

# “Wild Eyed Socialist”: The Use of Rhetorical Tools in Republican Speeches<sup>1</sup>

Emrys Chalfoun

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics

Haverford College  
December 2022

## Abstract

It is impossible to escape entirely from politics, so it is important to understand the tactics used by politicians. In this thesis I explore political rhetoric surrounding the use of the term *socialism* in thirteen speeches by Republican politicians in an attempt to understand the ways in which it is used to persuade audiences. The term *socialism* has recently been used by these politicians to describe the Democratic party, its candidates, and its policies, and yet many don't actually understand the term. This suggests that something else is at play in the use of *socialism* by Republicans. Through an analysis of the rhetorical tools used by Republicans in political speeches, I see how repetition, warlike speech, and the delineation of *us* and *them* are used in association with *socialism* as means of persuasion.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Acknowledgements:** I want to thank Amanda Payne, my thesis advisor, for supporting my interest and making sure I stayed on track; professors Brook Lillehaugen and Mark Gould for providing critical comments and useful readings; the students in the linguistics and sociology thesis seminars who gave comments and helped focus the thesis; my friend and Writing Center adviser Naren Roy who helped make sure I regularly had writing time; my friends who had to listen to my complaints about scheduling and deadlines throughout the semester; and finally, Sarah Gold who had to regularly deal with the chaos my life descended into over the course of the semester.

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Terminology	4
1.2 Thesis Structure	4
<b>2 Theoretical Background</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Means of Persuasion	5
2.2 Ultimate Terms	7
2.3 Parsons' Influence	8
2.4 Hart: True Believer	9
<b>3 What is socialism?</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Theoretical socialism	10
3.2 Americans and socialism	11
3.3 Republican Usage	12
<b>4 Method</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1 Sample	13
4.2 Rhetorical Tools	13
<b>5 Analysis</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Repeat: Socialism	15
5.2 Warlike Speech	16
5.3 America and the American	19
<b>6 Discussion</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 A certain frame of mind	21
6.2 Backing up claims	22
<b>7 Conclusion</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1 Weaknesses and Future Directions	23
7.2 Why Is This Important?	24
<b>Appendix: Transcripts</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>38</b>

## 1 Introduction

For my thesis I will be looking at Republican politicians and prominent figures' use of rhetorical tools, using the term *socialist* (and its other forms) to find a way into and to focus the analysis. Specifically, I am looking to see how they use this term to try and influence their audience's opinions and voting practices. Is there something more than just an understanding of the term and frequency of use at play in its ability to influence the listeners? This is an important topic since the way politicians speak and use terminology can influence the way their listeners build opinions on and relate to the ideas, policies, and figures described by the terms.

As a whole, Americans have a net-negative view toward the term *socialism*, and in relation to voting, there is a slight majority of people who would not vote for someone socialist in presidential elections (Newport 2020). These opinions are not restricted to any particular party, though there is a significant difference in rates of negative opinion when separated by party. For an example, let us take a look at the hypothetical situation of Bernie Sanders having gotten the Democratic presidential nomination in 2020.

Sanders, who defines himself as a democratic socialist, campaigned for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2020. If he had won the nomination, the Trump campaign probably would have especially stressed his socialism in the hope that it would influence voters, which, considering opinions toward socialism and the idea of a socialist president could have led to Trump winning the 2020 election.

Returning to the actual events with Biden becoming the Democratic presidential candidate and later the president, the Trump administration tried to paint Biden (who has specifically said he is not a socialist) as a socialist or at least a sympathizer. The use of the term socialism has had a real effect, as shown by a Miami Herald article from 2020 describing how the use of *socialism* increased votes for Republicans (Viglucchi et al. 2020). This is just one example of how Trump and conservatives have been using this term to influence listeners and their voting patterns, and, since they have seen results before, I see no reason that they would stop using this method now.

It is therefore important to understand the methods employed by Republican politicians to try and influence their audiences. The things they say can have a large impact on voting patterns within the US, and could lead to significant changes that would affect even the day to day lives of the average American, let alone the marginalized and communities who are still fighting to gain equal, if not equitable, rights.

Before I dive into the body of this thesis I want to address one terminology choice made within this thesis as I understand that some people who might read this thesis would find issue with the choice to use *Republican* to describe the people whose speeches I am analyzing. I will also set out a short overview of the structure of the thesis so that, upon finishing a section, the reader might not be surprised about the topic of the next section.

## 1.1 Terminology

One of the difficulties I came across in writing this paper was deciding what term to use for the people whose speeches I am analyzing. When it comes to *Republican*, it is clear that not all would fall under the category of those I am interested in, and therefore using *Republican* would be misleading, but is there a better term?

The Article "For Trump's Backers in Congress, 'Devil Terms' Help Rally Voters" (Valentino-DeVries and Eder 2022) uses the term *Objectors*, derived from the Republicans who voted to reject the result of 2020 elections, to describe this particular subset. However, I do not explicitly know that the speakers for the speeches I have chosen would fall under this term. The same goes for *Christian Nationalist* which I came across in Gorski and Perry's *The Flag and the Cross* (2022).

Because all of these speakers associate themselves with the Republican party, I have made the choice to use *Republican* recognizing that the analysis and conclusions found in this thesis do not necessarily hold true for every candidate across the entire Republican party.

## 1.2 Thesis Structure

Having set out the topic of this thesis and explained the terminology I will use throughout, it is time to lay out the structure of this thesis. In section 2 I will explain the theory which informs my thoughts and direction of the analysis. This includes Aristotle's discussion of the means of persuasion, Weaver's ultimate terms, Parsons' understanding of influence, and Hart's Discussion of the True Believer. From there I will move to section 3 where I set forth the different aspects of the term *socialism*. For this, I will separate it into theoretical socialism, American understanding of and opinions toward the term, and an initial introduction into how Republicans use it.

Section 4 is looking at the method I will use. Part of the section is on the speech sample, both background information and how the sample was chosen. The other part of this section is an overview of the rhetorical tools which will be focused on in the analysis. This is not a full list of rhetorical tools, instead listing only those which will be looked at in the analysis.

Section 5 houses the analysis of the data from the speeches. It is broken up into three parts, the first focusing on the repetitive use of the term *socialism*. The second part looks at aspects of warlike speech found throughout the speeches. Finally the third part looks at representations of America and the American political sphere given by the speakers. The analysis is then depend in section 6 by stepping back and looking at how the themes and data in section 5 are used in the attempt to persuade, connecting back to the theories presented in section 2. This section is separated into two parts associated with two of the categories of means of persuasion. The first part looks at how the rhetorical tools are used to manipulate emotions, and the second looks at the speeches' ability to prove the claims within them.

Section 7 brings the thesis to a close. In this section, I reflect on the weaknesses of the thesis, as well as considering possible future directions for this research to go, and just like all conclusions, I remind the reader where we started and how we got to the end.

## **2 Theoretical Background**

In this section I will be explaining the theories I will be drawing upon when analyzing political speeches. I will also note some of the issues within these theories when they are related to the analysis. At first glance, some of these theories may not seem to hold much relevance for a sociolinguistic analysis of political speeches, but they were crucial in forming the ways I thought about the topic and shaped the way I approached the analysis. Therefore their usefulness should become more obvious in the sections to come.

I will start with Aristotle's discussion of the three types of means of persuasion. These three types are categories which can be used to help better understand how the tools of rhetoric are being used. From here I will move on to discuss Weaver's Ultimate Terms, which will help in understanding the specifics of how the term *socialism* is being used. I will then move on to discuss Parsons' characterization of influence, which, though useful in understanding some aspects of influence, cannot be used to fully characterