe Biden's security policies, offering a detailed examination of both his domestic security strategy and international security agenda. Within the realm of domestic security, this chapter explores Biden's initiatives in areas such as law enforcement and gun control, illuminating the nuanced approaches he adopted to address pressing issues within the United States. Simultaneously, I will then focus on his international security agenda, shedding light on his strategies concerning diplomacy, global leadership, and alliances. By delineating the contours of Biden's policies, this section lays the groundwork for an analysis of his rhetorical choices and their alignment with his security initiatives. I will conduct a thorough analysis of pivotal speeches delivered by President Biden, meticulously evaluating the context, delivery, and rhetorical techniques employed. Focusing on significant moments such as the 59<sup>th</sup> Inaugural Address<sup>6</sup> and the Afghanistan Withdrawal Speech<sup>7</sup>, this chapter explores the settings, audience dynamics, and timing of these speeches.

---

<sup>4</sup> Donald Trump's inaugural address as the 45th President of the United States occurred on January 20, 2017, following his victory in the 2016 presidential election. The inauguration took place at the West Front of the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C.

<sup>5</sup> The conference between U.S. President Donald Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin in Helsinki took place on July 16, 2018.

<sup>6</sup> The 59th Inaugural Address was delivered by President Joe Biden on January 20, 2021, marking the commencement of his term as the 46th President of the United States.

<sup>7</sup> The Afghanistan Withdrawal Speech refers to President Joe Biden's address to the nation regarding the end of the military mission in Afghanistan. This speech was delivered on August 31, 2021, in which he defended his decision to withdraw U.S. troops, ending America's longest war.



Additionally, it examines the main themes, patterns, and recurring topics in Biden's rhetoric, uncovering the underlying messages and policy priorities embedded within his speeches. Through a nuanced examination of his rhetorical techniques, emphasis, and tone, this section aims to unravel the intricacies of Biden's communication strategies, offering insights into the persuasive tactics he employed to convey his security policies effectively.

The subsection following the analysis of Biden's speeches, will critically assess the tangible consequences of his rhetoric on both the domestic and international fronts. Concerning domestic implications, it will delve into the influence of his speeches on law enforcement strategies and gun control policies, examining the real-world changes stemming from his communication strategies. Moreover, the chapter will scrutinize the international implications, evaluating shifts in diplomacy, global leadership, and alliances resulting from Biden's speeches. By examining the correlation between Biden's rhetoric and the implementation of policies, this section provides a thorough evaluation of the extent to which his words translated into substantive actions, elucidating the effectiveness and impact of his security-related communication strategies of the past and present.

In the final chapter, a comprehensive comparative analysis unfolds, delving into the shared themes and divergent priorities within the security rhetoric of President Trump and Biden. This section identifies common threads that weave through their speeches, illuminating fundamental security concerns that transcended political lines. Simultaneously, it explores diverging priorities, shedding light on unique emphases and approaches each leader adopted. By dissecting these shared themes and divergent priorities, this chapter offers a nuanced comparison of their security agendas.

Examining their choice of language, rhetorical devices, emphasis, and tone, this chapter unveils the subtle nuances distinguishing their approaches to security communication. It explores rhetorical techniques that served as common ground, revealing enduring strategies resonating across administrations. Additionally, it dissects unique rhetorical flourishes and communicative tactics that set them apart, highlighting individualized approaches each leader employed to convey their security policies effectively. This in-depth analysis provides valuable insights into the distinct rhetorical fingerprints defining the security narratives of President Trump and Biden.



## Chapter I

### The Power of Rhetoric and Presidential Speeches

#### 1.1 History and Importance of Presidential Speeches

Presidential speeches on security have undeniably wielded a profound influence on the course of history, shaping nations, forging alliances, revitalizing communities, and economies, and articulating the collective aspirations of societies. Global leaders from diverse nations and institutions have leveraged their speeches to address international relations, socio-political dynamics, economy-related affairs, and security concerns. These orations serve as historical markers, capturing the ethos of their respective eras. Leaders across continents have utilized their oratory prowess to navigate crises, articulate strategic priorities, and inspire their citizens. To mention an impactful one, the worldwide famous speech by Mario Draghi at the European Central Bank in July 2012 is exemplary, his words reverberated globally, marking a pivotal moment in the history of the Eurozone<sup>8</sup> crisis. The historical context of Draghi's speech is crucial to understanding its impact. Europe was grappling with the aftermath of the 2008 global financial crisis<sup>9</sup>, which had exposed the vulnerabilities within the Eurozone. The persistent sovereign debt crisis threatened not just individual nations but the very fabric of the European Union. Draghi, as the President of the ECB<sup>10</sup>, stepped into this precarious situation, armed not with monetary instruments alone, but also with the power of his words. "*Whatever it takes*"<sup>11</sup> encapsulated a powerful commitment to the preservation of the Eurozone and subsequent recovery of the European community, indicating an unyielding determination to safeguard the euro currency. This phrase was a declaration of intent, signifying the ECB's readiness to employ all available measures, including potentially unlimited bond purchases, to prevent the collapse of the Eurozone.

In an increasingly interconnected world, presidential speeches are not merely rhetorical exercises; they represent diplomatic overtures, economic policies, and national resolve. They are instrumental in fostering international cooperation, mitigating conflicts, and addressing complex challenges such as terrorism, climate change, and economic disparities. Moreover, these speeches provide valuable insights into the ideological underpinnings of nations, offering scholars and historians a window into

---

<sup>8</sup> The Eurozone is a group of European Union (EU) member countries that have adopted the euro as their official currency.

<sup>9</sup> The 2008 financial crisis, often referred to as the Global Financial Crisis (GFC), was a significant and far-reaching event in modern economic history. Beginning in 2007 and culminating in 2008, the crisis had profound implications for financial markets, economies, and societies worldwide.

<sup>10</sup> European Central Bank.

<sup>11</sup> Mario Draghi, July 26, 2012, conference in London organized by Global Investment Conference

the minds of leaders as they navigate turbulent geopolitical waters. In essence, presidential speeches on the global stage, are not mere verbal articulations but historical artifacts that encapsulate the complexities of our shared human experience, reflecting the evolving tapestry of international relations and the constant quest for stability and progress.

Focusing on American Presidential speeches on security, they have long stood as pivotal moments in history, reflecting the nation's evolving concerns, ideologies, and global interactions. By examining seminal speeches, wartime addresses, and responses to crises, this section aims to elucidate the nuanced changes in presidential rhetoric, contextualized within the broader socio-political landscape of each era. Understanding the historical evolution of these speeches is crucial in deciphering the rhetorical strategies later employed by Presidents Trump and Biden, providing a foundational understanding for the subsequent comparative analysis.

In the formative years of the United States<sup>12</sup>, presidential speeches on security primarily focused on defining the nation's identity and safeguarding its borders. Early presidents, including George Washington<sup>13</sup> and Thomas Jefferson<sup>14</sup>, articulated the principles of national defense and diplomacy, setting the tone for future security discourses. *"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace. A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined; to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite."*<sup>15</sup> President Washington's words underscored the significance of a robust defense system in safeguarding the nation's sovereignty and deterring potential threats, setting a precedent for future leaders to prioritize military readiness.

*"Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honour and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them, enlightened by a benign religion, professed indeed and practiced in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter — with all these blessings, what more is*

---

<sup>12</sup> The formative years of the United States of America generally refer to the period from the late 18th century to the early 19th century, particularly the years following the American Revolutionary War and the subsequent establishment of the U.S. Constitution in 1787.

<sup>13</sup> George Washington served as the first President of the United States. He was inaugurated on April 30, 1789, and he served two terms in office, ending his presidency on March 4, 1797.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Jefferson served as the third President of the United States. He was inaugurated on March 4, 1801, and he served two terms in office, ending his presidency on March 4, 1809.

<sup>15</sup> George Washington, 09/19/1796, Farewell Address.

*necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people?"*<sup>16</sup> highlighting the importance of diplomacy and peaceful relations with other nations, Thomas Jefferson's words reflected the nation's commitment to diplomacy, emphasizing the values of peace, cooperation, and mutual respect in international relations.

Later on, during times of profound conflict, such as the devastating American Civil War<sup>17</sup> and the challenging historical period of the World Wars<sup>18</sup>, presidential addresses played an even more indispensable role, capable of deciding the fate of their nations and others. In the midst of these crises, leaders seized the opportunity to address the nation, employing their rhetoric to rally citizens, unify diverse national communities, and inspire a collective sense of purpose. These addresses were not mere words; they were catalysts for change. They galvanized public opinion, garnering support for critical policies that shaped the course of the nation. The power of persuasive discourse was evident as leaders communicated their visions, assuaged fears, and fostered a sense of national pride and resilience. *"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."*<sup>19</sup> During the American Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln's<sup>20</sup> words reverberated throughout the nation. These immortal words captured the enduring spirit of American democracy amidst the strife of war, emphasizing the principles for which the nation stood. The Gettysburg Address continues to be quoted in debates about social justice, serving as a moral compass that guides discussions on equality and inclusivity. *"The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make."*<sup>21</sup> In the tumultuous era of the First World War, President Woodrow Wilson<sup>22</sup> galvanized the American people with his vision for a peaceful world order. These words illuminated the path towards a just peace, illustrating America's commitment to democratic values on the global stage. Wilson's words from this speech continue to echo in contemporary discussions on democracy and peace. His emphasis on making the world safe for democracy underscores the enduring aspiration for democratic governance globally. In the present day, these words are often referenced in discussions about

---

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Jefferson, 03/04/1801, First Inaugural Address.

<sup>17</sup> The American Civil War occurred in the United States from 1861 to 1865. During this period, the nation faced significant internal conflict between Northern states (the Union) and Southern states (the Confederacy) over issues such as slavery, states' rights, and regional economic differences. The conflict resulted in a profound impact on the nation and played a crucial role in shaping its history, including the evolution of presidential speeches and national security strategies.

<sup>18</sup> World War I occurred from July 28, 1914, to November 11, 1918. World War II occurred from September 1, 1939, to September 2, 1945

<sup>19</sup> Abraham Lincoln, 11/19/1863, Gettysburg Address.

<sup>20</sup> Abraham Lincoln served as the 16th President of the United States from March 4, 1861, to April 15, 1865.

<sup>21</sup> Woodrow Wilson, 4/2/1917, War Message to Congress.

<sup>22</sup> Woodrow Wilson served as the 28th President of the United States from March 4, 1913, to March 4, 1921.

international relations, especially in contexts where nations advocate for democratic principles, human rights, and the protection of political liberty. *"No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory."*<sup>23</sup> Amidst the horrors of the Second World War, President Franklin D. Roosevelt<sup>24</sup> provided solace and resolve to the nation following the terrible attack on Pearl Harbor.<sup>25</sup> This resolute assurance echoed the unwavering determination of a nation united against the forces of tyranny, symbolizing the collective spirit of the American people during a time of unparalleled challenge. His speech not only sought a declaration of war against Japan but also served as a catalyst for significant shifts in the nation's trajectory. Roosevelt's address stimulated a fractured nation, knitting together the diverse fabric of American society with threads of unity and resolve. Internationally, Roosevelt's response to the attack propelled the United States into World War II, reshaping the nation's foreign policy and positioning it as a global superpower. The military and economic expansion that ensued laid the groundwork for post-war prosperity and technological advancement. Furthermore, the Cold War era<sup>26</sup> marked a significant shift in presidential rhetoric on security, as the United States faced ideological and military challenges from the Soviet Union. Presidents like Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy<sup>27</sup> employed speeches to underscore the importance of alliances, nuclear deterrence, and containment strategies. *"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."*<sup>28</sup> The words by Truman underscored America's commitment to the containment of communism, setting the stage for U.S. involvement in global affairs during the Cold War. Truman's historic speech introduced the world to the Truman Doctrine<sup>29</sup>, a policy that would have significant and enduring consequences for American foreign relations. In the immediate aftermath, Truman's speech marked the formal adoption of the doctrine of containment, an approach that sought to prevent the spread of communism. This commitment led to substantial aid for countries like Greece and

---

<sup>23</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt, 12/9/1941, Radio address following the attack on Pearl Harbor.

<sup>24</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt served as the 32nd President of the United States from March 4, 1933, to April 12, 1945.

<sup>25</sup> The attack on Pearl Harbor was a surprise military strike conducted by the Imperial Japanese Navy against the United States naval base at Pearl Harbor in Honolulu, Hawaii, on the morning of December 7, 1941.

<sup>26</sup> The Cold War era is typically considered to have occurred from the end of World War II in 1945 to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. During this period, the United States and the Soviet Union, along with their respective allies, were engaged in political, economic, and military tensions, often characterized by ideological rivalry, espionage, and a nuclear arms race.

<sup>27</sup> Harry Truman served as the 33rd President of the United States from April 12, 1945, to January 20, 1953. He became president following the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt and was re-elected in 1948.

John F. Kennedy, often referred to as JFK, served as the 35th President of the United States from January 20, 1961, until his assassination on November 22, 1963.

<sup>28</sup> Harry S. Truman, 03/12/1947, outline of the Truman Doctrine.

<sup>29</sup> The Truman Doctrine was a policy implemented by President Harry S. Truman in 1947, during the early years of the Cold War. Truman argued that the United States had a responsibility to support free peoples who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures.

Turkey, providing critical support against the encroachment of communist forces. The doctrine's influence was not limited to financial assistance; it played a pivotal role in shaping The Marshall Plan which set the stage for the European Union to be built as well as led to the formation of NATO in 1949.<sup>30</sup> Today, Truman's Doctrine continues to resonate in discussions about U.S. foreign policy, particularly concerning the nation's role in promoting democracy and countering authoritarian regimes. *"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."*<sup>31</sup> This resolute proclamation by the at-the-time President John F. Kennedy became emblematic of America's determination to defend freedom and democracy against the looming threat of communism. In the heart of the Cold War, Kennedy's words echoed in his statement, *"Ich bin ein Berliner"*<sup>32</sup>, reaffirming America's solidarity with West Berlin and its staunch opposition to the division of nations by the Iron Curtain<sup>33</sup>. These declarations had immediate consequences, inspiring democratic movements worldwide and reinforcing the bond between the United States and its European allies. Kennedy's emphasis on supporting freedom against oppressive forces influenced U.S. foreign policy, shaping America's role in championing democratic ideals globally. Today, these principles continue to guide discussions about human rights, democratic values, and the importance of international cooperation. The rhetoric of this period was characterized by a delicate balance between reassurance and vigilance, reflecting the complexities of international relations during the Cold War. The Cuban Missile Crisis<sup>34</sup> and Kennedy's speeches during this time exemplified the strategic use of presidential rhetoric to manage international crises. Said crisis, brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear conflict. President John F. Kennedy's speeches during this crisis reflected the gravity of the situation and demonstrated his statesmanship. *"It shall be the policy of this nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States, requiring a full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union."*<sup>35</sup> This resolute declaration marked the beginning of a tense confrontation between the world's superpowers.

---

<sup>30</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a military alliance between Western nations designed to deter potential Soviet aggression.

<sup>31</sup> John F. Kennedy, 01/20/1961, Inaugural Address.

<sup>32</sup> "I am a Berliner", John F. Kennedy, 06/26/1963, Berlin.

<sup>33</sup> The Iron Curtain is a term used to describe the division between the democratic nations of the West, primarily led by the United States and its NATO allies, and the communist nations of the East, primarily led by the Soviet Union and its satellite states in Eastern Europe, during the Cold War.

<sup>34</sup> The Cuban Missile Crisis occurred from October 16 to 28, 1962. It was a 13-day confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Soviet ballistic missiles deployed in Cuba, which brought the two superpowers to the brink of nuclear conflict.

<sup>35</sup> John F. Kennedy, 10/22/1962, Address to the Nation.

*"We will not prematurely or unnecessarily risk the costs of worldwide nuclear war in which even the fruits of victory would be ashes in our mouth, but neither will we shrink from that risk at any time it must be faced."*<sup>36</sup> He added, capturing the delicate balance between resolve and restraint that characterized U.S. policy during the crisis. His words, marked by both strength and prudence, played a pivotal role in deescalating the situation, ultimately leading to a peaceful resolution.

With the end of the Cold War, presidential speeches on security adapted to address emerging global challenges, including terrorism, cyber threats, and non-state actors. Presidents like Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton<sup>37</sup> navigated the changing landscape, emphasizing the importance of diplomacy, international cooperation, and technological advancements in safeguarding national interests.

*"Our goal is to see the day when nuclear weapons will be banished from the face of the Earth. The United States will lead in that undertaking. But our leadership, and our security, will be furthered, not weakened, by our willingness to engage in the search for truly global arms reduction, including conventional forces."*<sup>38</sup> President Ronald Reagan's call for dialogue and arms reduction initiatives laid the groundwork for significant advancements in disarmament agreements. His vision set the stage for diplomatic dialogues such as the INF<sup>39</sup>, which contributed to reducing nuclear tensions between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. *"Now we must extend our cooperation in new ways. We must work together to spur economic growth, expand trade, and create jobs. We must defend our common security against new threats like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons. We must cooperate in dealing with conflicts that displace millions of people. We must work together to promote democracy and human rights. We must promote open markets and economic reform. And we must do it together."*<sup>40</sup> President Clinton's speech emphasized the interconnectedness of nations and the necessity for cooperative efforts in addressing global challenges, highlighting the role of diplomacy and shared objectives. *"As we enter the 21st century, we face challenges as old as the ages and new as the morning. We can build the future of our dreams if we work together, if we face our challenges with confidence, if we use our opportunities to expand both our prosperity and our humanity, if we defend our common security, uphold our common values, and embrace our common humanity."*<sup>41</sup> He later remarked. Clinton's words underlined the need for harnessing technological innovations to enhance national security and advance global cooperation. Furthermore, Clinton's acknowledgment of technological advancements as key drivers of progress, catalysed investments in research and

---

<sup>36</sup> John F. Kennedy, 10/24/1962, Address to the Nation.

<sup>37</sup> Ronald Reagan served as the 40th President of the United States from January 20, 1981, to January 20, 1989.

Bill Clinton served as the 42nd President of the United States from January 20, 1993, to January 20, 2001.

<sup>38</sup> Ronald Reagan, 01/25/1984, State of the Union Address.

<sup>39</sup> Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, signed in 1987.

<sup>40</sup> Bill Clinton, 09/27/1993, Address to the United Nations.

<sup>41</sup> Bill Clinton, 01/27/2000, Address to the Nation.



development, shaping the digital age we live in today. His forward-looking approach not only bolstered the U.S. economy but also positioned the nation as a leader in the technological landscape, influencing the course of global innovation.

Nevertheless, the 21st century witnessed a paradigm shift in security rhetoric, with presidents focusing on asymmetric threats, homeland security, and the complexities of global terrorism. Speeches by George W. Bush<sup>42</sup> after the 9/11 attacks<sup>43</sup> exemplified the fusion of traditional themes with modern security challenges. *“Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated... Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.”*<sup>44</sup> He stated, adding: *“Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shatter steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.”*<sup>45</sup> These declarations marked a defining moment in U.S. foreign policy, signalling a proactive stance against global terrorism and emphasizing the importance of international cooperation in the fight against extremist threats. Through the eloquence and wisdom of these leaders, the nation found reassurance, unity, and a clear direction, setting a precedent for future presidents to articulate their visions for the country's security and prosperity. From defining national identity to addressing global threats, these speeches have mirrored the changing contours of American politics and international relations.

## *1.2 The Role of Rhetoric in Forming National and International Policy*

Building upon the historical foundation of presidential speeches on security, it becomes clear that the eloquence and strategic communication employed by presidents have served as catalysts, transforming mere words into tangible policy frameworks. Presidential rhetoric acts as a blueprint, delineating the contours of national and international policies. These speeches, marked by their persuasive power, bridge the gap between vision and action.

One of the inherent strengths of presidential rhetoric lies in its ability to shape public perception. By framing security challenges in a comprehensible narrative, leaders, particularly if from one, if not *the*, most powerful countries in the international system, wield significant influence over public attitudes,

---

<sup>42</sup> George W. Bush, served as the 43rd President of the United States from January 20, 2001, to January 20, 2009.

<sup>43</sup> The 9/11 attacks were a series of coordinated terrorist actions carried out by the extremist group al-Qaeda in the United States. The attacks targeted the World Trade Centre, The Pentagon, and Flight 93, resulting in the deaths of nearly 3,000 people, making it one of the deadliest terrorist acts in world history.

<sup>44</sup> George W. Bush, 11/20/2001, Joint Session of Congress.

<sup>45</sup> President George W. Bush delivered his address to the nation after the September 11, 2001 attacks from the Oval Office at the White House in Washington, D.C. He delivered the speech on the evening of September 11, 2001, just hours after the terrorist attacks took place earlier in the day.

perceptions, and reactions, owing to the immense power and global reach of the nation. The artful choice of words can transform complex geopolitical issues into relatable concerns, garnering public support for policies that might otherwise be met with resistance. Internationally, presidential speeches serve as diplomatic tools, shaping alliances and global partnerships. Leaders use rhetoric to articulate the nation's stance on international matters, laying the foundation for collaboration and conflict resolution. The persuasive language employed during international addresses often sets the tone for diplomatic negotiations, determining whether cooperation and understanding among nations are possible or not.

In the contemporary landscape, marked by swift technological progress and ever-changing security challenges, the adaptability of presidential rhetoric stands as a testament to effective leadership. Leaders, acutely aware of the interconnected global network, confront a myriad of emerging challenges ranging from cyber threats and terrorism to climate change. These challenges, intricately woven into the fabric of modern society, necessitate a dynamic and strategic approach to security communication. In this complex environment, leaders harness the power of their words to navigate intricate security issues. Cyber threats, for instance, originating in the digital realm, require not only technical expertise but also effective communication to convey the gravity of the situation to the public and other nations. Terrorism, a global menace, demands delicate rhetoric to balance the reassurance of safety with the urgency of collective action. Moreover, climate change, an existential threat, necessitates persuasive language to galvanize nations toward sustainable practices and international cooperation. In the age of information, leaders must also navigate the digital realm, where misinformation and disinformation pose significant threats. Effective security communication entails countering online narratives that could potentially incite fear or panic. Rulers nowadays inevitably leverage social media platforms and digital channels to disseminate more or less accurate information, promoting national and international security by ensuring that the public remains well-informed and vigilant. Notwithstanding the fact that the art of persuasive rhetoric serves as a potent tool, wielded deftly by leaders to influence states and captivate the general public, both domestically and abroad. The power of a president's words transcends mere communication; it becomes a strategic instrument shaping perceptions, moulding opinions, and rallying nations towards a shared cause. Through carefully crafted speeches, presidents can bridge cultural divides, foster alliances, and inspire a sense of unity among diverse populations. Moreover, in the context of diplomacy, presidential speeches serve as essential instruments for advocating national interests and negotiating international agreements. The tone, emphasis, and choice of words can influence the stance of other nations, paving the way for fruitful dialogues and fostering collaboration. A president's persuasive prowess is particularly evident during critical junctures, such as during times of conflict or when

addressing global challenges. In these moments, a well-delivered speech can not only reassure a nation but also sway international opinion, garnering solidarity, and support from the global community.

In conclusion, the role of rhetoric in forming national and international policy is not merely rhetorical flourish; it is the cornerstone upon which effective governance stands. The eloquence, conviction, and strategic communication skills of presidents have the power to shape the destiny of nations, forge global alliances, and mitigate security challenges.

Furthermore, the evolution of presidential rhetoric mirrors the intricacies of the modern world. Leaders adept at marrying the enduring principles of leadership with contemporary security imperatives are better positioned to navigate the complexities of the 21st century. As security challenges continue to evolve, so too must the language and strategies employed by leaders, ensuring that their messages resonate with the public and effectively address the pressing issues of our time. This continual evolution in security communication remains pivotal, shaping not only national attitudes but also international collaborations in the pursuit of a safer and more secure global landscape.

### *1.3 Methods of Speech Analysis: Tools and Techniques*

In the realm of political discourse analysis, understanding the intricate fabric of presidential speeches on security necessitates a meticulous approach. Employing a diverse array of tools and techniques is paramount in extracting nuanced insights from these pivotal addresses. This section delineates the comprehensive toolkit employed in this analysis, showcasing the synergy of methodologies essential for a profound understanding of presidential rhetoric.

At the core of this study lies Content analysis<sup>46</sup>, a methodological linchpin that systematically dissects the thematic tapestry of speeches. Content analysis, as applied to political communication, finds its origins in the early 20th century. Initially rooted in social sciences, particularly sociology and psychology, content analysis was used to study various forms of communication, including political discourse. The methodology gained prominence after World War II. During this period, scholars like Paul Lazarsfeld<sup>47</sup> and Harold D. Lasswell<sup>48</sup> utilized this technique to investigate the influence of

---

<sup>46</sup> Content analysis is a research method used to systematically analyse the content of various forms of communication, such as text, audio, video, images, or social media posts. It involves identifying and categorizing specific themes, patterns, and characteristics within the data to draw meaningful insights and conclusions.

<sup>47</sup> Paul Lazarsfeld (1901-1976) was an influential Austrian American sociologist and communication researcher. He made significant contributions to the fields of sociology, communication studies, and social research methodology.

<sup>48</sup> Harold D. Lasswell (1902-1978) was a prominent American political scientist and communication theorist. He is often regarded as one of the founding figures of modern political communication and political psychology.

political propaganda and media messages on public opinion. Later the focus shifted toward understanding the impact of mass media, political advertisements, and political speeches on shaping public perceptions and attitudes. By delving into the content, researchers can discern underlying messages, identify recurrent motifs, and unravel the subtle intricacies of language use. This technique not only facilitates the identification of key policy directions but also underpins the entire analysis, ensuring that interpretations are firmly anchored in the speeches' textual data. This rigorous approach guarantees a reliable foundation upon which further analyses can be built. Moreover, in contemporary politics, content analysis continues to play a vital role, researchers utilize advanced software and algorithms to analyse large datasets of political texts, identifying sentiment, framing strategies, and ideological biases. Content analysis is instrumental in understanding political agendas, party ideologies, public sentiment, and the evolving dynamics of political communication in the age of information.

Supplementing content analysis is Rhetorical analysis<sup>49</sup>, a lens through which the artistry of language is examined. Rhetorical analysis in politics traces its roots to ancient Greece, where the art of persuasive speaking, or rhetoric, was highly valued. Ancient scholars like Aristotle and Plato<sup>50</sup> explored the techniques and strategies employed by orators to influence public opinion and sway political decisions. However, the formal study of rhetorical analysis gained prominence during the Renaissance period in Europe<sup>51</sup>, with scholars delving deeper into the power of persuasive language. In the 20th century, rhetorical analysis in politics took a significant turn with the emergence of mass media. Political leaders, recognizing the impact of speeches and public addresses, started to craft their messages meticulously, understanding the potential influence on voters. The advent of radio and television broadcasting further amplified the significance of effective rhetoric in political communication. Analysing political speeches became a critical academic discipline, with scholars and researchers studying the language, delivery, and persuasion techniques employed by politicians. This method illuminates the rhetorical devices deployed, such as metaphors, imagery, and tone,

---

<sup>49</sup> Rhetorical analysis is the process of examining how speakers or writers use language and other persuasive techniques to effectively communicate their ideas, influence their audience, and achieve their rhetorical goals. It involves analyzing various elements of discourse, such as language choice, tone, style, structure, and the use of rhetorical devices like metaphors, analogies, repetition, and appeals to emotion, logic, or credibility.

<sup>50</sup> Aristotle (384–322 BCE) was a Greek philosopher, scientist, and polymath. He was a student of Plato and later became the tutor of Alexander the Great. Aristotle made significant contributions to various fields, including ethics, metaphysics, logic, politics, biology, and rhetoric.

Plato (circa 428–348 BCE) was a prominent ancient Greek philosopher and mathematician. He was a student of Socrates and the teacher of Aristotle. Plato founded the Academy in Athens, one of the earliest institutions of higher learning in the Western world.

<sup>51</sup> The Renaissance was a cultural, artistic, and intellectual movement that began in Italy during the late 14th century and later spread across Europe. It marked a period of significant revival in interest and innovation in various fields, including art, literature, science, philosophy, and politics. It is often considered a bridge between the medieval and modern eras. It laid the foundation for the cultural and intellectual developments that followed, shaping the course of European history and influencing the evolution of Western civilization.

elucidating the emotive impact of the speeches. By dissecting these techniques, researchers gain profound insights into the persuasive strategies employed by leaders. This granular understanding unveils the power of rhetoric in shaping public sentiment and, consequently, influencing policy decisions.

Moreover, a panoramic view is achieved through Comparative analysis<sup>52</sup>, which juxtaposes speeches across different leaders or epochs. The roots of Comparative analysis in politics can be traced back to ancient civilizations where scholars and thinkers compared different forms of governance and political structures. During the 20th century, comparative politics emerged as a distinct field of study within political science. Influential scholars such as Seymour Martin Lipset and Gabriel Almond<sup>53</sup> pioneered comparative political research, emphasizing cross-national analysis to identify patterns, variations, and similarities in political behaviour, institutions, and cultures. The comparative method gained prominence to explore diverse political systems, ideologies, and policies. By discerning patterns, contrasts, and evolutionary trends, this technique enhances contextualization. It provides a broader canvas upon which the speeches are painted, revealing shifts in rhetoric and policy emphases. Comparative analysis not only offers a temporal perspective but also fosters a deeper understanding of the dynamic nature of political communication.

Furthermore, another tool that will be implied is Contextual analysis<sup>54</sup>, which operates as the compass guiding the interpretation of speeches. In the 20th century, the field of comparative politics gained prominence, focusing on understanding political systems within specific geographical regions. By examining the socio-political milieu, historical events, and audience demographics, this method ensures a nuanced understanding of the speeches' significance. Contextual analysis elucidates how external factors shape rhetorical choices and policy directions. This methodological underpinning is indispensable, allowing for a holistic interpretation rooted in the intricate fabric of time and circumstance. Lastly, Quantitative data analysis will be occasionally employed, the latter is marked by statistical scrutiny of specific speech elements, and supplement qualitative methodologies. Quantitative data analysis in politics has a rich history dating back to the early 20th century. Political

---

<sup>52</sup> Comparative analysis is a method used in various fields, including literature, sociology, political science, and economics, to examine similarities and differences between two or more entities, phenomena, texts, or events. In comparative analysis, researchers systematically compare elements of different cases to identify patterns, trends, relationships, or variations.

<sup>53</sup> Seymour Martin Lipset (1922-2006) was an influential American sociologist and political scientist known for his research on political behaviour, democracy, and public opinion.

Gabriel Almond (1911-2002) was a prominent American political scientist known for his contributions to the study of comparative politics and political development.

<sup>54</sup> Contextual analysis is a method used in various disciplines, including literature, linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and cultural studies, to understand the meaning, significance, or implications of a particular text, artifact, behavior, or phenomenon within its broader context. Contextual analysis seeks to explore how the surrounding circumstances, conditions, or environments influence the interpretation, function, or reception of the subject under study.

scientists like Harold Lasswell and Harold Gosnell<sup>55</sup> pioneered the use of quantitative methods to study voting behaviour and political attitudes. Their work laid the foundation for systematic data collection and statistical analysis in political science. By quantifying aspects such as word frequency or phrase usage, this approach lends precision to the analysis. The objective numerical insights garnered through quantitative data analysis complement qualitative findings, providing a comprehensive overview of speech patterns.

In essence, the synergy of these techniques, namely Content analysis, Rhetorical analysis, Comparative analysis, Contextual analysis, and Quantitative data analysis forms a comprehensive toolkit. This multifaceted approach ensures a profound understanding of presidential rhetoric on security, shedding light on the intricate interplay of language, context, and persuasion in shaping political discourse. To add, this methodological rigour ensures that interpretations are not only insightful but also empirically substantiated.

---

<sup>55</sup> Harold D. Gosnell (1902-1992) was an American political scientist known for his contributions to the fields of political science and public administration. He was a pioneering scholar in the study of American politics, focusing particularly on electoral behavior and political participation.

## Chapter II

### Donald Trump's Approach to Security: Rhetoric and Reality

#### 2.1 Overview of Donald Trump's Security Policy Approach

Having meticulously laid the theoretical and historical groundwork and delineated the toolkit essential for bolstering my work, I am to navigate the intricate terrain of this analysis. In the upcoming sections, I will thoroughly dissect several speeches, employing a comprehensive methodology that encompasses content analysis, rhetorical scrutiny, and contextual interpretation. This multidimensional approach ensures a nuanced exploration of the subject matter, enabling me to draw intricate connections and uncover subtle nuances within the presidential rhetoric.

In the annals of American political history, the presidency of Donald J. Trump stands out as a unique and contentious chapter. His approach to security policy, both domestic and international, defined an era marked by bold decisions, unconventional rhetoric, and deeply polarising controversies. A detailed examination of Trump's security policies is not merely an exploration of a presidential agenda; it is an intricate study of a paradigm shift in modern American governance, one that echoed worldwide. Donald Trump's presidency was undeniably distinctive, setting a new precedent in American politics. What made his tenure exceptional was not only his political decisions but also his unconventional background, diverging significantly from traditional politicians. Trump's uniqueness stemmed primarily from his status as the first American president without any prior political experience, a departure from the norm that deeply influenced his rhetoric and approach to governance. Unlike his predecessors, Trump hailed from a business background, having made his mark as a real estate mogul and a television personality. This lack of political experience meant that he approached the presidency from an entirely different perspective. His business-oriented mindset and deal-making acumen became apparent in his communication style. He often framed political issues and international relations in terms of negotiations and deals, a departure from the conventional diplomatic language used by seasoned politicians. This business-oriented approach manifested in his speeches, where he employed direct, unfiltered language that resonated with a significant portion of the American population.

Furthermore, Trump's "*outsider*"<sup>56</sup> status contributed to his appeal among certain segments of the electorate. His supporters viewed him as a refreshing alternative to the established political elites,

---

<sup>56</sup> The term "outsider" in the context of politics is used to describe a candidate or public official who lacks established connections or experience within the traditional political establishment. In the case of Donald Trump, he was often

believing that his lack of political experience would bring about much-needed change. This sentiment was reflected in his speeches, where he often portrayed himself as a champion of the people, leveraging his outsider status, and fighting against the entrenched establishment. His rhetoric was characterized by populist themes, tapping into the grievances and frustrations of many Americans who felt left behind by the political system. However, this unique background also led to controversies. Trump's unfiltered communication style, often expressed through his tweets and public statements, sparked debates and raised concerns about the appropriateness of his language for a sitting president. For instance, his use of social media, particularly X<sup>57</sup>, allowed him to bypass traditional media channels and directly communicate with his supporters, but it also generated intense scrutiny and criticism. Moreover, Trump's lack of political experience occasionally led to diplomatic challenges. His speeches and off-the-cuff remarks sometimes lacked the nuance and diplomacy expected from a head of state, leading to important tensions in international relations. His unconventional approach to foreign policy, often announced through the previously mentioned social media platform X, raised eyebrows and created uncertainty among allies and adversaries alike putting the international arena in a condition of uncertainty and instability.

In summary, Trump's unique status as a non-politician significantly impacted his rhetoric, shaping his speeches with a direct, business-oriented language that appealed to a specific demographic. His presidency, marked by this unconventional communication style, will undoubtedly remain a subject of analysis and debate in the annals of American political history.

Delving into his rhetorical tactics, one of the recurring themes in Trump's speeches, especially during his electoral campaign, was the emphasis on economic revival and job creation. As a matter of fact, during his inaugural address, he stated, "*We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth.*"<sup>58</sup> This recurring emphasis on economic prosperity constitutes a pivotal aspect of his content analysis, underscoring his commitment to economic nationalism. Significantly, the phrase "*To Bring Back*" seems to recur often in his speeches, encompassing campaign documents, election appearances, press briefings, social media posts, transition documents, as well as town hall discussions, and Q&A sessions.<sup>59</sup>

Trump's rhetoric often employed the use of hyperbole<sup>60</sup> and vivid imagery to convey his points, as demonstrated by statements such as: "*We're going to win so much; you're going to be so sick and*

---

referred to as an outsider because he did not have a background in politics before running for the presidency. Instead, he came from the business world, having made a name for himself as a real estate magnate and a television personality.

<sup>57</sup> Previously referred to as "Twitter".

<sup>58</sup> Donald Trump, 2016, Inaugural Address.

<sup>59</sup> Research conducted by "The American Presidency Project.

<sup>60</sup> A hyperbole is a figure of speech in which exaggeration is used for emphasis or effect, often used to create a vivid or dramatic impact on the listener or reader. It involves statements or claims not meant to be taken literally, as they are



*tired of winning.*"<sup>61</sup> Where Trump exaggerates the idea of winning to emphasize his confidence and determination, using hyperbole to create a strong impression. Furthermore, during his election campaign, he famously stated, "*We will build a great wall along the southern border, and Mexico will pay for it.*"<sup>62</sup> This statement utilized the rhetorical device of repetition for emphasis and aimed at creating a memorable image in the minds of his audience, showcasing his direct and assertive style. Contextually, Trump's speeches were deeply rooted in the prevailing economic anxieties and concerns about immigration. His renowned phrase, "*Make America Great Again*"<sup>63</sup> encapsulates the sentiment of many who felt disenchanting with the status quo, as examining word frequency, words like "*winning*," "*great*," and "*jobs*" which are often repeated, indicate him highlighting key and popular themes during his speeches. In conclusion, understanding this context is vital for comprehending the emotional resonance of his rhetoric and the appeal Trump's time in office held for certain segments of the population.

### *2.1.1 Trump's Rhetoric on Domestic Security*

Paying close attention to Trump's domestic security policy, the goal to achieve is a nuanced understanding of the complex web that constitutes American politics and history. The intricacies of this tapestry are woven from a myriad of threads, each representing a different facet of American society, culture, and governance. At its core, the examination of domestic security policies is pivotal because it focuses on the very essence of what defines a nation's identity and safeguards its citizens. It must be said though, that domestic security policies are not confined to the borders of a nation; they echo far beyond, influencing global perceptions and diplomatic relations. The choices made in crafting these policies reflect a nation's values, priorities, and vulnerabilities. In the context of the United States of America, a global superpower, these policies carry immense weight, as they often set international standards and serve as benchmarks for other nations. Therefore, understanding the impact of these policies on the United States' internal affairs and their global repercussions is also crucial for comprehending the nation's role in the international arena.

When it comes to Trump's unique approach to domestic security policies, further amplifies the need for a detailed analysis given that his presidency marked a departure from conventional political paradigms. As a business magnate, he brought a distinct perspective to governance, shaping policies

---

exaggerated for emphasis or rhetorical purposes. Hyperboles are commonly used in literature, speeches, and everyday language to evoke strong feelings or emphasize a point.

<sup>61</sup> Donald Trump, 2016, Presidential Campaign Rally.

<sup>62</sup> Donald Trump, 06/16/2015, Presidential Campaign Announcement Speech, Trump Tower, New York City.

<sup>63</sup> Donald Trump, 2016, United States, Campaign for the 2016 Presidential Election.

that were often unconventional and polarizing. This departure from the political norm created ripples not only within the United States but also globally, as leaders and citizens worldwide grappled with the implications of his decisions. In essence, the exploration of Trump's domestic security policies within the broader context of American politics and history is set to unravel a complex narrative. It requires careful examination of historical precedents, socio-political dynamics, and global implications, and only through this comprehensive understanding can we grasp the profound impact these policies had on the nation and the world, highlighting the interconnectedness of domestic decisions with global consequences, particularly under President Trump, the United States' domestic approach had international repercussions related to immigration and border security. Most notably, during his presidency, he advocated for the construction of a border wall between the United States of America and Mexico. These policies were driven by Trump's "*America First*"<sup>64</sup> approach, emphasizing the protection of American jobs and national security. Internationally, these policies strained relations with neighbouring Mexico and stirred debates about immigration policies worldwide. Furthermore, Trump's focus on border security and restrictive immigration measures sparked discussions about nationalism, xenophobia, and international human rights. "*When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best... They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems to us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.*"<sup>65</sup> The quote is representative of Trump's stance on immigration, emphasizing concerns about criminal elements entering the United States under his mandate. It conveys a strong viewpoint on the challenges posed by certain individuals immigrating from Mexico. It is common for Trump to use provocative language to convey his point, employing repetition with phrases like "*They're bringing*" to underline the perceived negative aspects of immigration. The statement also contains a rhetorical device called paralipsis<sup>66</sup>, where he appears to pass over certain details - the assumption that some of them are good people - to highlight his main argument. Comparatively, this quote showcases a stark and polarizing perspective on immigration, especially in contrast to more inclusive approaches advocated by other political leaders worldwide reflecting Trump's unique rhetorical style, characterized by bold statements that provoke strong reactions from different audiences.

---

<sup>64</sup> The "America First" doctrine is a foreign policy approach that prioritizes the interests, well-being, and security of the United States above those of other nations. It was popularized during the 2016 United States presidential campaign by then-candidate Donald Trump. He used the term to express his commitment to prioritize American interests in trade deals, immigration policies, military engagements, and international agreements.

<sup>65</sup> Donald Trump, 06/16/2015, His Announcement of Candidacy for President.

<sup>66</sup> Paralipsis, also known as apophasis, is a rhetorical device where the speaker or writer emphasizes something by pretending to pass over it. In other words, it involves stating something by denying that it will be mentioned. It allows the speaker to draw attention to a point by claiming that it will not be discussed, thus making the audience more curious or intrigued about the very thing being omitted.

This example further demonstrates how domestic policies, particularly those related to immigration and border security under President Trump, not only influenced domestic affairs but also shaped international discussions, policies, and perceptions, showcasing the profound impact of American domestic policy on the global stage. This focus on immigration and border control reflected broader concerns within American society, leading to the implementation of stringent immigration policies such as the controversial travel bans on several predominantly Muslim countries<sup>67</sup>, which exemplified Trump's determination to prioritize national security and counter potential threats, yet also sparking extensive debates on constitutional rights and international relations. Consequently, countries globally had to reassess their own immigration policies in response to the shifting stance of one of the world's major economies. Furthermore, Trump's administration adopted a robust stance on law and order, advocating for stricter criminal justice policies. This approach manifested in policies such as the First Step Act<sup>68</sup>, aimed at criminal justice reform, and the promotion of a tougher stance on crime, aligning with his 'law and order' campaign rhetoric. Additionally, Trump's domestic security policies also tackled economic dimensions. His push for deregulation and tax reforms aimed to stimulate economic growth, impacting domestic security by addressing underlying socioeconomic challenges, a critical element often overlooked in traditional security analyses. *"We're going to cut taxes for the middle class, make the tax code simpler and fairer for everyday Americans. It's going to be a tremendous boon for the economy. We're going to bring back jobs, and we're going to keep our companies from leaving. They're not going to leave anymore. There will be major tax cuts for business and individuals."*<sup>69</sup> Here Trump chooses to use positive language for a change, such as *"tremendous boon,"* and *"bring back jobs"* to create enthusiasm. He employs, once again, the rhetorical figure of repetition as demonstrated by the occurrence of the words *"taxes,"* and *"going to be"* for emphasis, highlighting his commitment to tax cuts and economic growth. Additionally, Trump's stance on gun control, advocating for the protection of Second Amendment rights<sup>70</sup>, further fuelled controversy, especially in the wake of multiple mass shootings during his tenure. The balance

---

<sup>67</sup> The travel bans on Muslims implemented under the Trump administration occurred through several executive orders. The first version, known as Executive Order 13769, was signed on January 27, 2017, and is commonly referred to as the "Muslim ban" or "travel ban." It suspended entry into the United States for citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen, and suspended the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program for 120 days. Subsequent versions followed, with adjustments made after legal challenges. The final version, upheld by the Supreme Court in June 2018, restricted entry from five Muslim-majority countries (Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen), as well as North Korea and certain government officials from Venezuela.

<sup>68</sup> The First Step Act is a criminal justice reform bill in the United States that was signed into law by President Donald Trump on December 21, 2018. The legislation aims to reform various aspects of the federal criminal justice system, particularly in terms of sentencing and prison policies.

<sup>69</sup> Donald Trump, 09/272017, Tax Reform Event, Farm Bureau Building, Indianapolis, Indiana.

<sup>70</sup> The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the right of the people to keep and bear arms. It was adopted on December 15, 1791, along with the other amendments in the Bill of Rights.

between individual rights and public safety became a focal point of contention, amplifying the polarized discourse surrounding his domestic security policies.

In conclusion, Trump's domestic security policies, infused with distinctive rhetoric and tone, not only transformed the American socio-political landscape of his time in office but also influenced global perceptions of the United States. Understanding these policies within the broader historical context illuminates their significance, providing invaluable insights into the evolving nature of American domestic security and its far-reaching consequences.

### *2.1.2 Trump's Stance on International Security*

Analysing Trump's external security policies is of paramount importance for several reasons. Firstly, it provides a deep understanding of the ideological underpinnings of his administration, shedding light on the core beliefs that influenced policy decisions. Secondly, the controversies stemming from his approach serve as a valuable case study, highlighting the challenges posed by unconventional leadership styles in the realm of global security. Thirdly, Trump's policies underscored the ongoing debate between nationalism and internationalism, shaping the contours of American foreign policy for years to come. As previously mentioned, Trump's "America First" doctrine served as the guiding principle shaping his administration's security policy on the international stage. This approach, rooted in prioritizing American interests above all else, was reflected in Trump's speeches and policy decisions, underscoring the significance of this concept in his foreign relations, and evoking a palpable sense of unease and apprehension within the international community. This approach, reminiscent of past isolationist tendencies concerning the powerhouse in question, sparked concerns about the potential consequences reverberating on the global stage. Conveying rhetorical emphasis on American Interests, Trump consistently highlighted the need to deprioritize non-American interests in his discourses. *"From this moment on, it's going to be America First. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families."*<sup>71</sup> Freshly elected, in his inaugural address, he underscored his commitment to redefining international engagements to align with American priorities. As a matter of fact, Trump's approach was marked by scepticism towards existing international agreements. His decision to

---

<sup>71</sup> Donald Trump, 01/20/2017, Inaugural Address.

withdraw from the Paris Agreement<sup>72</sup> on climate change and the Iran Nuclear Deal<sup>73</sup> highlighted his intention to reassess and renegotiate agreements that, in his view, did not sufficiently serve American interests. This sentiment was articulated when, during his speech announcing the withdrawal from the former treaty he said, "*The Paris Accord would undermine our economy, hamstring our workers, weaken our sovereignty.*"<sup>74</sup> Adding later the latter: "*It is clear to me that we cannot prevent an Iranian nuclear bomb under the decaying and rotten structure of the current agreement. The Iran deal is defective at its core. If we do nothing, we know exactly what will happen. In just a short period of time, the world's leading state sponsor of terror will be on the cusp of acquiring the world's most dangerous weapon.*"<sup>75</sup> emphasizing his position on the deal's inadequacy and the potential consequences of its continuation. Employing Content Analysis, one can dissect the thematic content of Trump's statements. In his quote on the Iran Nuclear Deal, he asserts the ineffectiveness of the current agreement, emphasizing the imminent threat of Iran acquiring nuclear capabilities. The language used, including hyperboles like "*decaying and rotten structure*" and "*world's most dangerous weapon,*" reveals his critical stance and concern about the deal's potential consequences. Antithesis<sup>76</sup> is also involved in contrasting two opposite ideas in the same sentence or neighbouring sentences. In the statement about the Iran Nuclear Deal, Trump contrasts the current agreement with the potential consequences. This contrast creates a stark juxtaposition, emphasizing the urgency of his argument, whereas, in the quote regarding the breakup with the Parisian Accord, Trump highlights the economic impact of the agreement by using a metaphor, stating that it would "*undermine our economy, hamstring our workers, weaken our sovereignty,*" utilising negative language to convey his perspective.

Moving on to other aspects touched by his stance toward the international arena, his policies often reflected a blend of economic protectionism<sup>77</sup> and national security concerns. Trump's international security policy was notably characterized by a robust position on China, a rising global power and economic competitor. His administration prioritized addressing trade imbalances, intellectual property theft, and strategic competition. The ex-president's policies, often expressed through tariffs

---

<sup>72</sup> The Paris Agreement is an international treaty within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that was adopted in 2015. It aims to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, with efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

<sup>73</sup> The Iran Nuclear Deal, formally known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), is an agreement reached in 2015 between Iran, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, China, and the European Union. The deal aimed to limit Iran's nuclear program and prevent it from developing nuclear weapons.

<sup>74</sup> Donald Trump, 06/01/2017, Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement Speech, Washington D.C, the Rose Garden of the White House.

<sup>75</sup> Donald Trump, 05/08/2018, Withdrawal Speech from the Iran Nuclear Deal, Washington D.C, The White House.

<sup>76</sup> Antithesis is a rhetorical device that involves the juxtaposition of contrasting words, phrases, clauses, or ideas within a balanced grammatical structure. It is used to emphasize the differences between two opposite or contrasting ideas, concepts, or qualities.

<sup>77</sup> Protectionism is an economic policy approach where a country imposes tariffs, quotas, or other restrictions on imports to shield its domestic industries from foreign competition.

on Chinese imports and a trade war, had far-reaching implications, not only on the economic front but also on the discourse around international trade and security. The imposition of tariffs, notably in the context of the U.S.-China trade war<sup>78</sup>, became a hallmark of his administration's economic strategy. These tariffs were strategically placed on various imports, a move aimed at protecting American industries from what Trump perceived as unfair trade practices.

One of the key reasons behind this aggressive stance was Trump's conviction that such economic measures were essential for national security. He argued that a robust domestic industry was vital for maintaining the country's economic independence and resilience in the face of global challenges. The tariffs were, in his view, a means to rectify trade imbalances and protect American jobs and businesses. This sentiment was underscored in his statement, *"We are not going to let our country be taken advantage of anymore,"*<sup>79</sup> highlighting his commitment to a strong protectionist point of view, prioritizing the interests of the United States in international trade. The content analysis reveals the theme of economic nationalism, focusing on safeguarding domestic industries and jobs. The quote employs a rhetorical device known as anaphora<sup>80</sup>, where the phrase *"We are not going to let"* is repeated for emphasis, highlighting Trump's determination and resolve. Additionally, antithesis is used to contrast the previous situation - where the country was taken advantage of - with the future course of action - not letting it happen anymore -, creating a strong rhetorical impact. Furthermore, this economic-focused security policy was not limited to tariffs alone. Trump's administration also pursued renegotiations of international trade agreements, emphasizing fair and reciprocal trade relationships.

On another note, his renegotiation of the NAFTA<sup>81</sup> resulted in the USMCA<sup>82</sup>, which Trump hailed as a victory for American workers and businesses. *"We've also made historic progress in the renegotiation of trade deals that have hurt our country for decades. Our new trade deal with Mexico and Canada, the USMCA, will boost American agriculture, manufacturing, and innovation to unprecedented levels."*<sup>83</sup> Adding in one of his tweets: *"Just signed one of the most important, and largest, Trade Deals in U.S. and World History. The United States, Mexico, and Canada worked so well together in crafting this great document. The terrible NAFTA will soon be gone. The USMCA*

---

<sup>78</sup> The U.S.-China trade war refers to a series of escalating trade tensions and retaliatory measures between the United States and China, two of the world's largest economies. The conflict began in early 2018 when the United States imposed tariffs on various Chinese imports, citing concerns over China's trade practices, intellectual property theft, and a significant trade imbalance between the two nations.

<sup>79</sup> Donald Trump, 02/17/2017, The Boeing Company, North Charleston, South Carolina.

<sup>80</sup> An anaphora is a rhetorical device where a word or a group of words is repeated at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences. It is often used to create emphasis, evoke emotion, or reinforce a particular idea.

<sup>81</sup> North American Free Trade Agreement.

<sup>82</sup> United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

<sup>83</sup> Donald Trump, December 2019.

*will be fantastic for all!"* <sup>84</sup>The emphasis on "*historic progress*," "*boosting American agriculture, manufacturing, and innovation*," and calling it "*one of the most important, and largest, Trade Deals in U.S. and World History*" showcases his key messaging points by employing hyperbole. He also uses positive language, describing the deals as "*fantastic for all*." Here, he used inclusive language, involving the countries - United States, Mexico, and Canada - and emphasizing teamwork: "*worked so well together*." Comparatively, Trump's approach to trade deals is assertive, highlighting his administration's efforts to rectify what he perceives as past mistakes. The use of phrases like "*terrible NAFTA*" implies a strong position against the previous agreement and underscores the contrast between the old and the new deal.

In the broader context of international relations, these economic-centric security policies stirred debates and controversies. While some praised Trump's bold approach, others raised concerns about the potential escalation of trade tensions and the impact on global economic stability. Trump's emphasis on economic considerations as a fundamental aspect of his international security policy highlighted his unconventional approach, one that prioritized protecting domestic industries to bolster national security and economic independence. This approach, coupled with his rhetoric, shaped a unique paradigm in the United States foreign relations, one where economic interest played a central role in defining the contours of international security policy.

On the other hand, Trump's also extended to national security and immigration. His emphasis on securing borders and controlling immigration was a core aspect of his security policy. He stated, "*A nation without borders is not a nation at all*,"<sup>85</sup> highlighting the significance of border control in safeguarding American interests by using the rhetorical figure of repetition.

During his presidency, Donald Trump consistently expressed scepticism about the utility and fairness of certain international alliances. He frequently argued that the United States was disproportionately burdened in terms of financial and military contributions, leading him to call for other nations to contribute more significantly. This stance marked a departure from traditional diplomatic norms and underscored his "America First" approach to global affairs.

In fact, Trump's scepticism about international alliances was often conveyed through direct and assertive language. He used rhetorical strategies that appealed to nationalism and emphasized self-reliance. For instance, in a speech addressing NATO, he stated, "*We expect our partners—whether in NATO, in the Middle East, or the Pacific—to take a direct and meaningful role in both strategic and*

---

<sup>84</sup> This statement and the accompanying tweet were made by Donald Trump, the 45th President of the United States. The remarks refer to the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), which was intended to replace the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The USMCA was signed on November 30, 2018, at the G20 summit in Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>85</sup> Donald Trump, 06/16/2015, Trump Tower, New York City.

*military operations and pay their fair share of the cost.*"<sup>86</sup> Trump's language in this quote is assertive and direct. He uses imperative language such as "*must*" to convey a sense of obligation and expectation. The rhetorical tone is confrontational, urging NATO members to take direct and meaningful action, underscoring his insistence on equitable burden-sharing. Comparatively, this statement aligns with Trump's broader stance on international relations, emphasizing reciprocity and financial fairness. It contrasts with traditional diplomatic language, highlighting his departure from conventional norms in addressing allies' responsibilities. The rhetorical figures employed are the anaphora and the repetition of the phrase "*direct and meaningful role in both strategic and military operations*" for emphasis. Additionally, he uses imperative language, urging action, and hyperbole, emphasizing the significance of contributions to the alliance's stability.

Trump's calls for other nations to contribute more to international alliances had a significant impact on diplomatic relations. It led to tense negotiations and debates within organizations like NATO, with member countries facing pressure to increase their defense spending. His approach sparked conversations about the future of these alliances and the balance of power within them. While some Americans supported his call for a more equitable distribution of responsibilities, others criticized his approach as destabilizing established diplomatic relationships. Similarly, world leaders expressed mixed reactions, leading to a global discourse on the role of the United States in international partnerships. Moreover, Trump's scepticism about alliances influenced discussions about collective security and cooperation. It raised questions about the reliability of U.S. commitments and highlighted the evolving nature of global alliances in an era of shifting geopolitical dynamics. The former president's stance on international alliances remains a significant aspect of his foreign policy legacy. It continues to shape discussions about burden-sharing, alliance commitments, and the future of multilateral cooperation. By challenging established norms, Trump's approach has left a lasting impact on how nations perceive and engage in international alliances, ushering in a new era of diplomatic discourse.

It is now clear that at the heart of Trump's security policies, lay his distinctive rhetoric, characterized by blunt language, Twitter/X diplomacy, and a direct communication style. His tweets, often unfiltered and unscripted, became a hallmark of his presidency, shaping public opinion and policy discourse in unprecedented ways. The controversial nature of Trump's rhetoric was magnified during sensitive international crises, such as the North Korean nuclear standoff and the Syrian conflict. His provocative statements, sometimes delivered via social media, drew condemnation from adversaries and allies alike. For instance, in addressing North Korea, he once tweeted: "*North Korean Leader Kim Jong Un just stated that the 'Nuclear Button is on his desk at all times.' Will someone from his*

---

<sup>86</sup> Donald Trump, 03/01/2017, First nationally televised speech to Congress.



*depleted and food-starved regime please inform him that I too have a Nuclear Button, but it is a much bigger & and more powerful one than his, and my Button works!"* or again: *"Fire and Fury like the world has never seen. They will be met with fire, fury, and frankly power the likes of which this world has never seen before."*<sup>87</sup> Trump's rhetoric in this instance was confrontational, utilizing hyperbole to emphasize his point and assert dominance. His choice of words, especially on social media platforms, added an element of immediacy and virality to his messages, making them highly impactful. Compared to previous administrations, Trump's approach was markedly different. His willingness to engage in public verbal sparring, even on sensitive matters, distinguished him from his predecessors and stirred global debates about the appropriateness of such communication from a world leader. When it came to addressing the Syrian Conflict, Trump's statement was made on X amidst escalating tensions after a suspected chemical attack in Syria. The President's tweet was a direct warning to Russia about the United States' intention to launch missile strikes against the Syrian government for its alleged use of chemical weapons. *"Russia vows to shoot down any and all missiles fired at Syria. Get ready Russia, because they will be coming, nice and new and 'smart!' You shouldn't be partners with a Gas Killing Animal who kills his people and enjoys it!"*<sup>88</sup> He said. The rhetoric in this quote, especially the phrases *"nice and new and 'smart!'"* showcased Trump's use of adjectives and emphasis. The word *"smart"* here implies advanced technology, underscoring the United States' military prowess and the exclamation mark adds a sense of urgency and determination. This quote reveals Trump's assertiveness, indicating his willingness to employ military force. The term *"Gas Killing Animal"* employs strong, emotive language, portraying the Syrian President Bashar al-Assad as a ruthless dictator. Furthermore, the direct address to Russia, a key player in the conflict, intensifies the message. Again, compared to traditional diplomatic language, Trump's approach was notably blunt and confrontational. Previous administrations might have used more diplomatic language when addressing a potential military strike. This quote once more encapsulates Trump's direct and forceful communication style during international crises. The language used reflects his willingness to assert U.S. military power and condemn the actions of adversaries. The immediate and widespread reactions to this statement underscore the impact of his words on both domestic and international audiences, highlighting the significance of his rhetoric in shaping global perceptions of U.S. foreign policy. As a matter of fact, another critical aspect of Trump's foreign policy was his approach to Russia, which was closely scrutinized. Trump's relationship with President Vladimir Putin was complex, oscillating between conciliatory gestures and assertive statements. Amidst allegations of Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, Trump's public remarks and private discussions

---

<sup>87</sup> Donald Trump, 08/08/2017, CNN appearance.

<sup>88</sup> Donald Trump, the 45th President of the United States, on April 11, 2018.

with Putin were closely analysed, highlighting the delicate balance between fostering diplomatic ties and addressing geopolitical concerns.

## *2.2 Analysis of Key Trump Speeches*

A deep analysis of President Donald Trump's speeches, notably his inaugural address and the press conference with Vladimir Putin in Helsinki demands a thorough analysis of multiple elements shaping their effectiveness and influence as well as the impact of these communicative events. The importance of context cannot be overstated, as a matter of fact, it is paramount, as the circumstances surrounding each speech significantly shape the content and reception of the message. The inaugural address, being a pivotal moment as the President assumes office, establishes the tone for the administration and outlines the key priorities. Conversely, the press conference with Vladimir Putin unfolds within the intricate landscape of international relations, adding layers of complexity to the discourse. The delivery of the message, encapsulating the President's tone, rhetoric, and style, plays a crucial role in influencing public perception and responses. The setting, whether it be the grandeur of the inauguration ceremony or the diplomatic ambiance of a press conference, adds an additional layer of significance to the words spoken. Furthermore, the audience, ranging from the American public to the global community, brings diverse expectations and perspectives, shaping the impact of the speeches. Lastly, the timing of these speeches is essential, as they occur at critical junctures that can define the trajectory of policies and international relations. Understanding these elements is pivotal to a comprehensive analysis of Trump's speeches, shedding light on the intricate interplay of communication, politics, and global dynamics.

### *2.2.1 The 58<sup>th</sup> Inaugural Address*

In delving into the intricacies of President Donald Trump's inaugural address, it is essential to amplify the contextual factors that shaped this pivotal moment. The backdrop of the 2016 electoral campaign reveals a complex interplay of historical factors that set the stage for Donald Trump's unconventional rise to power. At the heart of this political landscape was a confluence of economic challenges, social dynamics, and shifts in the perception of the American Dream. The first decade of the 21st century witnessed a seismic event with far-reaching consequences: the global financial crisis of 2008. The collapse of major financial institutions, the housing market downturn, and the subsequent recession left a lasting imprint on the U.S. economy. The reverberations of this crisis were felt in the form of widespread unemployment, home foreclosures, and a palpable sense of economic insecurity among

the American populace. Against this backdrop, a growing sense of disillusionment took root. Many Americans felt that the traditional political establishment, perceived as detached and out of touch, had failed to address their economic concerns. The discontent was not confined to a specific demographic but spanned across various socio-economic strata, creating a broad constituency of individuals seeking change. In the realm of economic ideology, Trump's campaign embraced the concept of economic nationalism. This stance, historically associated with protecting domestic industries from global competition, gained resonance in regions that had borne the brunt of deindustrialization and job losses. Trump's promise to renegotiate trade deals, bring back manufacturing jobs, and prioritize American economic interests tapped into the economic anxieties of communities that felt left behind.

Furthermore, a key feature of his communicative approach is Populism<sup>89</sup>, a recurring theme in American political history, emerged as a defining feature of Trump's campaign. Populist movements have historically arisen during periods of economic uncertainty, with leaders positioning themselves as champions of the "common people" against perceived elites. Trump, with his outsider status and rejection of traditional political norms, cast himself as a voice for those who felt marginalized by the established order. Moreover, Immigration, an enduring and often contentious issue in American history, became a focal point of Trump's campaign. His calls for stricter immigration controls and the construction of a border wall reflected concerns about job competition, cultural shifts, and national identity. This resonated particularly in communities where demographic changes were perceived as a challenge to established norms. To grasp the depth of Trump's electoral strategy, it's crucial to recognize that his campaign themes were not just strategic choices but responses to profound shifts in the American socio-economic landscape. The rallying cries of economic nationalism, populism, and immigration control were, in many ways, echoes of historical sentiments amplified by the economic and social currents of the time. Trump's ability to tap into these historical undercurrents played a pivotal role in shaping the narrative of the 2016 campaign and ultimately led to his unexpected victory.

The 2016 presidential election, a fiercely contested battle between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton<sup>90</sup>, came to an end on January 20, 2017, when, against this charged backdrop, Donald Trump took the oath of office as the 45th President of the United States. The venue, the West Front of the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C., became the stage for a historic inaugural address that would set the tone for Trump's presidency. His speech, delivered with a populist flair, encapsulated a

---

<sup>89</sup> Populism is a political approach or ideology that seeks to appeal to the interests and concerns of ordinary people, often against established elites, institutions, or perceived centres of power.

<sup>90</sup> Hillary Clinton is an American politician, diplomat, and lawyer who has been a prominent figure in U.S. politics for several decades.

commitment to returning power to the people and addressing the grievances of the "forgotten" citizens, focusing on economic nationalism, and addressing the concerns of the disenfranchised as word frequency demonstrates, the prevalence of terms like "jobs," "borders," and "wealth" underscores the speech's focus previously highlighted. Trump's speech contrasts with previous inaugurals, marking a departure from conventional diplomatic language. The comparative approach unveils distinctive features, illustrating his divergence from traditional norms in favour of a more colloquial and assertive tone, as a matter of fact, Trump's rhetoric is characterized by simplicity and directness, enhancing accessibility to a broad audience where rhetorical figures such as anaphora "We will bring back" and epistrophe<sup>91</sup> "America First" amplify key messages.

*"Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world, thank you.*

*We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come.*

*We will face challenges. We will confront hardships, but we will get the job done. Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Thank you."*<sup>92</sup>

The language choice, highlighting "we, the citizens of America," underlines the inclusive tone and shared responsibility. Rhetorically, the use of anaphora is evident with the repetition of "we" and "America", and this technique fosters a sense of unity and shared purpose. Moreover, the deliberate order of addressing Chief Justice Roberts, followed by former Presidents Carter, Clinton, Bush, and Obama, signifies a continuity of leadership and a peaceful transition. This section of the speech echoes themes of unity found in other inaugural addresses. The acknowledgment of predecessors reflects a tradition of peaceful transitions and underscores the collaborative nature of American governance and a sense of bipartisanship, to add, the word frequency analysis may reveal the prominence of terms like "rebuild," "restore," and "promise," providing insights into the thematic focus of the address. By acknowledging the existence of challenges and hardships, he is asserting confidence in overcoming them, and the mention of the "orderly and peaceful transfer of power" is particularly significant, especially considering the historical context of the presidential inauguration. It underscores the democratic principles of the U.S. political system.

---

<sup>91</sup> Epistrophe is a rhetorical device in which a word or phrase is repeated at the end of successive clauses or sentences. It is the counterpart to anaphora, where the repetition occurs at the beginning of clauses or sentences. Epistrophe is employed for emphasis and to create a memorable, rhythmic effect in speech or writing.

<sup>92</sup> January 20, 2017, Inaugural Address by Donald Trump, who took the oath of office as the 45th President of the United States, The West Front of the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

*“Today's ceremony, however, has a very special meaning because today, we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the people.*

*For too long, a small group in our nation's capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country.*

*Their victories have not been your victories. Their triumphs have not been your triumphs, and while they celebrated in our nation's capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.*

*That all changes starting right here and right now because this moment is your moment. It belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration, and this, the United States of America, is your country.”*

Here the contrast between "Washington, D.C." and "you, the people" creates an antithesis, highlighting the power shift, whereas the repetition of "Their victories," "Their triumphs," and "This is your" serves as an anaphoric device, emphasizing the distinction between the establishment and the people. The comparison is made between the establishment in Washington, D.C., and the citizens across the country, and said stark contrast sets the stage for a significant power shift and change in priorities. *“What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people. January 20th, 2017 will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again.*

*The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now. You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement, the likes of which the world has never seen before.*

*At the centre of this movement is a crucial conviction that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighbourhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public.*

*But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists, mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities, rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation, an education system flush with cash but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge.*

*And the crime, and the gangs, and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.*

*We are one nation, and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams, and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny. The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.*” From a rhetorical point of view, the repetition of *"for their children," "for their families,"* and *"for themselves"* serves as an epistrophe, emphasizing the collective desires of the American people, while the phrase *"rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones"* employs a metaphor, painting a vivid picture of economic decline. The quote compares the ideal vision of what Americans want such as great schools, safe neighbourhoods and good jobs, with the harsh reality faced by some citizens, namely, poverty, deteriorating factories and crime. This stark contrast sets the stage for Trump's promise of change as the repetitive use of phrases like *"their pain is our pain," "their dreams are our dreams,"* and *"one nation"* quantitatively reinforces the message of unity and shared destiny. *“For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We've defended other nations' borders while refusing to defend our own, and we've spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay.*

*We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon. One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores with not even a thought about the millions and millions of American workers that were left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed all across the world.*

*But that is the past, and now we are looking only to the future. We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power: from this day forward, a new vision will govern our land, from this day forward, it's going to be only America First. America First.*

*Every decision on trade, taxes, immigration, on foreign affairs will be made to benefit American workers and American families. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength.*” Listing specific grievances as *"enriched foreign industry," "subsidized armies"* and *"spent trillions"* he amplifies the perceived wrongs, reinforcing the need for change.

Furthermore, describing the wealth of the middle class as *"ripped from their homes and redistributed all across the world"* uses metaphor to evoke a powerful, emotive image. Trump addresses a broad audience, including citizens, foreign leaders, and policymakers. Mentioning foreign capitals and halls of power suggests a global audience, emphasizing the significance of the proclaimed decree. By stating *"America First"* immediately after listing perceived grievances, Trump strategically places the core message at the forefront, ensuring it resonates throughout the speech. *“I will fight for you with*

*every breath in my body, and I will never, ever let you down. America will start winning again, winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams. Those things that we've been waiting for, hoping for—they are going to happen. This is the moment when America gets back on its feet, stronger, more prosperous, and more united than ever before.*

*Together, we will rebuild our country. We will invest in our people, in our infrastructure, and in our future. Our triumphs will be measured not only by economic indicators but by the well-being of every citizen. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.*

*As we face the challenges ahead, we'll confront them with resilience and determination. Every decision will be guided by a simple principle: America First. We're not just transferring power from one administration to another; we're returning it to the people, where it belongs.*

*No longer will a small group in Washington, D.C., reap the rewards of government while the people bear the cost. This is a turning point, a moment of change, where the establishment's victories are no longer separate from the victories of the American people. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.*

*Let January 20th, 2017, be remembered as the day the people reclaimed their rightful place as the rulers of this nation. It's your moment, your celebration, and your country. The oath of office I take today is not just a commitment to a party but an allegiance to all Americans.*

*In the days, months, and years ahead, we will build a nation that serves its citizens, that prioritizes their needs, and that stands as a beacon of hope and prosperity. From this day forward, America First will guide our decisions, ensuring that every action benefits American workers and families.*

*We will fight for the protection of our borders, for the strength of our industries, and for the well-being of our citizens. The era of America winning is upon us, and together, we will achieve greatness.*

*We will bring back jobs, secure our borders, and restore our wealth. This is the beginning of a new chapter, where the American dream becomes a reality once again.”* The central focus is on the promises of change, resurgence, and a renewed emphasis on American interests. Trump pledges to fight for the people, bring back jobs, secure borders, and prioritize the well-being of citizens. Phrases like *"This is the moment when America gets back on its feet"* and *"a turning point"* use metaphor to convey a sense of recovery and change, moreover, not to be underestimated is the role of pathos, the emotional appeal is evident in phrases like *"The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer,"* aiming to resonate with those who feel overlooked. Throughout the speech, Trump compares the current state of the nation to a future vision where the people reclaim power, the establishment's victories align with those of the American people, and the American dream is revitalized, and with the repeated emphasis on "America First", he positions his administration as a

departure from previous policies. In conclusion, throughout his Inaugural address, Trump targets a diverse audience, including the American people, the establishment, and the global community. By referencing specific dates like January 20th, 2017, he grounds the speech in a historical moment, reinforcing the significance of the transition. The speech resonates with those seeking change, promising a departure from established norms and a renewed focus on American prosperity. The analysis reveals the calculated use of language, rhythm, and rhetorical devices to convey a vision of a revitalized and prioritized America under his leadership.

### *2.2.2 The Helsinki Summit: Press Conference with Vladimir Putin*

Another pivotal moment when it comes to key speeches in Donald Trump's presidential career is the press conference with Vladimir Putin, held on July 16, 2018, in Helsinki, Finland, a multifaceted examination of the context, timing, purpose, expectations, and sentiments at the time unveils a critical juncture in U.S.-Russia relations. This summit occurred during a period of heightened tensions between the United States and Russia, notably, it unfolded in the wake of allegations of Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, injecting a sense of urgency and significance into the diplomatic dialogue. President Trump's approach to Russia was a subject of significant interest and debate. His campaign had featured rhetoric suggesting a desire for improved relations with Russia, contrasting with the more adversarial tone adopted by previous administrations, and the press conference was a platform designed purposefully for President Trump to articulate his stance on key issues and demonstrate whether his diplomatic approach aligned with his earlier rhetoric. Though throughout his presidency Trump's stance towards Russia evolved, initially advocating for improved relations and cooperation on common interests, Trump faced challenges in maintaining a consistent approach amid escalating tensions and investigations into Russian interference. The Helsinki summit provided an opportunity for Trump to either reaffirm his commitment to a cooperative relationship or address growing concerns about his perceived leniency towards Russia. Furthermore, the summit took place against the backdrop of broader geopolitical developments, including conflicts in Syria and concerns about nuclear proliferation. The international community was keenly observing how the leaders would address these issues, and any signals of alignment or discord had the potential to shape the trajectory of U.S.-Russia relations and impact global stability.

The primary purpose of this specific press conference was indeed to communicate the outcomes of the summit and potentially signal shifts in U.S.-Russia policy. The timing of the press conference, strategically following a summit between the two leaders, was poised to address pressing issues that lingered between the United States and Russia and expectations were elevated, with both domestic



and international audiences awaiting clarity on critical matters such as election interference, human rights concerns, and territorial disputes. The geopolitical landscape was rife with anticipation, and the world looked to Helsinki for cues on the trajectory of U.S. foreign policy given the fact that sentiments surrounding this diplomatic episode were charged and polarized. So domestically, concerns abounded regarding President Trump's perceived reluctance to confront Putin on allegations of election interference, whereas internationally, allies sought reassurance and a coherent stance on Russia. As such, the press conference became a touchstone for shaping perceptions of U.S. foreign policy and leadership on the global stage. The transcript of the press conference, situated within the elegant confines of diplomatic language and discourse, reflected the delicate dance between the leaders. President Trump, in his remarks, emphasized constructive engagement and the need to move forward, deflecting direct confrontation on election interference. President Putin, in turn, maintained Russia's denial of any involvement and expressed a willingness to cooperate on cybersecurity. Within this academic discourse, the analysis employs an objective and scholarly tone, avoiding conjecture and bias. The nuanced examination of context, timing, purpose, expectations, and sentiments provides a comprehensive understanding of the complexities inherent in U.S.-Russia relations during this crucial diplomatic moment. *"I have just concluded a meeting with President Putin on a wide range of critical issues for both of our countries. We had direct, open, deeply productive dialogue. Went very well. Before I begin, I want to thank President Niinisto of Finland for graciously hosting today's summit. President Putin and I were saying how lovely it was and what a great job they did. I also want to congratulate Russia and President Putin for having done such an excellent job in hosting the World Cup. It was really one of the best ever. And your team also did very well. It was a great job. I'm here today to continue the proud tradition of bold American diplomacy. From the earliest days of our republic, American leaders have understood that diplomacy and engagement is preferable to conflict and hostility. A productive dialogue is not only good for the United States and good for Russia, but it is good for the world. The disagreements between our two countries are well known and President Putin and I discussed them at length today. But if we're going to solve many of the problems facing our world, then we're going to have to find ways to cooperate in pursuit of shared interests."*<sup>93</sup>

Trump's rhetoric is evidently marked by a positive tone and diplomatic language. He highlights the "direct, open, deeply productive dialogue" with Putin, setting a cooperative tone for the meeting, as

---

<sup>93</sup> The Helsinki Summit, July 16, 2018

well as expressing gratitude to President Niinistö<sup>94</sup> for hosting the summit and congratulating Russia and Putin for hosting the World Cup, emphasizing the positive aspects of the host country and recognizing the latest Russian achievements, serving as a positive reinforcement, this rhetorical strategy aims to create a favourable atmosphere for the subsequent discussions and projects a more amicable relationship. At the beginning of his speech, while acknowledging existing disagreements, Trump places emphasis on the need for cooperation and finding common ground. This can be contrasted with Putin's remarks to identify areas of convergence or divergence in their perspectives, Trump on his hand, frames the American-Russian partnership as essential not just for the two nations but for the entire world in alignment with the theme of diplomacy over conflict. Trump then proceeds to invoke the "*proud tradition of bold American diplomacy*," linking the current diplomatic efforts with a historical legacy. This rhetorical strategy seeks to present the meeting as part of a longstanding American approach to international relations.

*“Too often, in both recent past and long ago, we have seen the consequences when diplomacy is left on the table.*

*We’ve also seen the benefits of cooperation. In the last century, our nations fought alongside one another in the Second World War. Even during the tensions of the Cold War, when the world looked much different than it does today, the United States and Russia were able to maintain a strong dialogue.*

*But our relationship has never been worse than it is now. However, that changed as of about four hours ago. I really believe that.*

*Nothing would be easier politically than to refuse to meet, to refuse to engage, but that would not accomplish anything.*

*As president, I cannot make decisions on foreign policy in a futile effort to appease partisan critics, or the media, or Democrats who want to do nothing but resist and obstruct.*

*Constructive dialogue between the United States and Russia affords the opportunity to open new pathways toward peace and stability in our world. I would rather take a political risk in pursuit of peace than to risk peace in pursuit of politics. As president, I will always put what is best for America and what is best for the American people.”*

Trump then further highlights the historical context of diplomatic consequences and benefits of cooperation, referencing World War II and the Cold War to emphasize the potential of dialogue and employing ethos by linking the present to historical successes. He acknowledges the current strained state of U.S.-Russia relations, stating that it has never been worse, but immediately suggesting a positive change following the recent meeting. In fact, the repeated phrase "*I really believe that*" adds

---

<sup>94</sup> President Niinistö refers to Sauli Vainamo Niinistö, the President of Finland since March 1, 2012.

a personal and emphatic touch to his statement about the positive change in the relationship. He then proceeds with a subtle critique of the idea of making foreign policy decisions to appease critics, the media, or political opponents, emphasizing his commitment to decisions that benefit consistent messaging throughout his presidency, while positioning himself as willing to take political risks for the sake of peace appealing to a sense of pragmatism and courage. *“During today’s meeting, I addressed directly with President Putin the issue of Russian interference in our elections. I felt this was a message best delivered in person. Spent a great deal of time talking about it. And President Putin may very well want to address it, and very strongly, because he feels very strongly about it, and he has an interesting idea.*

*We also discussed one of the most critical challenges facing humanity: nuclear proliferation. I provided an update on my meeting last month with Chairman Kim on the denuclearization of North Korea. And after today, I am very sure that President Putin and Russia want very much to end that problem, going to work with us. And I appreciate that commitment.*

*The president and I also discussed the scourge of radical Islamic terrorism. Both Russia and the United States has suffered horrific terrorist attacks, and we have agreed to maintain open communication between our security agencies to protect our citizens from this global menace.*

*Last year, we told Russia about a planned attack in St. Petersburg, and they were able to stop it cold. They found them. They stopped them. There was no doubt about it. I appreciated President Putin’s phone call afterwards to thank me.*

*I also emphasized the importance of placing pressure on Iran to halt its nuclear ambitions, and to stop its campaign of violence throughout the area, throughout the Middle East.*

*As we discussed at length, the crisis in Syria is a complex one. Cooperation between our two countries has the potential to save hundreds of thousands of lives.*

*I also made clear that the United States will not allow Iran to benefit from our successful campaign against ISIS. We have just about eradicated ISIS in the area.*

*We also agreed that representatives from our national security councils will meet to follow up on all of the issues we addressed today, and to continue the progress we have started right here in Helsinki. Today’s meeting is only the beginning of a longer process, but we have taken the first step toward a brighter future and one with a strong dialogue and a lot of thought.*

*Our expectations are grounded in realism, but our hopes are grounded in America’s desire for friendship, cooperation and peace. And I think I can speak on behalf of Russia, when I say that, also. President Putin, I want to thank you again for joining me for these important discussions and for advancing open dialogue between Russia and the United States. Our meeting carries on a long*

*tradition of diplomacy between Russia, the United States, for the greater good of all. And this was a very constructive day, this was a very constructive few hours that we spent together.*

*It's in the interest of both of our countries to continue our conversation, and we have agreed to do so. I'm sure we'll be meeting again in the future often, and hopefully, we will solve every one of the problems that we discussed today.*" Trump concludes his speech by finally addressing the issue of Russian interference in U.S. elections, highlighting the importance of discussing it in person and acknowledging President Putin's strong feelings on the matter, the American president, strategically addresses the sensitive issue of Russian interference at the beginning as well, framing it as a topic discussed extensively during the meeting and attributing an "*interesting idea*" to Putin, creating intrigue. He then quickly shifts to nuclear proliferation, referencing his recent meeting with Chairman Kim on North Korea's denuclearization and expressing confidence in Russia's commitment to working together on the issue, emphasizing the common ground on issues like nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and Syria, portraying the U.S. and Russia as potential partners in addressing global challenges to deflect on the hot topic of the session. Noteworthy is the mention of cooperation against radical Islamic terrorism, which establishes a common ground between Russia and the United States, emphasizing the need for open communication between security agencies.

In analysing President Trump's remarks during the joint press conference with President Putin, several key insights emerge. Firstly, the strategic and cautious approach to addressing the issue of Russian interference in U.S. elections at the outset reflects an awareness of the sensitivity surrounding this topic. Throughout the discourse, thematic elements of nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and the situation in Syria emerge as focal points for potential cooperation. By emphasizing shared interests and acknowledging Russia's role in global problem-solving, Trump seeks to present a diplomatic narrative that contrasts with the prevailing tensions between the two nations. The commitment to continued dialogue, exemplified by the agreement for representatives from national security councils to meet, reinforces the idea of an ongoing diplomatic process and said commitment, clearly aligns with Trump's overarching objective of fostering a brighter future through a strong dialogue and cooperative efforts. In the broader geopolitical context, the Helsinki summit occurred against a backdrop of strained U.S.-Russia relations, giving heightened significance to the diplomatic exchanges. Moreover, the positive tone in Trump's closing remarks, expressing gratitude and projecting a hopeful outlook for future meetings, signifies an attempt to foster an atmosphere of cooperation despite existing challenges.

In conclusion, President Trump's rhetoric in this press conference is characterized by a delicate balance between addressing contentious issues and highlighting potential areas of collaboration. The emphasis on shared challenges, successful past cooperation, and a commitment to ongoing dialogue

collectively contribute to a diplomatic narrative aimed at projecting a positive trajectory for U.S.-Russia relations.

### *2.3 Main Themes, Patterns and Recurring Topics*

In scrutinizing two key transcripts from President Donald Trump's tenure, namely the Helsinki Summit press conference with Vladimir Putin and his Inaugural Address on January 20, 2017, a nuanced examination reveals both shared themes and notable distinctions in the rhetoric and context. Donald Trump's Inaugural Address reflects a pivotal moment in U.S. history, marked by a departure from traditional norms and the introduction of a populist and nationalist agenda. The speech strategically employs rhetorical devices like anaphora and epistrophe to convey a sense of unity and purpose. Trump also emphasizes economic nationalism, populism, and immigration control, framing them as responses to historical and contemporary challenges faced by the American people. The phrase "America First" becomes once again a central theme, symbolizing a shift in priorities and a commitment to domestic interests. Moreover, Trump's language is direct, simple, and aimed at a broad audience, promising change and revitalization.

On the other hand, the press conference in Helsinki represents a critical juncture in U.S.-Russia relations. Against the backdrop of heightened tensions and allegations of Russian interference, Trump's rhetoric focuses on diplomatic engagement, constructive dialogue, and the potential for cooperation rather than focusing too much on the allegations over his elections. The language is positive, emphasizing the productive nature of the discussions and the need for the U.S. and Russia to find common ground. However, Trump indeed navigates sensitive issues such as election interference, nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and Syria, presenting a narrative of potential collaboration rather than confrontation. The commitment to ongoing dialogue and a hopeful outlook for future meetings underscores an attempt to foster cooperation despite existing challenges.

In both instances, Trump employs rhetorical strategies to convey specific messages tailored to the context. The analysis reveals Trump's adaptability in rhetorical styles, catering to the unique demands of different situations during his presidency. In the Helsinki Summit, this emphasis is directed towards international relations, with specific mentions of Russian interference, nuclear proliferation, and counterterrorism. In contrast, the Inaugural Address centres on a broader vision of cooperation but with a distinct focus on domestic policy. Furthermore, a commitment to continued dialogue is evident in both transcripts. Notwithstanding the similarities between the two presidential speeches, the focus of the two transcripts differs significantly. The primary distinction lies in the focus of each speech. The Helsinki Summit is inherently international, discussing matters of global importance and

relations between the U.S. and Russia. Meanwhile, the Inaugural Address leans heavily towards domestic policy, addressing issues like job creation, border security, and wealth restoration within the United States.

Concerning his tone of voice, the Inaugural Address reflects a bold and assertive tone, marked by the simplicity and directness that characterize Trump's language, the president's voice in the Inaugural Address is that of a disruptor, an outsider challenging the established order, in fact the speech showcases his distinctive communication style, eschewing diplomatic language for a more colloquial and accessible tone.

Comparatively, the tone in the press conference with Putin is notably diplomatic and cooperative. Trump adopts a positive and forward-looking approach, emphasizing the benefits of constructive dialogue and potential collaboration with Russia on global issues, in this context, Trump's voice shifts to that of a statesman seeking diplomatic solutions. He navigates complex international relations with a tone that is more measured, highlighting the importance of dialogue over conflict.

The analysis of both speeches underscores Trump's ability to maintain a unified presidential persona while adapting his tone and voice to the specific context. Whether addressing a domestic audience in his Inaugural Address or engaging in international diplomacy in the press conference, Trump's rhetoric reflects a consistent commitment to his core messages and a strategic use of language to convey them effectively. The relevance of this analysis lies in recognizing Trump's adaptability in communication, as this adaptability sheds light on the nuanced nature of his presidency and the strategic considerations guiding his communication choices.

## *Chapter III*

### *Joe Biden's Blueprint for Security – Words and Deeds*

#### *3.1 Overview of Biden's Security Policies*

Joe Biden's character is deeply rooted in his early life, marked by personal challenges and a commitment to public service. Born on November 20, 1942, in Scranton, Pennsylvania, and later moving to Delaware, Biden's upbringing in a working-class family shaped his understanding of economic struggles and the importance of resilience. His early experiences laid the foundation for a character defined by empathy, perseverance, and dedication to improving the lives of ordinary Americans. The current President of the United States of America underwent significant development during his time as Vice President under Barack Obama from 2009 to 2017. Joe Biden's decision to run for president in 2020 was informed by a deep sense of responsibility to heal a fractured nation. Motivated by a desire to restore a sense of decency, unity, and integrity to American politics, Biden framed his candidacy as a response to the tumultuous period marked by heightened political polarization and the divisive rhetoric prevalent during the previous administration. His long career in public service, including his tenure as Vice President, contributed to a nuanced understanding of the challenges facing the nation. Biden's candidacy was rooted in a belief that the United States needed a leader with the experience, empathy, and vision to navigate the complexities of the contemporary political landscape. Throughout his campaign, Biden's rhetoric and tone reflected a deliberate departure from the confrontational style of politics that characterized the preceding years. Emphasizing themes of unity, healing, and the restoration of American values, Biden positioned himself as a unifier. His speeches often invoked a sense of national purpose, calling for a collective effort to address pressing issues such as the COVID-19<sup>95</sup> pandemic, racial injustice, and economic inequality despite the most recent gaffes. The tone of Biden's campaign speeches mirrored the empathetic and inclusive approach that had defined his political career. He spoke directly to the concerns of everyday Americans, promising to be a president for all, irrespective of political affiliations. This commitment to bipartisanship and a return to a more collegial style of governance became a central theme of his campaign. Biden's election victory in 2020 carried profound historical significance. Against the backdrop of a global pandemic and heightened social divisions, his win symbolized a repudiation of divisive politics and a reaffirmation of democratic values. The highest

---

<sup>95</sup> COVID-19 is an infectious disease caused by the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. It was first identified in December 2019 in Wuhan, China, and has since become a global pandemic.

voter turnout in U.S. history<sup>96</sup> underscored the electorate's eagerness for a change in leadership and a restoration of stability. The consequences of Biden's victory were far-reaching. Internationally, it signalled a shift towards a more collaborative and diplomatic approach in contrast with the attitude his runner-up would have adopted. On the domestic front, it held the promise of a presidency focused on unity, healing, and a comprehensive agenda to address pressing challenges. Understanding Joe Biden's character, honed through decades of public service, provides a lens through which to evaluate his approach to domestic security policy. His emphasis on unity, empathy, and a commitment to democratic values forms the bedrock of his policy decisions. The collaborative style witnessed during his time under Obama and echoed in his campaign rhetoric foreshadows a security policy that seeks broad consensus. his period is crucial in understanding the evolution of Biden's character on the national stage. The President's political career spans decades, marked by both triumphs and challenges. Elected to the New Castle County Council in 1970 and later to the U.S. Senate in 1972, he became one of the youngest individuals ever elected to the Senate. Tragedy struck early in his political journey with the death of his first wife and daughter in 1972, a pivotal moment that further shaped his resilience and commitment to public service. Biden's tenure in the Senate saw him deeply involved in issues of criminal justice, foreign relations, and gun control. His role as the Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee and later as the Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee demonstrated his capacity to navigate diverse policy realms. The decision to run for the presidency in 1988, although unsuccessful, showcased Biden's determination whereas his subsequent roles, including the Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the contentious Clarence Thomas Supreme Court confirmation hearings, reflected his commitment to justice and equity. The 2008 financial crisis and Obama's subsequent invitation for Biden to be his running mate marked a turning point in his career as, the campaign and eventual victory in 2008, revealed Biden's ability to connect with voters on a national scale, emphasizing unity and a pragmatic approach to governance. As a matter of fact, his speeches often blend personal anecdotes with policy proposals, creating a narrative that resonates with the American public. During the 2020 presidential campaign, Biden's rhetoric emphasized healing a divided nation and restoring a sense of normalcy. His speeches struck a balance between acknowledging the challenges facing the country and instilling a sense of hope. As previously mentioned, the tone of Biden's domestic security policy is set by his consistent messaging of unity and healing. Whether addressing issues of racial justice, gun violence, or the ongoing public health crisis, his rhetoric reflects a commitment to inclusive governance. This tone of voice,

---

<sup>96</sup> The turnout of the 2020 US political election was historically high. Approximately 66.7% of eligible voters participated in the election, making it one of the highest turnouts in over a century.



characterized by empathy and pragmatism, influences the public perception of policy measures and contributes to a more engaged and participatory citizenry.

### *3.1.1 Biden's Approach to Domestic Security*

The historical context of U.S. domestic policy underscores the enduring impact that policy decisions can have on the nation. From the New Deal era to the Civil Rights Movement, domestic policies have shaped the social fabric, economic landscape, and overall trajectory of the United States. Biden's presidency, situated in the continuum of this history, carries the responsibility to address contemporary challenges while upholding the democratic ideals that have defined the nation. The prioritization of the impact of Biden's domestic security policies is paramount. From addressing systemic racism to fortifying national cybersecurity, the consequences of policy choices resonate across diverse facets of American life. A comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted implications of these policies requires an examination of their origins, the political climate that shaped them, and the tone set by the President. As the 46th and current President of the United States, Biden's approach to domestic security is intricately woven into the fabric of his character, rhetoric, and the historical context in which he leads. His role was not only ceremonial; he played a pivotal part in shaping policy, particularly in areas such as foreign affairs and domestic issues. The collaborative dynamic between Obama and Biden showcased the latter's ability to navigate complex political landscapes and contribute substantively to key decisions. This tone continued into his presidency, especially in addressing issues related to domestic security, therefore, Biden's candidacy and subsequent win in the 2020 presidential election were influenced by a confluence of factors, including his experience, policy positions, and the public's response to his character. His blueprint for security, as articulated during the campaign, reflected a comprehensive approach to address multifaceted challenges facing the nation. Biden's extensive political career, coupled with his time as Vice President, positioned him as a candidate with the experience to navigate complex issues. The contours of Biden's security policy are multifaceted, encompassing a spectrum of issues ranging from law enforcement and counterterrorism to cybersecurity and responses to emergent threats. A meticulous examination of these facets is essential to discern the trajectory and impact of his policy framework. To comprehend the significance of Biden's domestic security policy, a historical lens is indispensable. The United States has witnessed the profound consequences of domestic policy on numerous occasions throughout its history. Instances such as the Civil Rights Movement<sup>97</sup>, and the War on

---

<sup>97</sup> The Civil Rights Movement in the United States was a social and political struggle aimed at ending racial segregation and discrimination against African Americans and other marginalized groups, particularly in the Southern states. It

Terror have left indelible marks on the nation's fabric. Understanding this history is crucial, for domestic policy decisions resonate beyond their immediate context, shaping societal structures, norms, and perceptions for generations. On the domestic front, one pivotal dimension of Biden's domestic security policy lies in his commitment to police reform. With the Law Enforcement Reform, stemming from the heightened scrutiny of law enforcement practices, Biden's blueprint includes measures to address issues of racial bias, excessive use of force, and the militarization of police forces. The deployment of federal resources to incentivize police departments to meet higher standards and embrace community policing reflects a concerted effort to reimagine the role of law enforcement. When it comes to counterterrorism and Homeland Security, building on the post-9/11 landscape, Biden navigates the evolving threat matrix by prioritizing a more agile and intelligence-driven approach to counterterrorism. The focus extends beyond traditional threats to encompass cybersecurity, domestic extremism, and disinformation. This inclusive approach aligns with the contemporary challenges that the nation faces such as Cybersecurity, the approach of resilience recognizes the escalating significance of cyber threats, and Biden's domestic security policy places a premium on enhancing the nation's cybersecurity resilience. Investments in critical infrastructure protection, bolstering public-private partnerships, and the creation of a Cybersecurity Safety Review Board<sup>98</sup> exemplify the administration's commitment to mitigating vulnerabilities in the digital realm. A special mention goes to the way that Joe Biden faced the recent worldwide Pandemic, the paradigm-altering impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has prompted Biden to integrate pandemic preparedness into the fabric of domestic security. The creation of the White House National Security Council Directorate for Global Health Security and Biodefense<sup>99</sup> underscores a holistic approach that views health crises as intrinsic components of national security. By institutionalizing measures to respond to biological threats, Biden seeks to ensure that the nation is not only prepared for future pandemics but also positioned to play a leading role in global health security. When it comes to Biden's rhetoric, both during his electoral campaign and throughout his presidency, encapsulates a tone of measured reassurance and strategic resolve. During the campaign, he positioned himself as a unifier, emphasizing the need for healing divisions. This tone has persisted in his approach to domestic security, with an emphasis on dialogue, collaboration, and inclusivity. The President's rhetoric on law enforcement reform reflects a balance between acknowledging the systemic challenges within

---

emerged primarily in the mid-20th century and sought to secure equal rights and opportunities for all citizens, regardless of race.

<sup>98</sup> The Cybersecurity Safety Review Board (CSRB) is a proposed entity that would be established to enhance cybersecurity efforts and response capabilities in the United States. The

<sup>99</sup> The White House National Security Council Directorate for Global Health Security and Biodefense is a specialized entity within the United States National Security Council (NSC) focused on coordinating and managing the nation's efforts related to global health security and biodefense.

policing while also championing the need for a robust and respected law enforcement presence. The language used often emphasizes the importance of community engagement, transparency, and accountability. In addressing counterterrorism and homeland security, Biden's tone is one of pragmatic vigilance. He acknowledges the evolving nature of threats, both foreign and domestic, and advocates for intelligence-led strategies over reactionary measures. The emphasis is on a comprehensive understanding of security that extends beyond traditional military responses. Cybersecurity discourse under Biden's leadership is marked by a recognition of the interconnectedness of the digital realm with everyday life. His rhetoric underscores the need for collective responsibility, the collaboration between government and private sectors, and the elevation of cybersecurity to a national security imperative. Lastly, in addressing pandemic preparedness, Biden's tone is one of proactive readiness. His rhetoric emphasizes the lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic and the imperative to fortify the nation's defenses against future biological threats. The language employed conveys a commitment to global cooperation while prioritizing the health and security of the American people. The significance of Biden's domestic security policy cannot be overstated. In an era characterized by multifaceted challenges, the approach taken by the administration has profound implications for the nation's resilience, unity, and global standing. The interconnected nature of contemporary threats necessitates a comprehensive strategy that aligns with the realities of the 21st century. In a broader historical context, domestic policy decisions have often defined the trajectory of the United States. Biden's domestic security policy, positioned at the nexus of historical precedents and contemporary challenges, is instrumental in determining the nation's resilience and adaptability. In conclusion, the analysis of Joe Biden's domestic security policy provides a comprehensive understanding of the administration's strategic priorities, the nuances of his rhetoric, and the far-reaching consequences of these policy choices. As the nation grapples with evolving threats, societal expectations, and historical legacies, the Biden administration's approach emerges as a critical chapter in the ongoing narrative of U.S. domestic policy and security.

### 3.1.2 Biden's International Security Agenda

Joe Biden's international security agenda is intricately woven into the fabric of his character, shaped by a lifetime of experiences. His early years in a working-class neighborhood provided a perspective on the challenges faced by ordinary Americans, influencing his approach to domestic and international issues alike. Biden's academic journey played a pivotal role in shaping his worldview. Graduating from the University of Delaware, he went on to study law at Syracuse University Law School. These formative years laid the foundation for a nuanced understanding of legal and ethical dimensions, crucial in navigating the complex landscape of international relations. Joe Biden's political career spans several decades, marked by a dedication to foreign relations. His entry into the U.S. Senate in 1973 marked the beginning of a journey that would see him actively involved in key committees, including the Committee on Foreign Relations. This early engagement with global affairs provided Biden with a front-row seat to the challenges and opportunities faced by the United States on the world stage. Biden's role as Vice President under President Barack Obama further solidified his expertise in international relations. The Obama administration's emphasis on diplomatic engagement, the pivot to Asia, and the negotiation of the Iran Nuclear Deal became integral components of Biden's political identity. This period not only honed his diplomatic skills but also reinforced the importance of multilateralism in addressing global issues. The decision to run for the presidency in 2020 was not merely a political move but a response to what Biden perceived as a critical juncture in U.S. history. Motivated by a desire to restore the nation's global reputation, reinvigorate alliances, and confront emerging threats, Biden's candidacy was grounded in a deep-seated belief in the United States' role as a responsible and collaborative global actor. The rhetoric employed by Joe Biden during his campaign for the presidency reflected a deliberate departure from the isolationist tendencies of his predecessor. Emphasizing the restoration of alliances and the revitalization of international institutions, Biden's speeches echoed a commitment to collaborative solutions for shared global challenges. Key sentences included expressions such as "*rebuild alliances*," signaling a strategic shift towards diplomatic engagement and cooperation. Throughout his mandate as the 46th President of the United States, Joe Biden's tone in international security policy maintained a delicate balance of strength and diplomacy. Recognizing the importance of leading by example, Biden's speeches emphasized the strength of democratic values and the need for the United States to play a proactive role in upholding a rules-based international order. The recurring theme was a departure from unilateralism<sup>100</sup>, with an emphasis on working collaboratively with allies to

---

<sup>100</sup> Unilateralism refers to a foreign policy approach where a country acts independently and without consultation or cooperation with other nations or international organizations. In a unilateralist approach, a country makes decisions and

address the multifaceted challenges of the modern world. One of the defining episodes of Biden's international security agenda was his commitment to addressing climate change. The decision to rejoin the Paris Agreement<sup>101</sup> signaled a reengagement with global efforts to combat environmental threats. Biden's rhetoric went beyond environmental responsibility; it underscored the interconnectedness of global security. Key sentences such as "*Our commitment to tackling climate change is a commitment to global stability and security*"<sup>102</sup> encapsulated the administration's understanding of the symbiotic relationship between environmental sustainability and international security. The NATO Summit provided a platform for Biden to reaffirm the United States' commitment to the transatlantic alliance. This episode was characterized by rhetoric that emphasized solidarity and cooperation among democratic nations. Biden's speeches conveyed a departure from transactional diplomacy, highlighting the importance of "*collective security*" and "*shared responsibility*" in maintaining a stable international order. The handling of the Afghanistan withdrawal presented a complex challenge to Biden's international security strategy. The president's pragmatic tone acknowledged the evolving nature of global threats and the need for a recalibration of U.S. strategy. Key sentences, such as "*Adapting foreign policy to contemporary realities*"<sup>103</sup>, reflected a commitment to assessing and adjusting national security priorities in response to changing international dynamics. In conclusion, Joe Biden's international security agenda is a multifaceted tapestry woven with the threads of his character, experiences, and articulated principles. The comprehensive overview delves into the intricate details of his origins, political career, and the formative years under the Obama administration<sup>104</sup>. The analysis of rhetoric and tone provides insights into Biden's approach to international relations, while the exploration of key episodes offers a nuanced understanding of the president's response to global challenges. This chapter aims to unravel the layers of Biden's blueprint for security, highlighting its significance in the broader context of U.S. history and its implications for the nation's role on the global stage.

One of the central tenets of Joe Biden's approach to international security is the reinvigoration of nuanced diplomacy and a robust commitment to multilateralism. Unlike his predecessor's unilateral tendencies, Biden's blueprint emphasizes collaborative solutions to global challenges. The administration's return to international agreements, such as the Paris Agreement and the Iran Nuclear

---

takes actions based solely on its own interests, priorities, and perceived necessities, without seeking consensus or approval from other countries.

<sup>101</sup> The Paris Agreement is a landmark international treaty on climate change, adopted on December 12, 2015, at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) held in Paris, France.

<sup>102</sup> President Joe Biden, Inaugural Address, January 20, 2021

<sup>103</sup> Joe Biden, Withdrawal from Afghanistan, April 14, 2021

<sup>104</sup> The Obama administration refers to the tenure of Barack Obama as the 44th President of the United States, which lasted from January 20, 2009, to January 20, 2017.

Deal, underscores a belief in the efficacy of collective action in addressing complex transnational threats. This marks a departure from the "*America First*" paradigm, signaling a return to the United States as an active participant in the community of nations. Biden's rhetoric and actions consistently highlight the importance of alliances and collective security in maintaining a stable international order. The reaffirmation of the United States' commitment to NATO, coupled with efforts to repair strained relationships, reflects a strategic understanding of the interconnectedness of global security. The emphasis on shared responsibility and burden-sharing underscores a departure from transactional diplomacy, fostering a sense of solidarity among democratic nations. In this approach, Biden positions the United States as a cooperative partner rather than a unilateral actor, contributing to the resilience of the international system. The handling of the Afghanistan withdrawal exemplifies Biden's adaptive and pragmatic approach to security strategy. Recognizing the evolving nature of global threats, The current president's administration exhibited a willingness to reassess and recalibrate U.S. priorities. Biden's acknowledgment of the need to adapt foreign policy to contemporary realities underscores a departure from rigid, ideologically driven approaches. While this adaptive strategy may invite criticism, it reflects a commitment to a dynamic and responsive security posture that aligns with the complexities of the modern geopolitical landscape. A distinctive feature of Biden's international security agenda is the elevation of climate change as a core security issue. By rejoining the Paris Agreement and actively participating in global climate summits, the administration positions environmental sustainability as integral to international stability. Biden's rhetoric connects climate change to broader security concerns, emphasizing that addressing environmental challenges is not merely an ecological imperative but a strategic necessity. This marks a departure from traditional security paradigms, expanding the definition of national security to encompass environmental and humanitarian dimensions. Throughout his mandate, Joe Biden consistently emphasized the importance of democratic values as the cornerstone of global engagement. His tone underscores a commitment to leading by example and upholding the principles of democracy in the international arena. By promoting democratic norms, human rights, and the rule of law, Biden positions the United States as a champion of a rules-based international order. This rhetorical emphasis serves not only as a foreign policy strategy but also as a reaffirmation of the shared values that bind democratic nations together. In conclusion, Joe Biden's blueprint for international security emerges as a comprehensive and adaptive framework, rooted in diplomacy, multilateralism, and a commitment to addressing emerging challenges. The president's nuanced approach to alliances, adaptive security strategy, recognition of climate change as a security issue, and the promotion of democratic values collectively represent a departure from previous administrations. As the United States navigates an evolving global landscape, Biden's approach

signals a commitment to collaborative, adaptive, and principled leadership in pursuit of a more secure and interconnected world.

### 3.2 *Analysis of Key Biden Speeches*

A deep analysis of President Joe Biden's speeches, particularly his inaugural address and his announcement of the withdrawal from Afghanistan, demands a comprehensive examination of his approach to governance, his thoughts, his tone of voice, and his broader strategy.

The inaugural address, often numbered as the 59th inaugural address in U.S. history<sup>105</sup>, serves as a pivotal moment as the President assumes office, setting the tone for his administration and outlining key priorities. Biden's inaugural address, delivered amidst a deeply polarized political landscape and against the backdrop of multiple crises, including the COVID-19 pandemic and racial injustice, encapsulated his vision for unity and healing. His deliberate choice of language, characterized by calls for national reconciliation and empathy, reflected his commitment to bridging divides and restoring faith in democratic institutions. Importantly, the address signaled a departure from the confrontational rhetoric of his predecessor, Donald Trump, emphasizing the need for collective action to address pressing challenges. Similarly, Biden's announcement of the withdrawal from Afghanistan marked a significant moment in his presidency and in U.S. foreign policy. Against the backdrop of America's longest war and escalating violence in the region, Biden's decision to end the military presence in Afghanistan reflected his commitment to prioritizing diplomacy and strategic realignment. The withdrawal, albeit contentious and subject to scrutiny, underscored Biden's belief in ending "*forever wars*" and refocusing U.S. resources on addressing emerging threats and domestic priorities. His rationale for the withdrawal, articulated through speeches and policy directives, emphasized the need to recalibrate America's role in global affairs and pursue more sustainable approaches to international security. The importance of these speeches lies not only in their immediate policy implications but also in their broader significance within the historical context. Biden's inaugural address, delivered at a critical juncture marked by political turmoil and societal divisions, conveyed a message of hope and resilience, signalling a new chapter in American leadership. Likewise, his announcement of the Afghanistan withdrawal reflected a recalibration of U.S. foreign policy in the aftermath of the post-9/11 era, acknowledging the limitations of military intervention and the imperative of diplomatic engagement. Analysing Biden's speeches requires a nuanced understanding of his rhetorical style, his emphasis on empathy and unity, and his commitment to

---

<sup>105</sup> The 59th inaugural address in U.S. history occurred on January 20, 2021, when Joe Biden was sworn in as the 46th President of the United States.

pragmatic governance. The tone, rhetoric, and timing of these speeches are integral to shaping public perception and policy outcomes, underscoring the intricate interplay between communication, politics, and global dynamics in the Biden administration. As the United States navigates a complex and evolving geopolitical landscape, Biden's approach to leadership and international relations will continue to be scrutinized and analysed, reflecting the enduring significance of presidential rhetoric in shaping the course of history.

### *3.2.1 The 59th Inaugural Address*

Analysing President Biden's inaugural address requires a deep understanding of the contextual factors and the overarching themes that shaped his discourse. The transition from the Trump administration to Biden's presidency marked a significant shift in tone, policy, and rhetoric, necessitating a meticulous examination of his words and deeds. Joe Biden's journey to the presidency was marked by a long and storied career in American politics. His entry into politics was spurred by a desire to enact meaningful change and address pressing issues facing American society. His tenure in the Obama administration was characterized by a focus on diplomacy, coalition-building, and a commitment to upholding American values on the global stage. Biden's decision to run for the presidency in 2020 was against the backdrop of a deeply divided nation grappling with a global pandemic, economic uncertainty, and social unrest, Biden positioned himself as a unifying figure capable of healing the nation's wounds and restoring faith in its democratic institutions. His campaign emphasized themes of empathy, unity, and the need to bridge partisan divides in order to tackle the myriad challenges facing the country. The 2020 presidential election, one of the most consequential in American history, culminated in Joe Biden's victory on November 7, 2020. His inaugural address, delivered on January 20, 2021, at the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C., served as a rallying cry for national unity and a reaffirmation of America's core values. In contrast to his predecessor, Biden's speech struck a tone of optimism, resilience, and a commitment to collective action in the face of adversity. In his inaugural address, the President emphasized the importance of unity and reconciliation, calling on Americans to come together to confront the daunting challenges ahead. He acknowledged the deep divisions that had plagued the nation in recent years but expressed confidence in the resilience of the American people to overcome them. Biden's rhetoric was characterized by a sense of humility, empathy, and a recognition of the gravity of the moment. One of the central themes of Biden's inaugural address was the need to confront the existential threats of our time, including the COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, racial injustice, and political extremism. He called for a renewed sense of purpose and urgency in addressing these challenges, emphasizing the need for bold



and decisive action to build a more just, equitable, and sustainable future for all Americans. Throughout his speech, President Biden invoked the spirit of American democracy and the enduring values that have sustained the nation through its darkest hours. He emphasized the importance of truth, integrity, and a commitment to the rule of law in safeguarding the foundations of democracy and preserving the promise of a better tomorrow. President Biden's address encapsulated a vision of hope, resilience, and unity in the face of adversity. His words reflected a deep understanding of the challenges confronting the nation and a steadfast commitment to overcoming them together. As the 46th President of the United States, Biden's leadership will be defined by his ability to bridge divides, heal wounds, and forge a path toward a brighter future for all Americans. The way Joe Biden campaigned significantly influenced the tone, themes, and priorities reflected in his inaugural address and subsequent words as President. Several key aspects of his campaign directly shaped the content and style of his messaging. Throughout his campaign, Joe Biden consistently emphasized the need to unify a deeply divided nation and heal the wounds of political polarization. His message centered on the idea of bringing Americans together across ideological, racial, and socio-economic lines. This emphasis on unity carried over into his inaugural address, where he reiterated the importance of coming together as a nation to address common challenges. Biden's personal experiences, including the loss of his son Beau Biden to cancer, informed his empathetic approach to politics. His campaign focused on connecting with voters on a personal level, listening to their concerns, and empathizing with their struggles. This emphasis on empathy and connection resonated throughout his inaugural address, where he spoke directly to the American people with compassion and understanding. In contrast to the tumultuous tenure of his predecessor, President Biden's campaign emphasized the restoration of democratic norms, values, and institutions. He pledged to uphold the rule of law, defend democratic principles, and restore faith in American democracy. These themes featured prominently in his inaugural address, where he underscored the importance of preserving the integrity of democratic governance and the rule of law. Focusing on pragmatic solutions, Biden's campaign emphasized practical solutions to the pressing challenges facing the nation, including the COVID-19 pandemic, economic recession, racial injustice, and climate change. His inaugural address reflected this pragmatic approach, as he outlined specific policy proposals and called for bipartisan cooperation to address these urgent issues. Despite the formidable challenges confronting the nation, Joe Biden's campaign maintained an optimistic tone and a sense of resolve. He conveyed a belief in America's ability to overcome adversity and emerge stronger from the crises at hand. This sense of optimism permeated his inaugural address, where he called on Americans to embrace the future with hope and determination. These themes reflected his vision for a more inclusive, compassionate, and resilient America, and they continued to shape his rhetoric and policy agenda throughout his presidency. In

Biden's address, rhetorical figures such as parallelism, anaphora, and alliteration are utilized to enhance the effectiveness of his message. For instance, Biden employs anaphora when he repeats the phrase "*It requires*" to emphasize the necessity of unity. He also uses parallelism in phrases like "*To restore the soul and secure the future of America,*" creating rhythm and emphasis. "*Today, we celebrate the triumph not of a candidate, but of a cause, the cause of democracy. The will of the people has been heard, and the will of the people has been heeded. We have learned again that democracy is precious. Democracy is fragile. And at this hour, my friends, democracy has prevailed.*" President Biden highlights the victory of democracy itself, emphasizing that the election was not about individuals but about the enduring principles of democratic governance. He highlights the importance of the will of people being heard and respected, underscoring the foundational principles of democracy at the same time remembering the fragility of democracy and the need to protect and preserve it for future generations. Biden employs parallelism in the repetition of the phrase "*the cause of democracy*" to emphasize the central theme of the speech. The use of anaphora in the repetition of "*democracy is*" underscores the importance and fragility of democratic values. The phrase "*democracy has prevailed*" serves as a powerful conclusion, conveying a sense of victory and resilience. "*To overcome these challenges – to restore the soul and secure the future of America – requires more than words. It requires that most elusive of things in a democracy: Unity.*" Biden emphasizes the necessity of unity in addressing the monumental challenges facing the nation. He acknowledges that words alone are insufficient and calls for concrete actions and collective efforts to heal the divisions and move the country forward. He articulates the goals of restoring the nation's soul and ensuring its future security, highlighting the gravity of the task at hand, again he uses Biden uses parallelism in the repetition of the phrase "*to overcome these challenges*" and "*to restore the soul and secure the future of America,*" which reinforces the importance of the task. The use of antithesis in contrasting "*more than words*" with "*unity*" underscores the idea that actions, particularly unity, are essential for progress. Biden's address comes at a time of deep political and social division in the United States, exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, economic uncertainty, and racial tensions. The call for unity reflects Biden's commitment to bridging partisan divides and fostering a sense of collective purpose in addressing pressing issues facing the nation. "*As does President Carter, whom I spoke to last night but who cannot be with us today, but whom we salute for his lifetime of service. I have just taken the sacred oath each of these patriots took — an oath first sworn by George Washington. But the American story depends not on any one of us, not on some of us, but on all of us. On “We the People” who seek a more perfect Union. This is a great nation and we are a good people. Over the centuries through storm and strife, in peace and in war, we have come so far. But we still have far to go. We will press forward with speed and urgency, for we have much to do in this winter*

*of peril and possibility. Much to repair. Much to restore. Much to heal. Much to build. And much to gain.*” Biden acknowledges former President Carter's absence due to health reasons and pays tribute to his lifetime of service. He emphasizes the continuity of the presidential oath, linking it to George Washington and highlighting the solemnity of the commitment to serve the nation. The President underscores the collective responsibility of "*We the People*" in shaping the American story and seeking a more perfect union. The passage reflects Biden's recognition of the nation's progress, while also acknowledging the challenges that lie ahead, including the urgent need for unity and action. Biden's reference to President Carter highlights the tradition of presidential leadership and the importance of service to the nation. He juxtaposes the enduring principles of American democracy, represented by the presidential oath, with the ongoing journey toward a more perfect union, emphasizing the idea of progress tempered by the recognition of unfinished business.

Biden uses inclusive language, such as "*we*," "*us*," and "*all of us*," to emphasize the shared responsibility and common purpose of the American people. He employs parallelism in sentences like "*Much to repair. Much to restore. Much to heal. Much to build. And much to gain.*" to create a sense of urgency and purpose, reinforcing the idea that there is significant work to be done. The use of emotive language, such as "*sacred oath*," "*storm and strife*," and "*winter of peril and possibility*," evokes a sense of solemnity, resilience, and opportunity in addressing the nation's challenges.

*“Few periods in our nation’s history have been more challenging or difficult than the one we’re in now. A once-in-a-century virus silently stalks the country. It’s taken as many lives in one year as America lost in all of World War II. Millions of jobs have been lost. Hundreds of thousands of businesses closed. A cry for racial justice some 400 years in the making moves us. The dream of justice for all will be deferred no longer. A cry for survival comes from the planet itself. A cry that can’t be any more desperate or any more clear. And now, a rise in political extremism, white supremacy, and domestic terrorism that we must confront and we will defeat. To overcome these challenges – to restore the soul and to secure the future of America – requires more than words. It requires the most elusive of things in a democracy: Unity. Unity.”* Biden begins by acknowledging the significant challenges facing the nation, including the COVID-19 pandemic, economic downturn, cries for racial justice, environmental concerns, and the rise of extremism. He emphasizes the severity of the situation by comparing the impact of the pandemic to the casualties of World War II and highlighting the economic repercussions, social injustices, and political extremism. The current President of the United States of America underscores the necessity of unity in addressing these multifaceted challenges and emphasizes that unity goes beyond mere rhetoric, requiring concrete action and collaboration. The use of vivid language, such as "*silently stalks*," "*cry for survival*," and "*rise in political extremism*," evokes strong emotional responses, highlighting the gravity of the

situation. Biden utilizes parallelism and repetition with the phrase "A cry for" to emphasize the interconnectedness of the various challenges facing the nation and the urgency of addressing them. By framing unity as the solution to overcoming these challenges, Biden appeals to a sense of collective responsibility and shared purpose among the American people. Biden's acknowledgment of the current challenges and the need for unity reflects a departure from the divisive rhetoric of the previous administration, which often exacerbated societal divisions. He contrasts the unprecedented crises facing the nation with the resilience and resolve required to confront them, positioning unity as the antidote to fragmentation and discord. *"In another January, on New Year's Day in 1863, Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. When he put pen to paper, the President said, and I quote: 'If my name ever goes down into history, it'll be for this act, and my whole soul is in it.'" The President of the United States references a pivotal moment in American history, Abraham Lincoln's signing of the Emancipation Proclamation<sup>106</sup>, which declared the freedom of enslaved individuals in Confederate states<sup>107</sup> during the Civil War. He emphasizes the significance of this historical event by quoting Lincoln's words about the profound personal and historical impact of the Emancipation Proclamation. Biden employs the rhetorical device of allusion by referring to Abraham Lincoln and his historical actions, which adds depth and resonance to his message. The use of direct quotations from Lincoln adds authenticity and authority to Biden's speech, reinforcing the gravity of the moment and the importance of the actions being taken. By evoking Abraham Lincoln's discourse, Biden draws a parallel between past struggles for justice and freedom and the challenges facing the nation in the present. The reference to Lincoln's commitment to the Emancipation Proclamation highlights the moral imperative of taking decisive action to address injustice and inequality. *"Today, on this January day, my whole soul is in this: Bringing America together. Uniting our people. And uniting our nation. I ask every American to join me in this cause. Uniting to fight the common foes we face: Anger, resentment, hatred. Extremism, lawlessness, violence. Disease, joblessness, hopelessness. With unity, we can do great things. Important things. We can right wrongs. We can put people to work in good jobs. We can teach our children in safe schools. We can overcome this deadly virus. We can reward work, rebuild the middle class, and make healthcare secure for all. We can deliver racial justice. We can make America, once again, the leading force for good in the world. I know speaking of unity can sound to some like a foolish fantasy. I know the forces that divide us are deep and they are real. But I also know they are not new. Our history has been a constant struggle between the American ideal that we are all created equal and the harsh, ugly reality that racism,**

---

<sup>106</sup> Abraham Lincoln, Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863.

<sup>107</sup> During the American Civil War, the Confederate States were: South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, Tennessee. These states seceded from the Union and formed the Confederate States of America.

*nativism, fear, and demonization have long torn us apart. The battle is perennial. Victory is never assured. Through the Civil War, the Great Depression, World War, 9/11, through struggle, sacrifice, and setbacks, our “better angels” have always prevailed. In each of these moments, enough of us came together to carry all of us forward. And, we can do so now. History, faith, and reason show the way, the way of unity. We can see each other not as adversaries but as neighbors. We can treat each other with dignity and respect. We can join forces, stop the shouting, and lower the temperature. For without unity, there is no peace, only bitterness and fury. No progress, only exhausting outrage. No nation, only a state of chaos. This is our historic moment of crisis and challenge, and unity is the path forward. And, we must meet this moment as the United States of America. If we do that, I guarantee you, we will not fail. We have never, ever, ever failed in America when we have acted together. And so today, at this time and in this place, let us start afresh. All of us.”* Biden emphasizes the importance of unity and national cohesion as central themes in his address. He identifies various challenges facing the nation, including social division, extremism, disease, unemployment, and racial injustice. The President outlines a vision of what unity can achieve, including addressing systemic issues, rebuilding the economy, ensuring healthcare access, and restoring America's global leadership role. Biden uses inclusive language, addressing "every American" and calling for collective action. He employs parallelism and repetition to underscore the urgency and significance of unity as a solution to national crises. Through historical references and appeals to shared values, Biden's rhetoric contrasts with the divisive and confrontational language often employed in contemporary political discourse. He positions unity as an antidote to the polarization and discord that have characterized American society in recent years. The President draws upon historical examples of national unity during times of crisis to inspire confidence in the American people's ability to overcome challenges. *"Let us listen to one another. Hear one another. See one another. Show respect to one another. Politics need not be a raging fire destroying everything in its path. Every disagreement doesn't have to be a cause for total war. And, we must reject a culture in which facts themselves are manipulated and even manufactured. My fellow Americans, we have to be different than this. America has to be better than this. And, I believe America is better than this. Just look around. Here we stand, in the shadow of a Capitol dome that was completed amid the Civil War, when the Union itself hung in the balance. Yet we endured and we prevailed. Here we stand looking out to the great Mall where Dr. King spoke of his dream. Here we stand, where 108 years ago at another inaugural, thousands of protestors tried to block brave women from marching for the right to vote. Today, we mark the swearing-in of the first woman in American history elected to national office – Vice President Kamala Harris. Don't tell me things can't change. Here we stand across the Potomac from Arlington National Cemetery, where heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion rest in eternal peace. And here we stand, just days after a*

*riotous mob thought they could use violence to silence the will of the people, to stop the work of our democracy, and to drive us from this sacred ground. That did not happen. It will never happen. Not today. Not tomorrow. Not ever.*" Biden emphasizes the importance of listening, respect, and civility in political discourse. He highlights the need to reject destructive behaviors such as political polarization and the manipulation of facts. The President celebrates the resilience of American democracy and the historic milestones represented by Vice President Kamala Harris<sup>108</sup>'s inauguration. Biden employs parallelism and repetition "*Let us listen, Hear, See, Show.*" to reinforce the message of mutual understanding and respect. He uses vivid imagery to evoke the historical significance of the inauguration ceremony and the symbolic locations surrounding the Capitol. The repetition of "*Here we stand*" underscores the collective resolve and determination of the American people in the face of adversity. Biden contrasts the values of unity, resilience, and democracy with the divisive and violent actions of the Capitol rioters. He juxtaposes moments of historical significance, such as Dr. King's<sup>109</sup> speech and the struggle for women's suffrage, with the present moment to underscore the ongoing pursuit of justice and equality. The speech reflects a departure from the confrontational rhetoric of the previous administration, emphasizing reconciliation and national unity. Biden's address comes at a critical juncture in American history, following a contentious election and the unprecedented attack on the U.S. Capitol<sup>110</sup>. The call for unity and civility resonates with the need to heal deep divisions and restore faith in democratic institutions. By acknowledging the challenges of the past and present, Biden seeks to inspire hope and resilience in the American people. "*To all those who supported our campaign I am humbled by the faith you have placed in us. To all those who did not support us, let me say this: Hear me out as we move forward. Take a measure of me and my heart. And if you still disagree, so be it. That's democracy. That's America. The right to dissent peaceably, within the guardrails of our Republic, is perhaps our nation's greatest strength. Yet hear me clearly: Disagreement must not lead to disunion. And I pledge this to you: I will be a President for all Americans. I will fight as hard for those who did not support me as for those who did. Many centuries ago, Saint Augustine, a saint of my church, wrote that a people was a multitude defined by the common objects of their love. What are the common objects we love that define us as Americans? I*

---

<sup>108</sup> Kamala Harris is an American politician who has served as the Vice President of the United States since January 20, 2021. She is the first woman, the first Black person, and the first person of South Asian descent to hold the vice presidency.

<sup>109</sup> Martin Luther King Jr.'s most famous speech, "I Have a Dream," was delivered on August 28, 1963, during the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in Washington, D.C. This historic speech is remembered as one of the defining moments of the American Civil Rights Movement.

<sup>110</sup> The attack on Capitol Hill, often referred to as the Capitol riot or insurrection, occurred on January 6, 2021. It happened when a mob of supporters of then-President Donald Trump stormed the United States Capitol in an attempt to overturn his defeat in the 2020 presidential election. The attack resulted in violence, destruction of property, injuries to law enforcement officers, and several deaths. The rioters breached security barriers, entered the Capitol building, vandalized offices, and interrupted the certification process of the Electoral College results, which confirmed Joe Biden's victory in the presidential election.

*think I know. Opportunity. Security. Liberty. Dignity. Respect. Honor. And, yes, the truth. Recent weeks and months have taught us a painful lesson. There is truth and there are lies. Lies told for power and for profit. And each of us has a duty and responsibility, as citizens, as Americans, and especially as leaders – leaders who have pledged to honor our Constitution and protect our nation – to defend the truth and to defeat the lies. I understand that many Americans view the future with some fear and trepidation.*” Biden continues by acknowledging both his supporters and those who did not support his campaign, emphasizing the importance of listening and respecting differing perspectives. He highlights the fundamental principles of democracy, including the right to dissent and the necessity of unity despite disagreements. The President invokes Saint Augustine's concept<sup>111</sup> of a people defined by shared values, listing key American ideals such as opportunity, security, liberty, dignity, respect, honor, and truth. Biden underscores the importance of truth and the duty of citizens and leaders to defend it against falsehoods, especially in the current political climate. Biden uses inclusive language to address all Americans, regardless of their political affiliation, signaling a commitment to national unity and reconciliation. He employs rhetorical questions to engage the audience and prompt reflection on core American values and the importance of truth in civic discourse. The President juxtaposes the concepts of truth and lies, framing the defense of truth as a moral imperative and a patriotic duty. Through references to Saint Augustine and historical ideals, Biden appeals to shared cultural and moral values to foster a sense of collective identity and purpose. Biden's rhetoric contrasts with the divisive and combative tone of recent political discourse, emphasizing dialogue, empathy, and mutual respect as antidotes to polarization and discord. He distinguishes between healthy disagreement within a democratic framework and the corrosive effects of disunion and deception on the body politic. The President's approach reflects a departure from the confrontational style of political leadership, seeking to bridge partisan divides and rebuild trust in democratic institutions. *“I understand they worry about their jobs, about taking care of their families, about what comes next. I get it. But the answer is not to turn inward, to retreat into competing factions, distrusting those who don’t look like you do, or worship the way you do, or don’t get their news from the same sources you do. We must end this uncivil war that pits red against blue, rural versus urban, conservative versus liberal. We can do this if we open our souls instead of hardening our hearts. If we show a little tolerance and humility. If we’re willing to stand in the other person’s*

---

<sup>111</sup> Saint Augustine, a prominent theologian and philosopher of the late Roman Empire, proposed a concept of a people defined by shared values within his works. This concept revolves around the idea that a community or society is bound together not only by common interests or geographical proximity but also by a shared set of moral and ethical principles. According to Saint Augustine, a community characterized by shared values is more than just a collection of individuals living in proximity to one another. Instead, it is a cohesive unit whose members are united by a common understanding of what is good, just, and virtuous. These shared values serve as the foundation for social cohesion, cooperation, and collective action.

*shoes just for a moment. Because here is the thing about life: There is no accounting for what fate will deal you. There are some days when we need a hand. There are other days when we're called on to lend one. That is how we must be with one another. And, if we are this way, our country will be stronger, more prosperous, more ready for the future. My fellow Americans, in the work ahead of us, we will need each other. We will need all our strength to persevere through this dark winter. We are entering what may well be the toughest and deadliest period of the virus. We must set aside the politics and finally face this pandemic as one nation. I promise you this: as the Bible says weeping may endure for a night but joy cometh in the morning. We will get through this, together The world is watching today. So here is my message to those beyond our borders: America has been tested and we have come out stronger for it. We will repair our alliances and engage with the world once again. Not to meet yesterday's challenges, but today's and tomorrow's. We will lead not merely by the example of our power but by the power of our example. We will be a strong and trusted partner for peace, progress, and security. We have been through so much in this nation. And, in my first act as President, I would like to ask you to join me in a moment of silent prayer to remember all those we lost this past year to the pandemic. To those 400,000 fellow Americans – mothers and fathers, husbands and wives, sons and daughters, friends, neighbors, and co-workers. We will honor them by becoming the people and nation we know we can and should be. Let us say a silent prayer for those who lost their lives, for those they left behind, and for our country. Amen. This is a time of testing. We face an attack on democracy and on truth. A raging virus. Growing inequity. The sting of systemic racism. A climate in crisis. America's role in the world. Any one of these would be enough to challenge us in profound ways. But the fact is we face them all at once, presenting this nation with the gravest of responsibilities. Now we must step up. All of us. It is a time for boldness, for there is so much to do. And, this is certain. We will be judged, you and I, for how we resolve the cascading crises of our era. Will we rise to the occasion? Will we master this rare and difficult hour? Will we meet our obligations and pass along a new and better world for our children? I believe we must and I believe we will. And when we do, we will write the next chapter in the American story. It's a story that might sound something like a song that means a lot to me. It's called "American Anthem" and there is one verse stands out for me:*

*"The work and prayers  
of centuries have brought us to this day  
What shall be our legacy?  
What will our children say? ...  
Let me know in my heart  
When my days are through*



*America*

*America*

*I gave my best to you.”*

*Let us add our own work and prayers to the unfolding story of our nation. If we do this then when our days are through our children and our children’s children will say of us they gave their best. They did their duty. They healed a broken land My fellow Americans, I close today where I began, with a sacred oath. Before God and all of you I give you my word. I will always level with you. I will defend the Constitution. I will defend our democracy. I will defend America. I will give my all in your service thinking not of power, but of possibilities. Not of personal interest, but of the public good. And together, we shall write an American story of hope, not fear. Of unity, not division. Of light, not darkness. An American story of decency and dignity. Of love and of healing. Of greatness and of goodness. May this be the story that guides us. The story that inspires us. The story that tells ages yet to come that we answered the call of history. We met the moment. That democracy and hope, truth and justice, did not die on our watch but thrived. That our America secured liberty at home and stood once again as a beacon to the world. That is what we owe our forebearers, one another, and generations to follow. So, with purpose and resolve we turn to the tasks of our time. Sustained by faith. Driven by conviction. And, devoted to one another and to this country we love with all our hearts. May God bless America and may God protect our troops. Thank you, America.”*

Biden acknowledges the concerns of the American people, including worries about jobs, family, and the future. He emphasizes the importance of unity and cooperation in facing challenges such as political division, the pandemic, systemic racism, and climate change. The President pledges to lead with transparency, defend democratic values, and work for the common good. He invokes religious and patriotic imagery to inspire hope, resilience, and collective action, he then proceeds to employ empathetic language to connect with his audience, acknowledging their fears and struggles. He uses rhetorical questions and appeals to shared values such as unity, duty, and hope to engage the audience emotionally and morally. The President employs vivid imagery using "dark winter," "broken land," and "unfolding story" to evoke a sense of urgency and purpose. Furthermore, Biden's use of repetition with "America," "democracy and hope, truth and justice" reinforces key themes and underscores their significance. He’s rhetoric contrasts with the divisive and confrontational tone of recent political discourse, offering a message of unity, resilience, and moral clarity. One of the central themes of President Biden's inaugural address is the celebration and triumph of democracy. He emphasizes that the election was not merely about the victory of a candidate but about the enduring principles of democratic governance. Biden though, underscores the fragility of democracy, reminding Americans of its precious nature and the need to protect and preserve it for future generations. This theme reflects

a broader concern about the erosion of democratic norms and the importance of upholding the democratic process. He contrasts the challenges facing the nation with its capacity for renewal and collective action, framing adversity as an opportunity for growth and transformation. The President's inclusive language and emphasis on shared values stand in contrast to the polarizing rhetoric of his predecessor, signaling a departure from partisan brinkmanship and a return to inclusive governance. The President's address comes at a pivotal moment in American history, marked by political turmoil, social unrest, and public health crises. The rhetoric reflects Biden's broader agenda of national healing, reconciliation, and renewal, seeking to bridge divides and restore confidence in democratic institutions. The invocation of religious and patriotic symbols resonates with the values and traditions of American civic culture, reinforcing themes of resilience, perseverance, and collective purpose. Throughout his address, President Biden issues a call to action, urging Americans to work together to overcome challenges and secure the future of the nation. He emphasizes the importance of concrete actions and collective efforts in building a more inclusive and prosperous society. President Biden's tone in the inaugural address is one of solemnity, reflection, and hope. He speaks with a sense of gravity and purpose, acknowledging the weight of the challenges facing the nation while expressing optimism about the future. The tone is measured and inclusive, seeking to unify rather than divide. Biden's rhetoric is characterized by its simplicity, clarity, and accessibility. He employs straightforward language to convey complex ideas and themes, making his message relatable to a broad audience. The use of historical references and anecdotes adds depth and resonance to his words, emphasizing the enduring values of American democracy. Furthermore, President Biden consistently emphasizes the importance of unity and healing in a deeply divided nation. He acknowledges the deep ideological and political divisions that have characterized American society in recent years and calls for Americans to come together across partisan lines to address common challenges. Biden's call for unity reflects his campaign message of reconciliation and his belief in the power of collective action to overcome adversity. Throughout his address, President Biden draws on historical references and anecdotes to underscore the continuity of American democracy and the resilience of the American spirit. By invoking figures such as Abraham Lincoln and referencing historical events like the Emancipation Proclamation, Biden seeks to connect the present moment to the broader arc of American history. These references serve to remind Americans of their shared heritage and the values that have defined the nation throughout its history. In conclusion, President Biden's inaugural address represents a clarion call for unity, healing, and collective action in the face of unprecedented challenges. By emphasizing the importance of democracy, unity, and shared purpose, Biden seeks to inspire hope and rally support for his vision of a more inclusive and prosperous America. As the nation embarks on a new chapter in its history, President Biden's inaugural address serves as a guiding

light, reminding Americans of the enduring values that have defined the nation for generations. Through his words, he seeks to inspire hope, rally support, and chart a path forward toward a more inclusive and prosperous future for all Americans.

### *3.2.2 The Withdrawal from Afghanistan Speech*

In deconstructing the discourse surrounding President Biden's withdrawal from Afghanistan, it is imperative to navigate the multifaceted landscape that contributed to this historic decision. The genesis of this narrative lies in the prolonged military engagement that characterized the United States' presence in Afghanistan for two decades<sup>112</sup>. The backdrop involves intricate geopolitical dynamics, shifting global priorities, and a reassessment of the role of the U.S. in the world. To understand the importance of President Biden's announcement and its far-reaching consequences, we must delve into the contextual factors that shaped this pivotal moment. The United States' involvement in Afghanistan can be traced back to the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. The decision to deploy troops aimed to dismantle terrorist networks, primarily Al-Qaeda<sup>113</sup>, and prevent the resurgence of Taliban rule. Over the years, the mission evolved, encompassing nation-building objectives, counterinsurgency efforts, and complex geopolitical considerations. As the conflict persisted, the human and financial toll on the U.S. escalated, prompting a reassessment of the strategic calculus. In analysing President Biden's discourse, it is crucial to examine the rhetorical strategies employed to convey the essence of this decision. The President's address marks a departure from the hawkish rhetoric of previous administrations. The tone is somber, reflecting the weight of the decision to end America's longest war. Through carefully chosen words and phrases, Biden communicates a commitment to bring closure to a chapter marked by sacrifice, challenges, and, at times, controversy. President Biden announced the decision to withdraw U.S. troops from Afghanistan on April 14, 2021. This announcement was part of his plan to complete the withdrawal by September 11, 2021, marking the 20th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks that initially led to U.S. involvement in Afghanistan. Biden's discourse begins with a acknowledgment of the historical context, recognizing the prolonged nature of the conflict and the sacrifices made by American troops. The president emphasizes the evolving nature of the mission, from its inception in response to 9/11 to the contemporary imperative of

---

<sup>112</sup> The United States' military operations in Afghanistan began on October 7, 2001, in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia. These attacks, carried out by the Islamist extremist group al-Qaeda, resulted in the deaths of nearly 3,000 people.

<sup>113</sup> Al-Qaeda is a militant Islamist extremist organization founded by Osama bin Laden, Abdullah Azzam, and others in the late 1980s. The name "Al-Qaeda" translates to "The Base" in Arabic. Initially established to support the Afghan Mujahideen resistance against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s, Al-Qaeda later evolved into a global terrorist network with the goal of establishing a transnational Islamic caliphate governed by Sharia law.

ensuring the safety of Americans and ending an era of perpetual war. The speech encapsulates a commitment to a more restrained and strategic foreign policy approach. Biden deploys rhetorical devices to underscore the significance of the withdrawal. The repetition of phrases such as "ending an era of major military operations" and "*bringing our troops home*" serves as an anaphoric device, driving home the central theme of disengagement. The president also utilizes antithesis, highlighting the shift from a wartime posture to a more diplomatic and focused strategy. The rhetoric is pragmatic, emphasizing the need to prioritize resources and attention on pressing domestic challenges. In comparing Biden's discourse on the Afghanistan withdrawal to previous presidential addresses, a departure from the interventionist language of the past is evident. Unlike speeches that emphasized the need for a sustained military presence, Biden's address signals a recalibration of priorities, aligning with a growing consensus that the costs of prolonged engagement outweigh the benefits. The decision to withdraw from Afghanistan must be understood within the broader context of evolving global dynamics. The rise of new geopolitical challenges, the emergence of non-state actors, and the shifting focus towards great power competition contributed to a reassessment of the U.S. role in the Middle East. Additionally, the domestic context, with a growing call for resource reallocation to address pressing issues like the pandemic and economic recovery, played a pivotal role in shaping this policy shift. This analysis provides insights into the thematic focus of the address and the president's strategic priorities. Examining the distribution of positive and negative sentiment throughout the speech could reveal the emotional tone and rhetorical strategies employed to convey the gravity of the decision. President Biden's discourse on the withdrawal from Afghanistan marks a significant shift in U.S. foreign policy. The analysis of this address reveals a nuanced and strategic approach, emphasizing the need to conclude a prolonged military engagement while acknowledging the complexities of the region. The decision carries implications for America's global standing, its approach to future conflicts, and the prioritization of resources. As the nation grapples with the aftermath of this historic decision, the discourse serves as a critical artifact in understanding the trajectory of U.S. foreign policy in the 21st century. The president first laid the path for the way forward in Afghanistan in an address to the nation and noted that only the citizens of Afghanistan have the right and responsibility to lead their country. "*After consulting closely with our allies and partners, with our military leaders and intelligence personnel, with our diplomats and our development experts, with the Congress and the vice president, as well as with [Afghan President Ashraf Ghani]<sup>114</sup> and many others around the world, I concluded that it's time to end America's longest war. It's time for American troops to come home,*" the president said. In this excerpt, President

---

<sup>114</sup> President Ghani refers to Ashraf Ghani, who served as the President of Afghanistan from September 29, 2014, until his resignation on August 15, 2021.

Biden emphasizes the extensive consultation process he underwent before making the decision to withdraw U.S. troops from Afghanistan. He highlights key stakeholders involved in the decision-making process, including allies, military leaders, intelligence personnel, diplomats, development experts, Congress, the vice president, and Afghan President Ashraf Ghani. By acknowledging these consultations, Biden aims to convey the thoroughness and deliberation behind his decision, emphasizing the importance of considering diverse perspectives and expert opinions. Biden's use of inclusive language, such as "*our allies and partners*," "*our military leaders and intelligence personnel*," and "*our diplomats and our development experts*," serves to emphasize collective decision-making and shared responsibility. By incorporating various stakeholders, Biden underscores the collaborative nature of the decision-making process. By mentioning specific groups and individuals consulted, Biden asserts his authority as president and underscores his commitment to informed decision-making. The repetition of "*with*" before each group or individual highlights the breadth of consultation undertaken, reinforcing the thoroughness of the decision-making process. Compared to previous presidential administrations, Biden's rhetoric reflects a departure from unilateral decision-making and emphasizes a more collaborative and consultative approach. Unlike some past administrations that may have been criticized for making decisions without adequate consultation, Biden's approach aims to foster transparency, inclusivity, and collective ownership of the decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan. Biden's emphasis on consultation and inclusivity reflects broader trends in contemporary governance, where leaders seek to engage stakeholders in decision-making processes to enhance legitimacy and effectiveness. The decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan comes after years of debate and evolving public sentiment regarding the U.S. military presence in the region. Biden's rhetoric acknowledges the complexity of the issue and the need for a comprehensive, multilateral approach to address it. "*The United States met its objective 10 years ago with the assassination of Taliban leader Osama bin Laden*", he said, adding since then, "*Our reasons for staying have become increasingly unclear.*" Over the past 20 years, "*the terrorist threat has become more dispersed, metastasizing around the globe: al-Shabab in Somalia, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, ISIS attempting to create a caliphate in Syria and Iraq and establishing affiliates in multiple countries in Africa and Asia*," he said of the terrorism threat. "*With the terror threat now in many places, keeping thousands of troops grounded and concentrated in just one country and across the billions [of dollars spent] each year makes little sense to me and to our leaders*," Biden said. "*We cannot continue the cycle of extending or expanding our military presence in Afghanistan — hoping to create ideal conditions for the withdrawal and expecting a different result.*" Biden asserts that the primary objective of the U.S. in Afghanistan, the assassination of Osama

bin Laden<sup>115</sup>, was accomplished a decade ago. By stating this, he implies that the original purpose of the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan has been fulfilled. The statement acknowledges the evolution of the terrorist threat over the past 20 years. Biden highlights the spread of terrorism to various regions globally, citing examples such as al-Shabab in Somalia, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, and ISIS in Syria, Iraq, Africa, and Asia. The President argues that the continued presence of thousands of troops in Afghanistan, along with the associated financial costs, is no longer justified. He suggests that maintaining troops in one country does not effectively address the dispersed nature of the terrorist threat. Biden presents a logical argument by pointing out the achievement of the primary objective and the evolving nature of the terrorist threat. He questions the effectiveness of the current strategy by emphasizing the futility of expecting different results from past approaches. While the language used is mostly factual and logical, there is an underlying tone of pragmatism and realism. Biden's assertion that "*keeping thousands of troops grounded*" makes "*little sense*" conveys a sense of practicality and urgency. Biden's rhetoric represents a departure from previous administrations' justifications for maintaining a military presence in Afghanistan. Unlike previous arguments centered around nation-building and stabilization efforts, Biden's rationale focuses on achieving specific objectives and adapting to the changing nature of the terrorist threat. The decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan occurs amidst shifting global priorities and changing dynamics in U.S. foreign policy. Biden's statement reflects a broader trend towards reevaluating America's military engagements abroad and prioritizing resources and attention on emerging challenges such as great power competition and non-state threats. As the fourth U.S. president with the Afghanistan war on his watch, Biden said he would not pass the longest war in American history on to another president. He noted that he inherited the drawdown deadline of this year and he intends to keep the U.S. agreement with the Taliban, which was formulated during the former administration. But the United States will withdraw its troops in a safe, deliberate and responsible manner and in full coordination with its partners and allies in Afghanistan, the president said. Diplomacy and counter-terrorism mechanisms will be reorganized to hold the Taliban accountable, Biden said. Meeting critics of the drawdown head-on, the commander in chief said the withdrawal will not hurt the country's reputation. The United States will be more formidable if it focuses on future challenges, and not those in the past, he said. "*Our diplomacy does not hinge on having boots in harm's way — U.S. boots on the ground. We have to change that thinking. American troops shouldn't be used as a bargaining chip between warring parties in other countries. You know, that's nothing more than a recipe for keeping American*

---

<sup>115</sup> Osama bin Laden was a prominent figure in global terrorism and the founder of the militant Islamist organization known as al-Qaeda. Born in Saudi Arabia in 1957, bin Laden came from a wealthy and influential family. He became involved in jihadist activities during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s, where he supported Afghan fighters resisting Soviet forces.

*troops in Afghanistan indefinitely.*” Biden emphasizes the distinction between diplomacy and military presence, suggesting that effective diplomacy does not depend on having U.S. troops deployed in harm's way. He asserts that American troops should not be used as bargaining chips between warring parties in other countries. This implies that the use of troops in this manner is not aligned with U.S. interests or values. In order to avoid indefinite military engagement, Biden argues against keeping American troops in Afghanistan indefinitely, suggesting that using them as bargaining chips would perpetuate their presence without clear strategic objectives. Biden's statement appeals to logic and morality by suggesting that using troops as bargaining chips is neither strategically sound nor morally justifiable. The language used is clear and assertive, leaving little room for ambiguity. By framing the use of troops as a bargaining chip as detrimental to U.S. interests, Biden strengthens his argument for withdrawing troops from Afghanistan. Biden's rhetoric represents a departure from previous administrations' approaches to military engagement. By rejecting the notion of using troops as bargaining chips, he signals a shift towards a more diplomatic and principled foreign policy stance. Later in July, President Biden made some remarks on the status of the United States's withdrawal from Afghanistan in the East Room of the White House:

*“Good afternoon. Earlier today, I was briefed by our senior military and national security leaders on the status of the drawdown of U.S. forces and allied forces in Afghanistan. When I announced our drawdown in April, I said we would be out by September, and we're on track to meet that target. Our military mission in Afghanistan will conclude on August 31st. The drawdown is proceeding in a secure and orderly way, prioritizing the safety of our troops as they depart. Our military commanders advised me that once I made the decision to end the war, we needed to move swiftly to conduct the main elements of the drawdown. And in this context, speed is safety. And thanks to the way in which we have managed our withdrawal, no one — no one U.S. forces or any forces have — have been lost. Conducting our drawdown differently would have certainly come with a increased risk of safety to our personnel.”* Biden announces the conclusion of the military mission in Afghanistan, emphasizing the timeline and the target date of August 31st. He highlights the importance of safety and orderly withdrawal, prioritizing the well-being of U.S. troops as they depart from Afghanistan, and he justifies the decision for a swift withdrawal, citing advice from military commanders and emphasizing that speed is crucial for safety. Biden's language is always clear and direct, providing a straightforward update on the status of the drawdown without ambiguity. He appeals to the importance of safety for U.S. personnel, emphasizing that the management of the withdrawal prioritizes the security of troops. Biden's approach contrasts with previous administrations' handling of military withdrawals, emphasizing the importance of safety and orderly process over extended engagements or abrupt exits. *“To me, those risks were unacceptable. And*

*there was never any doubt that our military would perform this task efficiently and with the highest level of professionalism. That's what they do. And the same is true of our NATO Allies and partners who have supported — we are supporting, and supporting us as well, as they conclude their retrograde. I want to be clear: The U.S. military mission in Afghanistan continues through the end of August. We remain — we retain personnel and capacities in the country, and we maintain some authority — excuse me, the same authority under which we've been operating for some time. As I said in April, the United States did what we went to do in Afghanistan: to get the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 and to deliver justice to Osama Bin Laden, and to degrade the terrorist threat to keep Afghanistan from becoming a base from which attacks could be continued against the United States. We achieved those objectives. That's why we went. We did not go to Afghanistan to nation-build. And it's the right and the responsibility of the Afghan people alone to decide their future and how they want to run their country. Together, with our NATO Allies and partners, we have trained and equipped over three hu- — nearly 300,000 current serving members of the military — of the Afghan National Security Force, and many beyond that who are no longer serving. Add to that, hundreds of thousands more Afghan National Defense and Security Forces trained over the last two decades. We provided our Afghan partners with all the tools — let me emphasize: all the tools, training, and equipment of any modern military. We provided advanced weaponry. And we're going to continue to provide funding and equipment. And we'll ensure they have the capacity to maintain their air force. But most critically, as I stressed in my meeting just two weeks ago with President Ghani and Chairman Abdullah, Afghan leaders have to come together and drive toward a future that the Afghan people want and they deserve.”* Biden articulates his belief that the risks associated with the continued presence of U.S. troops in Afghanistan were deemed unacceptable. This reflects a strategic reassessment of the costs and benefits of prolonged military engagement in the region. He lauds the efficiency, professionalism, and sacrifice of the U.S. military and NATO Allies throughout the withdrawal process. This acknowledgment underscores the collaborative effort and solidarity among allied nations during a critical transitional period. Biden reaffirms that the U.S. military mission in Afghanistan will persist until the end of August. This statement serves to clarify the timeline and operational parameters surrounding the withdrawal, instilling a sense of clarity and purpose amidst the transition. The President asserts that the core objectives of the U.S. mission in Afghanistan, including the capture of terrorists and prevention of future attacks on U.S. soil, have been successfully accomplished. This narrative frames the withdrawal as a culmination of strategic goals rather than a retreat from responsibilities. Biden emphasizes the principle of Afghan sovereignty and self-determination, rejecting the notion of external intervention and nation-building. This stance underscores a broader shift towards a more diplomatic and non-interventionist foreign policy



approach. President Biden employs rhetorical devices to reinforce his message: By highlighting the efficiency and professionalism of the military, Biden appeals to quintessential American values of duty, honor, and service. This rhetorical strategy aims to evoke a sense of national pride and unity in the face of a complex geopolitical challenge. Biden's emphasis on Afghan autonomy resonates with principles of self-determination and respect for international sovereignty. This rhetorical choice reflects a commitment to multilateralism and diplomatic engagement in resolving global conflicts. Biden's discourse contrasts the achievements of the U.S. mission in Afghanistan with the broader concept of nation-building. By framing the withdrawal as a fulfillment of primary objectives rather than a failure of interventionist policies, Biden seeks to reframe the narrative surrounding America's role in the region. *“In our meeting, I also assured Ghani that U.S. support for the people of Afghanistan will endure. We will continue to provide civilian and humanitarian assistance, including speaking out for the rights of women and girls. I intend to maintain our diplomatic presence [presence] in Afghanistan, and we are coordinating closely with our international partners in order to continue to secure the international airport. And we’re going to engage in a determined diplomacy to pursue peace and a peace agreement that will end this senseless violence. I’ve asked Secretary of State Blinken and our Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation to work vigorously with the parties in Afghanistan, as well as the regional and international stakeholders to support a negotiated solution. To be clear — to be clear: Countries in the region have an essential role to play in supporting a peaceful settlement. We’ll work with them, and they should help step up their efforts as well. We’re going to continue to work for the release of detained Americans, including Mark — excuse me — Fre- Frerichs — I want to pronounce the name correctly; I mis- — I misspoke — so that he can return to his family safely. We’re also going to continue to make sure that we take on the Afghan nationals who work side-by-side with U.S. forces, including interpreters and translators — since we’re no longer going to have military there after this; we’re not going to need them and they have no jobs — who are also going to be vital to our efforts so they — and they’ve been very vital — and so their families are not exposed to danger as well. We’ve already dramatically accelerated the procedure time for Special Immigrant Visas to bring them to the United States. Since I was inaugurated on January 20th, we’ve already approved 2,500 Special Immigrant Visas to come to the United States. Up to now, fewer than half have exercised their right to do that. Half have gotten on aircraft and com — commercial flights and come, and the other half believe they want to stay — at least thus far. We’re working closely with Congress to change the authorization legislation so that we can streamline the process of approving those visas. And those who have stood up for the operation to physically relocate thousands of Afghans and their families before the U.S. military mission concludes so that, if they choose, they can wait safely outside of Afghanistan while their U.S.*

*visas are being processed. The operation has identified U.S. facilities outside of the continental United States, as well as in third countries, to host our Afghan allies, if they ch- — if they so choose. And, starting this month, we're going to begin to re- — re- — reloc- — we're going to begin relocation flights for Afghanistan SIV applicants and their families who choose to leave. We have a point person in the White House and at the State Department-led task force coordinating all these efforts.*” Biden emphasizes enduring U.S. support for the people of Afghanistan, highlighting continued assistance in humanitarian and civilian domains. This reflects a commitment to uphold principles of human rights and stability in the region. The President expresses a commitment to maintaining diplomatic presence in Afghanistan and engaging in determined diplomacy to pursue peace. This underscores a shift towards diplomatic solutions and multilateral engagement in resolving conflicts. He underscores the importance of protecting Afghan nationals who worked alongside U.S. forces, ensuring their safety and facilitating their relocation to the United States. This reflects a sense of moral responsibility towards individuals who supported U.S. military efforts. Biden's rhetoric emphasizes the importance of diplomatic solutions and international cooperation in achieving peace in Afghanistan. The use of phrases like *"determined diplomacy"* and *"negotiated solution"* underscores a diplomatic approach to conflict resolution. The President's language reflects a sense of moral obligation toward vulnerable populations in Afghanistan, particularly interpreters and translators who assisted U.S. forces. The use of phrases like *"ensure their families are not exposed to danger"* appeals to humanitarian values and empathy.

Biden's rhetoric contrasts with previous militaristic approaches to foreign policy, highlighting a shift towards diplomacy, humanitarian assistance, and international collaboration. This reflects a departure from unilateral military interventions towards multilateral engagement and conflict resolution. The discourse is situated within the broader context of the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan and the transition towards diplomatic solutions. Biden's rhetoric reflects an acknowledgement of the complex humanitarian and security challenges facing Afghanistan and underscores the importance of sustained international support and engagement.

*“But our message to those women and men is clear: There is a home for you in the United States if you so choose, and we will stand with you just as you stood with us. When I made the decision to end the U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan, I judged that it was not in the national interest of the United States of America to continue fighting this war indefinitely. I made the decision with clear eyes, and I am briefed daily on the battlefield updates. But for those who have argued that we should stay just six more months or just one more year, I ask them to consider the lessons of recent history. In 2011, the NATO Allies and partners agreed that we would end our combat mission in 2014. In 2014, some argued, “One more year.” So we kept fighting, and we kept taking casualties. In 2015,*

*the same. And on and on. Nearly 20 years of experience has shown us that the current security situation only confirms that “just one more year” of fighting in Afghanistan is not a solution but a recipe for being there indefinitely. It’s up to Afghans to make the decision about the future of their country. Others are more direct. Their argument is that we should stay with the Afghan — in Afghanistan indefinitely. In doing so, they point to the fact that we — we have not taken losses in this last year, so they claim that the cost of just maintaining the status quo is minimal. But that ignores the reality and the facts that already presented on the ground in Afghanistan when I took office: The Taliban was at its strongest militarily since 2001. The number of U.S. forces in Afghanistan had been reduced to a bare minimum. And the United States, in the last administration, made an agreement that the — with the Taliban to remove all our forces by May 1 of this past — of this year. That’s what I inherited. That agreement was the reason the Taliban had ceased major attacks against U.S. forces. If, in April, I had instead announced that the United States was going to back — going back on that agreement made by the last administration — [that] the United States and allied forces would remain in Afghanistan for the foreseeable future — the Taliban would have again begun to target our forces. The status quo was not an option. Staying would have meant U.S. troops taking casualties; American men and women back in the middle of a civil war. And we would have run the risk of having to send more troops back into Afghanistan to defend our remaining troops. Once that agreement with the Taliban had been made, staying with a bare minimum force was no longer possible. So let me ask those who wanted us to stay: How many more — how many thousands more of America’s daughters and sons are you willing to risk? How long would you have them stay? Already we have members of our military whose parents fought in Afghanistan 20 years ago. Would you send their children and their grandchildren as well? Would you send your own son or daughter? After 20 years — a trillion dollars spent training and equipping hundreds of thousands of Afghan National Security and Defense Forces, 2,448 Americans killed, 20,722 more wounded, and untold thousands coming home with unseen trauma to their mental health — I will not send another generation of Americans to war in Afghanistan with no reasonable expectation of achieving a different outcome. The United States cannot afford to remain tethered to policies creating a response to a world as it was 20 years ago. We need to meet the threats where they are today. Today, the terrorist threat has metastasized beyond Afghanistan. So, we are repositioning our resources and adapting our counterterrorism posture to meet the threats where they are now significantly higher: in South Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. But make no mistake: Our military and intelligence leaders are confident they have the capabilities to protect the homeland and our interests from any resurgent terrorist challenge emerging or emanating from Afghanistan. We are developing a counterterrorism over-the-horizon capability that will allow us to keep our eyes firmly*

*fixed on any direct threats to the United States in the region, and act quickly and decisively if needed. And we also need to focus on shoring up America's core strengths to meet the strategic competition with China and other nations that is really going to determine — determine our future. We have to defeat COVID-19 at home and around the world, make sure we're better prepared for the next pandemic or biological threat. We need to establish international norms for cyberspace and the use of emergenc- — emerging technologies. We need to take concerted action to fight existential threats of climate change. And we will be more formidable to our adversaries and competitors over the long run if we fight the battles of the next 20 years, not the last 20 years. Finally, I want to recognize the incredible sacrifice and dedication that the U.S. military and civilian personnel, serving alongside our Allies and partners, have made over the last two decades in Afghanistan. I want to honor the significance of what they've accomplished and the great personal risk they encountered and the incredible cost to their families: pursuing the terrorist threat in some of the most unforgiving terrain on the planet — and I've been almost throughout that entire country; ensuring there hasn't been another attack on the homeland from Afghanistan for the last 20 years; taking out Bin Laden. I want to thank you all for your service and the dedication to the mission so many of you have given, and to the sacrifices that you and your families have made over the long course of this war. We'll never forget those who gave the last full measure of devotion for their country in Afghanistan, nor those whose lives have been immeasurably altered by wounds sustained in service to their country. We're ending America's longest war, but we'll always, always honor the bravery of the American patriots who served in it. May God bless you all, and may God protect our troops. Thank you."* President Biden begins by extending a clear message to Afghan allies, assuring them of a home in the United States and pledging continued support. This highlights the moral obligation to those who stood by the U.S. military during the conflict. Throughout the discourse, Biden articulates a compelling rationale for ending U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan. He emphasizes the unsustainable nature of prolonged conflict and redirects attention to pressing domestic and global challenges. Biden strategically employs historical examples, particularly instances of extending military missions beyond agreed timelines, to caution against perpetuating the cycle of "*just one more year*" in Afghanistan. This rhetorical device underscores the need to learn from past mistakes and chart a new course forward. The President directly challenges proponents of continued military presence in Afghanistan by posing thought-provoking questions about the human cost of prolonged conflict and the feasibility of achieving different outcomes. This rhetorical strategy aims to stimulate reflection and debate among stakeholders Biden's rhetoric draws a sharp contrast between the consequences of maintaining the status quo in Afghanistan and the imperative of adapting U.S. policies to address evolving threats and strategic priorities. By juxtaposing the sacrifices of the past with the necessity

of focusing on future challenges, he underscores the urgency of strategic recalibration. The discourse unfolds within the broader context of shifting global dynamics and America's evolving role in the world. Biden's rhetoric reflects a pragmatic assessment of national interests, security imperatives, and the changing nature of geopolitical threats. The decision to withdraw from Afghanistan is framed as part of a broader strategic realignment aimed at safeguarding American interests and promoting stability in the region. President Biden's recent address on the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan marks a pivotal moment in American foreign policy. His discourse reflects a comprehensive assessment of the historical context, strategic imperatives, and moral considerations surrounding the decision to end America's longest war. President Biden's rhetoric on ending the U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan exemplifies a nuanced and strategic approach to foreign policy. Through a thorough examination of content, rhetorical strategies, comparative insights, contextual considerations, and quantitative data, we gain a comprehensive understanding of the complexities and imperatives driving this historic decision. President Biden employs a clear and direct communication style throughout the discourse, providing a straightforward update on the status of the drawdown without ambiguity. This approach contributes to the overall transparency of the decision-making process, allowing the audience to grasp the key points without convolution. The President consistently emphasizes the importance of safety in the withdrawal process, underscoring that the orderly drawdown prioritizes the security of U.S. troops. This messaging aims to reassure the public and stakeholders that the administration is committed to minimizing risks to military personnel during the withdrawal. Biden strategically justifies the decision to end the military involvement in Afghanistan by referencing historical examples of prolonged conflicts and emphasizing the need to learn from past experiences. By framing the withdrawal within a historical context, he seeks to rationalize the departure from extended military engagements, presenting it as a well-considered decision. The President acknowledges the efficiency, professionalism, and sacrifices of the U.S. military and NATO Allies throughout the withdrawal process. This acknowledgment reinforces the collaborative effort and solidarity among allied nations during a critical transitional period. Biden communicates a narrative that the core objectives of the U.S. mission in Afghanistan have been successfully accomplished, framing the withdrawal as a culmination of strategic goals. The emphasis on Afghan sovereignty and self-determination signals a departure from interventionist policies and a commitment to a diplomatic approach. The President articulates a commitment to diplomatic solutions and international cooperation in achieving peace in Afghanistan. This reflects a shift towards a more diplomatic and non-interventionist foreign policy approach, emphasizing the importance of collaborative efforts to resolve conflicts. Biden expresses a commitment to humanitarian assistance, particularly in supporting vulnerable populations such as interpreters and

translators who assisted U.S. forces. This humanitarian focus aligns with a broader shift towards diplomacy, assistance, and international collaboration rather than a purely militaristic approach. The discourse concludes with a forward-looking perspective, emphasizing the need for the U.S. to adapt to current global challenges and strategic competition.

Biden underscores the importance of repositioning resources to address evolving threats in regions like South Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, signaling a broader strategic realignment. President Biden concludes by expressing gratitude and recognition for the sacrifices made by the U.S. military and civilian personnel over the past two decades in Afghanistan. This acknowledgment honors the dedication and significance of their accomplishments, providing a sense of closure to the longest war in American history. In summary, President Biden's rhetoric reflects a carefully crafted narrative that combines strategic justification, historical context, and a forward-looking perspective. The emphasis on safety, diplomacy, humanitarian support, and strategic realignment shapes the discourse as a key artifact in defining the trajectory of American foreign policy in the 21st century.

### *3.3 Main Themes, Patterns and Recurring Topics*

In analysing President Biden's inaugural address and his speech on the withdrawal from Afghanistan, several key themes emerge, reflecting both the challenges and aspirations shaping his presidency. The first one is “*Unity and Healing*”, throughout both speeches, President Biden emphasizes the imperative of unity and healing, calling for a renewed sense of national purpose and solidarity. In his inaugural address, he underscores the need to bridge partisan divides and confront the forces of polarization that have threatened the fabric of American democracy. Similarly, in his speech on the Afghanistan withdrawal, Biden highlights the importance of solidarity among allies and the need for reconciliation in the aftermath of conflict. On the Foreign Policy and Diplomacy front, they feature prominently in both transcripts, reflecting Biden's commitment to multilateral engagement and diplomatic solutions to global challenges. He emphasizes the significance of international cooperation in addressing shared threats and advancing common interests. Moreover, Biden's decision to withdraw from Afghanistan underscores a strategic realignment in U.S. foreign policy, prioritizing diplomatic engagement over prolonged military intervention. When it comes to Humanitarianism and Human Rights President Biden's discourse emphasizes humanitarian concerns and human rights as foundational principles guiding American leadership on the world stage. He reaffirms the United States' commitment to upholding human rights, supporting vulnerable populations, and addressing humanitarian crises, particularly in conflict-affected regions like Afghanistan. On the National Security and Defense front, the theme of national security and defense looms large in the discourse

on the Afghanistan withdrawal, as President Biden navigates the complexities of transitioning U.S. military involvement in the region. He articulates a strategic rationale for the withdrawal, emphasizing the safety of U.S. troops and the need to adapt defense strategies to evolving threats. Biden's speeches frequently reference historical context and lessons learned from past conflicts, highlighting the consequences of prolonged military engagements and the imperative of adapting policies to address emerging threats. By drawing upon historical analogies and experiences, Biden seeks to inform present decisions and shape future strategies. In terms of rhetorical style and tone of voice, President Biden adopts a pragmatic and diplomatic approach characterized by clarity, authenticity, and empathy. His speeches are marked by straightforward language and concise messaging, aimed at enhancing transparency and accessibility for diverse audiences. Moreover, Biden's tone conveys a sense of optimism and resolve, even in the face of complex challenges and historical legacies. In conclusion, President Biden's inaugural address and speech on the Afghanistan withdrawal reflect a coherent vision for America's role in the world—one grounded in unity, diplomacy, and a commitment to core values. As he navigates the complexities of domestic and international affairs, Biden's leadership style emphasizes the importance of unity, diplomacy, and progress in addressing shared challenges and advancing global stability and prosperity.

## *Chapter IV*

### *A Comparative Analysis – Trump vs. Biden*

#### *4.1 Shared Themes and Diverging Priorities*

In the final chapter of this thesis, we embark on a journey to dissect and analyse the framing of national and international security issues by two key figures in American politics: Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr. Through their speeches, both presidents articulated their security-related policies and priorities, employing a variety of rhetorical strategies to convey their messages to the American public and the international community. The first research question we were interested in answering was how Trump and Biden framed national and international security issues in their speeches. Throughout their respective presidencies, both leaders addressed a myriad of security challenges, ranging from terrorism and military engagements to cybersecurity and global health crises. Trump often adopted a confrontational and nationalist tone, emphasizing themes of strength, sovereignty, and America-first policies. On the other hand, Biden's rhetoric reflected a more diplomatic and collaborative approach, emphasizing multilateralism, alliances, and global cooperation in addressing security threats. The following question delves into the rhetorical strategies employed by Trump and Biden to convey their security-related policies and priorities. Trump's speeches were characterized by direct language, hyperbole, and repetition, often employing slogans and catchphrases to appeal to his base and project strength. He utilized simple and assertive language to communicate his security agenda, often employing fear-based tactics to rally support for his policies. Conversely, Biden's rhetoric was marked by empathy, inclusivity, and a focus on diplomacy. He employed a more nuanced and measured approach, using evidence-based arguments, appeals to shared values, and calls for unity to convey his vision for security. Finally, we explore the key rhetorical differences and similarities in the national and international security narratives presented by Trump and Biden. While both presidents prioritized the safety and security of the American people, their approaches diverged significantly in terms of tone, style, and policy emphasis. Trump's rhetoric often focused on border security, military strength, and unilateral action, whereas Biden's speeches emphasized diplomacy, alliances, and multilateral engagement. Despite these differences, both leaders shared a commitment to protecting national interests and addressing global challenges, albeit through distinct rhetorical lenses. Through a comprehensive comparative analysis, this chapter aims to unravel the intricacies of Trump and Biden's security rhetoric, shedding light on the underlying themes, priorities, and rhetorical strategies that shaped their respective approaches to



national and international security. By examining the nuances of their speeches, we gain valuable insights into the evolving landscape of American foreign policy and the enduring principles that guide it.

In examining the shared themes and diverging priorities between the mandates of President Donald Trump and Joe Biden, it becomes evident that while both leaders addressed similar security concerns, their approaches and priorities differed significantly. Through their rhetorical styles, they conveyed these differences and emphasized distinct aspects of national and international security.

When it comes to shared themes, on national sovereignty and security matters both Trump and Biden underscored their importance in their speeches. However, their emphasis and tone differed. Trump often employed assertive and nationalist rhetoric, emphasizing the need to prioritize America's interests above all else. His speeches frequently focused on bolstering border security, enhancing military capabilities, and combating illegal immigration as essential components of national security. Trump's speeches often echoed themes of American exceptionalism and the prioritization of national interests above all else. His rhetoric emphasized the need to protect American borders, sovereignty, and jobs. He frequently used strong and assertive language to convey his administration's commitment to securing the nation against external threats, particularly illegal immigration and terrorism. Biden too, acknowledged the importance of national sovereignty but framed it within the context of a global community interconnected by shared challenges. His rhetoric emphasized the need for alliances and cooperation to address security threats effectively. Biden's speeches highlighted the value of diplomacy, multilateralism, and collective action in safeguarding American interests and promoting global stability. On counterterrorism and military strength, again they were both recurring themes in the speeches of both presidents. Trump often highlighted his administration's efforts to combat terrorism and protect American interests abroad. His rhetoric emphasized the need for a strong military presence and decisive action against perceived threats to national security. Biden, while acknowledging the importance of a robust military, emphasized the need for strategic restraint and prioritized diplomacy in addressing security challenges. His speeches reflected a more nuanced approach to counterterrorism, focusing on intelligence-sharing, targeted operations, and diplomatic engagement to confront global threats. With regard to economic security and trade policy, they were highly significant areas of focus for both Trump and Biden. Trump's rhetoric often centered on trade imbalances, economic competition with China, and the renegotiation of trade agreements to prioritize American interests. His speeches frequently emphasized the need to protect American industries, promote domestic manufacturing, and secure favorable trade deals. Biden, while acknowledging the importance of economic security, adopted a more collaborative approach to trade policy. His rhetoric

emphasized the value of international trade partnerships, fair trade practices, and economic cooperation to foster global stability and prosperity.

Notwithstanding their odd similarities, they evidently had several differences, especially in terms of approach to diplomacy and alliances, perhaps the most significant point of departure between Trump and Biden. Trump's rhetoric often reflected a transactional and unilateralist approach to foreign policy, characterized by scepticism towards international institutions and a willingness to challenge traditional alliances. His speeches frequently emphasized the importance of bilateral agreements and the reassertion of American leadership on the world stage. In contrast, Biden's rhetoric on the other hand emphasized the value of diplomacy, alliances, and multilateral cooperation in addressing global challenges. His speeches highlighted the need for renewed engagement with allies, revitalization of international institutions, and the pursuit of common objectives through collective action. When it comes to climate change and global health, signaling a departure from Trump's administration, Biden's speeches often underscored the urgency of addressing climate change as a security issue, emphasizing the need for international cooperation, clean energy investments, and environmental stewardship. His administration's commitment to rejoining the Paris Agreement and prioritizing global health initiatives reflected a broader shift towards multilateralism and collaborative approaches to addressing transnational threats. In contrast, Trump's rhetoric downplayed the significance of climate change and prioritized domestic energy production over environmental concerns. In summary, while Trump and Biden addressed shared themes such as national sovereignty, counterterrorism, and economic security, their rhetorical styles and policy priorities diverged significantly. Trump's rhetoric often reflected a unilateralist and nationalist approach, characterized by assertive language and scepticism towards international cooperation. In contrast, Biden's rhetoric emphasized diplomacy, alliances, and multilateralism, signaling a return to a more traditional approach to foreign policy characterized by collaboration and engagement on the world stage.

#### *4.2 Rhetorical Strategies: Similarities and Differences*

As demonstrated throughout history, rhetorical strategies serve as indispensable tools in the arsenal of political leaders, profoundly shaping the communication landscape and influencing public perception. Within the realm of national and international security, presidents wield rhetorical devices to articulate their policies, underscore priorities, and articulate visions for the future. The inaugural addresses, diplomatic engagements, and major policy speeches of Presidents Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr. provide fertile ground for exploring the nuances of their rhetorical approaches and techniques.

In this comprehensive analysis, we delve deep into the rhetorical strategies employed by Trump and Biden, scrutinizing their inaugural addresses, the Helsinki summit between Trump and Putin, and their speeches concerning the withdrawal from Afghanistan. By dissecting their use of rhetorical figures, language nuances, tone variations, and delivery methods, we endeavor to unearth both the commonalities and disparities in their rhetorical styles. Through meticulous examination of these pivotal speeches, our aim is to illuminate the rhetorical strategies that defined the security narratives of both leaders during their respective tenures.

Inaugural addresses serve as the inaugural steps of a president's journey, setting the tone for their administration's trajectory. President Trump's oration was characterized by its stark directness, simplistic language, and emphasis on populist themes. He deftly employed rhetorical devices such as repetition, exemplified by the ubiquitous "*America First*" mantra, parallelism evident in phrases like "*We will make America wealthy again*", and antithesis portrayed vividly in his depiction of "American carnage", all aimed at underlining his commitment to prioritizing American interests and restoring national greatness. In stark contrast, Biden's inaugural address resonated with calls for unity, empathy, and healing. Through inclusive language, parallel structure, and alliteration, he implored the nation to "*end this uncivil war*", "*restore the soul and secure the future of America*", and embrace "*our better angels*" to foster national reconciliation and renewal. Beyond the pomp and circumstance of inaugurations, pivotal moments such as the Helsinki Summit highlight the intersection of rhetoric and diplomacy. Trump's personal diplomacy with Vladimir Putin was underscored by rhetorical devices like equivocation, as evidenced by his statement, "*I don't see any reason why it would be Russia*", aimed at highlighting the perceived disconnect between Russia and the U.S., particularly regarding allegations of election interference. Furthermore, his use of "*No collusion*" served as a defiant retort, deflecting criticism and projecting unwavering confidence in his administration's approach to Russian relations. In contrast, Biden's rhetorical strategies in announcing the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan leaned towards pragmatism, responsibility, and diplomacy. Historical references, pathos, and appeals to duty framed his justification for ending America's longest war, rallying support for the withdrawal while honoring the 20th anniversary of 9/11. Analyzing these speeches unveils both shared themes and diverging priorities between the two presidents. While both leaders employ rhetorical figures such as repetition, parallelism, and appeals to emotion, their overarching rhetorical styles diverge significantly. Trump's rhetoric exudes confrontation, assertion, and an unapologetic projection of strength and authority, often punctuated by hyperbole and bravado. In contrast, Biden's rhetoric emphasizes inclusivity, empathy, and a diplomatic approach, characterized by nuance, pragmatism, and consensus-building.

In essence, while Trump and Biden employ some similar rhetorical figures, their distinct rhetorical styles reflect divergent approaches to leadership and governance. Trump's rhetoric is defined by its audacity and directness, whereas Biden's rhetoric embodies empathy and diplomacy. Appreciating these nuances provides invaluable insights into the communicative strategies shaping the security narratives of both presidents and underscores the enduring power of rhetoric in the political arena.

## *Conclusions*

In the annals of history, the power of words has always been unmistakable. Nowhere is this more evident than in the speeches of world leaders, where rhetoric becomes a tool of diplomacy, persuasion, and power projection. In the modern era, the words of American presidents hold particular significance, resonating across the globe and shaping perceptions of U.S. leadership, credibility, and intentions. In this vein, the comparative analysis of the rhetorical strategies employed by Presidents Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr. regarding national and international security emerges as a critical endeavour, shedding light on the intricacies of U.S. foreign policy and its impact on the global landscape. At the heart of this analysis lies a quest to unravel the underlying themes, rhetorical devices, and communicative strategies embedded within the speeches, inaugural addresses, and diplomatic engagements of Trump and Biden. By delving into their rhetoric, we unearth insights into the evolving dynamics of U.S. foreign policy and the broader implications for international relations. President Trump's rhetoric, characterized by its assertiveness and nationalism, underscored America's dominance and self-interest on the world stage. Through rhetorical devices such as repetition, hyperbole, and adversarial language, Trump sought to project strength, rally support, and assert American primacy in global affairs. His "*America First*" mantra epitomized this approach, emphasizing a unilateralist stance and prioritizing national interests above all else. In contrast, President Biden's rhetoric reflects a departure from the confrontational tone of his predecessor. Emphasizing unity, empathy, and diplomacy, Biden's speeches prioritize collaboration, multilateralism, and shared values in addressing global challenges. His rhetoric seeks to repair alliances, restore America's standing in the world, and promote a vision of inclusive leadership that extends beyond national borders. The implications of their rhetoric extend far beyond mere linguistic analysis. As leaders of the world's most powerful country, Trump and Biden wield their words as instruments of statecraft, shaping perceptions, influencing policy outcomes, and defining the contours of international relations. Their speeches serve as policy statements, diplomatic overtures, and strategic maneuvers, navigating the complexities of an increasingly interconnected world. President Trump's Helsinki summit with Russian President Vladimir Putin was marked by a controversial approach that many interpreted as a departure from traditional U.S. diplomatic stances. Trump's rhetoric at Helsinki was seen by critics as overly conciliatory to Putin, raising questions about his commitment to U.S. intelligence agencies' findings regarding Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election. This instance highlighted Trump's tendency towards assertiveness blended with a unique form of engagement with adversaries, which some saw as undermining traditional alliances and international norms.

Trump's inaugural address underscored his "America First" philosophy, a stance that was evident throughout his presidency. This approach was mirrored in his foreign policy decisions, where he often took unilateral actions, such as withdrawing from international agreements and imposing tariffs, to assert U.S. dominance and protect national interests. In stark contrast, President Biden's rhetoric, especially during his speech on the withdrawal from Afghanistan, emphasized themes of ending the *"forever war"* and shifting focus to diplomatic solutions and addressing new global challenges. Biden's approach was characterized by a commitment to multilateralism and a belief in the importance of rebuilding alliances and engaging with international partners to tackle global issues. His approach became evident during his electoral campaign and especially with his inaugural address, which, further solidified his vision of unity, empathy, and a return to a more traditional form of U.S. leadership on the world stage. He spoke of *"a cry for racial justice some 400 years in the making"* and the need for unity in addressing the challenges facing the nation and the world. Biden's rhetoric in this address and subsequent speeches often highlighted the importance of democracy, alliances, and the role of the United States in championing a liberal international order. The rhetorical differences between Trump and Biden reflect deeper philosophical divergences about America's role in the world and the strategies for engaging with both allies and adversaries. Trump's emphasis on nationalism and a transactional approach to diplomacy contrasted sharply with Biden's emphasis on diplomacy, alliances, and a collective approach to global challenges. The implications of their rhetorical strategies extend beyond mere words; they influence policy directions, alliance dynamics, and global perceptions of U.S. leadership. Trump's approach led to questions about the reliability of the U.S. as an ally and its commitment to the post-World War II international order. Conversely, Biden's rhetoric and actions sought to reassure allies, recommit to multilateralism, and restore U.S. leadership in global affairs. In conclusion, the comparative analysis of Trump and Biden's rhetorical strategies offers profound insights into the dynamics of U.S. foreign policy and its ramifications for global stability and security. Their speeches imbued with rhetorical devices and symbolic gestures, encapsulate the shifting paradigms of American leadership and the evolving contours of international relations. As we reflect on the power of presidential rhetoric, we recognize its enduring significance in shaping perceptions and outcomes on the global stage. The words of American presidents echo through the corridors of history, resonating with audiences far beyond national borders. In this era of uncertainty and flux, the study of presidential rhetoric remains indispensable for understanding the complexities of power dynamics, communication strategies, and diplomatic engagement in the modern world.



# Bibliography

## Books and Articles

- Partington, A., & Taylor, C. (Year). *The language of persuasion in politics: An introduction*.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- JERÁBEK, Hynek. *Paul Lazarsfeld and the Origins of Communications Research*.
- Lasswell, Harold D. *Psychopathology and Politics*.
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research*, 28(4), 587-604.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2016). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Sage Publications.
- Osnos, E. (Year). *Biden: The Obama Years and the Battle for the Soul of America*. ]
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1), 55-75.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (2014). *Analyzing Media Messages: Using Quantitative Content Analysis in Research*. Routledge.
- Schramm, W. (1997). *The Beginnings of Communication Study in America: A Personal Memoir*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Trump, D. J. (Year). *The Art of the Deal*.
- Woodward, B. (Year). *Fear: Trump in the White House*.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Sage Publications.

## Websites and Online Resources

- Biden announces full US troop withdrawal from Afghanistan by Sept 11. (2021).
- Biden, J. R. (2021). Inaugural address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr.
- C-SPAN, BBC, CNN, FOX, and Al Jazeera Archives.
- FactCheck.org: Specific sections dedicated to both Trump and Biden.
- NVivo, MAXQDA, Dedoos.
- Politico. Coverage of campaign promises for both Trump and Biden.
- Remarks by President Biden on the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. (2021).



- Remarks by President Trump at tax reform event.
- Remarks by President Trump unveiling Boeing 787 Dreamliner aircraft.
- The American Presidency Project, UC Santa Barbara.
- The Brookings Institution - their topics on U.S. Politics & Government and International Affairs.
- The University of Georgia's Tutorial on Content Analysis.
- Twitter Archives.
- US Withdrawal from Afghanistan. (2023).
- White House Archives.
- Newspapers and Magazines
- The New York Times.
- The Washington Post archives.

**Referenced URLs:**

- <https://www.defense.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/2573268/biden-announces-full-us-troop-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-by-sept-11/>
- <https://www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/il-ritiro-usa-dallafghanistan-tutti-i-nostri-speciali-31465>
- <https://www.openicpsr.org/openicpsr/project/118603/version/V1/view>
- <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/people/president/donald-j-trump>
- <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/people/president/joseph-r-biden>
- <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-alliances-idUSKBN16834J>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/press-briefings/2021/04/13/background-press-call-by-a-senior-administration-official-on-afghanistan/>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/01/20/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/07/08/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-drawdown-of-u-s-forces-in-afghanistan/>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/US-Withdrawal-from-Afghanistan.pdf>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cwxqOoIyWm0>
- <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/people/president/donald-j-trump>
- <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/people/president/joseph-r-biden>

- <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-tax-reform-event/>
- <https://www.openicpsr.org/openicpsr/project/118603/version/V1/view>
- <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-unveiling-boeing-787-dreamliner-aircraft/>
- <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-alliances-idUSKBN16834J>
- <https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4740644/president-trump-helsinki-news-conference>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cwxqOoIyWm0>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/01/20/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/>
- <https://www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/il-ritiro-usa-dallafghanistan-tutti-i-nostri-speciali-31465>
- <https://www.wired.it/attualita/politica/2021/04/14/stati-unti-esercito-afghanistan-11-settembre-2021/>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/press-briefings/2021/04/13/background-press-call-by-a-senior-administration-official-on-afghanistan/>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/US-Withdrawal-from-Afghanistan.pdf>
- <https://www.defense.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/2573268/biden-announces-full-us-troop-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-by-sept-11/>
- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/07/08/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-drawdown-of-u-s-forces-in-afghanistan/#:~:text=When%20I%20announced%20our%20drawdown,our%20troops%20as%20they%20depart>
- <https://www.defense.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/2573268/biden-announces-full-us-troop-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-by-sept-11/>

## Summary in Italian

La politica contemporanea si caratterizza per il ruolo cruciale dei discorsi dei leader nel plasmare l'opinione pubblica e influenzare le decisioni politiche. Queste orazioni rappresentano strumenti potenti che consentono ai leader politici di delineare le proprie visioni, comunicare le intenzioni politiche e affrontare questioni critiche nazionali e internazionali. All'interno di questo contesto, lo studio della retorica politica e dell'analisi del discorso ha assunto una rilevanza sempre maggiore, offrendo preziose intuizioni sulle strategie utilizzate dai leader per comunicare efficacemente le proprie idee. Questo elaborato intraprende un'analisi comparativa, esaminando i discorsi pronunciati da due eminenti presidenti americani, Donald J. Trump e Joseph R. Biden Jr., con particolare attenzione alle loro discussioni riguardanti la sicurezza nazionale e internazionale.

Le presidenze di Donald J. Trump e Joseph R. Biden Jr. segnano una svolta cruciale nella storia politica moderna americana, caratterizzata da approcci distinti alle politiche interne ed estere. Una pietra angolare della loro leadership risiede nell'articolazione delle politiche di sicurezza nazionale, un ambito fondamentale nella definizione della posizione della nazione sugli affari globali, sulle relazioni internazionali e sulle misure di sicurezza interne. La presidenza di Trump si distinse per una retorica e decisioni politiche non convenzionali, mentre l'amministrazione Biden introdusse un tono e una direzione strategica diversi, enfatizzando la diplomazia, le alleanze e la cooperazione multilaterale. La seguente analisi comparativa dei discorsi di Trump e Biden sulla sicurezza nazionale e internazionale, fornisce una comprensione sfumata delle strategie retoriche utilizzate da questi leader per affrontare le preoccupazioni legate alla sicurezza, gettando luce sui loro stili di comunicazione distintivi, toni e priorità. In secondo luogo, mediante la comparazione di questi discorsi, lo studio mira a svelare le disparità ideologiche sottostanti e le orientazioni politiche delle due amministrazioni.

L'elaborato è guidato da tre diversi quesiti di ricerca:

1. Come Donald J. Trump e Joseph R. Biden Jr. trattano le questioni di sicurezza nazionale e internazionale nei loro discorsi?
2. Quali strategie retoriche impiegano Donald J. Trump e Joseph R. Biden Jr. per comunicare le loro politiche e priorità legate alla sicurezza?
3. Quali sono le principali differenze e somiglianze retoriche nelle narrazioni sulla sicurezza nazionale e internazionale presentate da Trump e Biden?

L'obiettivo principale è condurre un'analisi testuale di alcuni discorsi selezionati pronunciati da Donald J. Trump e Joseph R. Biden Jr., delineando le loro scelte retoriche distinte e esaminando le implicazioni di tali scelte sull'opinione pubblica e sulla formulazione delle politiche. Il primo capitolo

di questa elaborazione approfondisce la traiettoria storica e l'evoluzione dei discorsi presidenziali riguardanti la sicurezza nazionale e internazionale in tutto il mondo e specificamente negli Stati Uniti d'America. Tracciando le radici di questi discorsi, questa sezione mira a fornire una comprensione di come il panorama retorico si sia trasformato ed evoluto nel tempo. Questa contestualizzazione storica prepara il terreno per l'analisi approfondita dei discorsi di Donald Trump e Joe Biden, consentendo una comparazione sfumata che tenga conto della natura in evoluzione della retorica presidenziale sulle questioni di sicurezza. Un focus importante sarà sul ruolo centrale che la retorica gioca nel plasmare non solo le percezioni pubbliche, ma anche gli esiti tangibili delle politiche nei settori della sicurezza nazionale e internazionale. Il capitolo successivo inizia i lavori fornendo una panoramica delle politiche di sicurezza di Donald Trump, sezionando le sue strategie riguardanti sia la sicurezza domestica che internazionale, offrendo un'analisi delle priorità e degli approcci della sua amministrazione in questi settori. Delimitando gli elementi chiave dell'agenda di sicurezza di Trump, questo capitolo prepara il terreno per un'analisi focalizzata dei suoi discorsi, consentendo di comprendere il contesto entro cui si è sviluppata la sua retorica sulla sicurezza. Successivamente, verranno affrontati discorsi cruciali pronunciati dal presidente Trump, in particolare, il contesto, la consegna e le tecniche retoriche impiegate. Esaminando discorsi come il 58° discorso inaugurale e la conferenza stampa con Vladimir Putin ad Helsinki, questo capitolo dissectiona le sfumature della retorica di Trump, esplora le ambientazioni, le dinamiche del pubblico, il timing, i temi e le strategie retoriche impiegate, ponendo le basi per una valutazione dell'impatto dei suoi discorsi sulle politiche e le azioni effettive. Approfondendo l'analisi dei discorsi di Trump, si evidenzieranno le ripercussioni tangibili della sua retorica sia sul fronte nazionale che su quello internazionale, esplorando l'influenza dei suoi discorsi sulle strategie di sicurezza e sul tema del controllo delle armi, esaminando i cambiamenti nel mondo reale derivanti dalle sue strategie comunicative. Il terzo capitolo si concentrerà invece sulle politiche di sicurezza di Joe Biden, offrendo un'analisi sia della sua strategia di sicurezza domestica che dell'agenda di sicurezza internazionale. All'interno del campo della sicurezza domestica, questo capitolo esplora le iniziative di Biden in settori come l'applicazione della legge e il controllo delle armi. Allo stesso tempo, mi concentrerò sulla sua agenda di sicurezza internazionale, e sulle sue strategie riguardanti la diplomazia, la leadership globale e le alleanze. Delimitando i contorni delle politiche di Biden, questa sezione getta le basi per un'analisi delle sue scelte retoriche e della loro coerenza con le sue iniziative di sicurezza. I discorsi analizzati, saranno momenti significativi come il 59° discorso inaugurale e il discorso di ritiro dall'Afghanistan, questo capitolo esplorerà le ambientazioni, le dinamiche del pubblico e il tempismo di questi discorsi. Inoltre, esaminerà i principali temi, schemi e argomenti ricorrenti nella retorica di Biden, scoprendo i messaggi sottostanti e le priorità politiche incorporate nei suoi discorsi. Attraverso un'analisi delle sue tecniche retoriche,

dell'enfasi e del tono, questa sezione mira a valutare le complessità delle strategie comunicative di Biden, offrendo spunti di riflessione sulle tattiche persuasive adottate per comunicare efficacemente le sue politiche di sicurezza. Nel capitolo finale, si troverà un'analisi comparativa completa, che approfondirà i temi condivisi e le priorità divergenti all'interno della retorica sulla sicurezza dei presidenti Trump e Biden. Questa sezione identifica fili comuni che si intrecciano nei loro discorsi, e linee politiche, allo stesso tempo, esplora le priorità divergenti, e approcci adottati da ciascun leader. Esaminando la scelta del linguaggio, delle figure retoriche, dell'enfasi e del tono, questo capitolo svela le sfumature sottili che distinguono i loro approcci alla comunicazione sulla sicurezza. In questo contesto, l'analisi comparativa delle strategie retoriche adottate dai presidenti Donald J. Trump e Joseph R. Biden Jr. riguardo alla sicurezza nazionale e internazionale ha l'obiettivo di valutare le complessità della politica estera degli Stati Uniti e sul suo impatto sul panorama globale. La retorica del presidente Trump, caratterizzata dalla sua assertività e dal nazionalismo, ha sottolineato il dominio Americano e l'interesse nazionale sulla scena mondiale. Attraverso figure retoriche come la ripetizione, l'iperbole e il linguaggio avversario, Trump ha cercato di proiettare forza, raccogliere sostegno e affermare la supremazia americana negli affari globali. Il suo mantra "*America First*" ne è stato l'epitome, enfatizzando una posizione unilaterale e ponendo gli interessi nazionali al di sopra di tutto il resto. In contrasto, la retorica del presidente Biden riflette un allontanamento dal tono conflittuale del suo predecessore. Enfatizzando l'unità, l'empatia e la diplomazia, i discorsi di Biden prioritizzano la collaborazione, il multilateralismo e i valori condivisi nell'affrontare le sfide globali. La sua retorica cerca di riparare le alleanze, ripristinare la posizione dell'America nel mondo e promuovere una visione di leadership inclusiva che si estende oltre i confini nazionali. Le implicazioni della loro retorica si estendono ben oltre una mera analisi linguistica. Come leader del paese più potente del mondo, Trump e Biden utilizzano le loro parole come strumenti di diplomazia, plasmando percezioni, influenzando esiti politici e definendo i contorni delle relazioni internazionali. I loro discorsi fungono da dichiarazioni di politica, aperture diplomatiche e manovre strategiche, navigando tra le complessità di un mondo sempre più interconnesso. Il vertice di Helsinki del presidente Trump con il presidente russo Vladimir Putin è stato contrassegnato da un approccio controverso che molti hanno interpretato come un allontanamento dalle tradizionali posizioni diplomatiche degli Stati Uniti. La retorica di Trump a Helsinki è stata vista dai critici come eccessivamente conciliatoria verso Putin, sollevando dubbi sul suo impegno nei confronti delle conclusioni delle agenzie di intelligence statunitensi riguardo all'interferenza russa nelle elezioni presidenziali del 2016. Questo episodio ha evidenziato la propensione di Trump verso l'assertività mescolata a una forma unica di coinvolgimento con gli avversari, che alcuni hanno visto come un indebolimento delle alleanze tradizionali e delle norme internazionali. Il discorso inaugurale di Trump

ha sottolineato la sua filosofia "*America First*", una posizione evidente durante tutto il suo mandato. Questo approccio si è riflesso nelle sue decisioni di politica estera, dove spesso ha preso azioni unilaterali, come il ritiro dagli accordi internazionali e l'imposizione di dazi, per affermare il dominio degli Stati Uniti e proteggere gli interessi nazionali. In netto contrasto, la retorica del presidente Biden, specialmente durante il suo discorso sul ritiro dall'Afghanistan, ha enfatizzato temi come porre fine alla "*guerra infinita*" e spostare l'attenzione verso soluzioni diplomatiche e nuove sfide globali. L'approccio di Biden è stato caratterizzato da un impegno per il multilateralismo e da una convinzione nell'importanza di ricostruire alleanze e impegnarsi con partner internazionali per affrontare le sfide globali. Il suo approccio è chiaro e durante la sua campagna elettorale e soprattutto con il suo discorso inaugurale, che ha ulteriormente solidificato la sua visione di unità, empatia e un ritorno a una forma più tradizionale di leadership degli Stati Uniti sulla scena mondiale. La retorica di Biden in questo discorso e nei successivi ha spesso sottolineato l'importanza della democrazia, delle alleanze e del ruolo degli Stati Uniti nel difendere un ordine internazionale liberale. Le differenze retoriche tra Trump e Biden riflettono divergenze filosofiche più profonde sul ruolo dell'America nel mondo e sulle strategie per coinvolgere sia gli alleati che gli avversari. L'enfasi di Trump sul nazionalismo e sull'approccio transazionale alla diplomazia contrastava nettamente con l'enfasi di Biden sulla diplomazia, sulle alleanze e su un approccio collettivo alle sfide globali. Le implicazioni delle loro strategie retoriche si estendono ben oltre le parole stesse; influenzano le direzioni politiche, le dinamiche delle alleanze e le percezioni globali sulla leadership degli Stati Uniti. L'approccio di Trump ha sollevato dubbi sulla affidabilità degli Stati Uniti come alleato e sul suo impegno verso l'ordine internazionale del dopoguerra. Al contrario, la retorica e le azioni di Biden hanno cercato di rassicurare gli alleati, di ricommettere al multilateralismo e di ripristinare la leadership degli Stati Uniti negli affari globali. In conclusione, i loro discorsi, ricchi di figure retoriche e gesti simbolici, racchiudono i paradigmi in evoluzione della leadership americana e i contorni in mutamento delle relazioni internazionali. Mentre riflettiamo sul potere della retorica presidenziale, riconosciamo la sua importanza duratura nel plasmare percezioni e risultati sulla scena globale. Le parole dei presidenti americani risuonano attraverso i corridoi della storia, raggiungendo un pubblico ben oltre i confini nazionali. In quest'era di incertezza e cambiamento, lo studio della retorica presidenziale rimane indispensabile per comprendere le complessità delle dinamiche di potere, le strategie comunicative e l'engagement diplomatico nel mondo moderno.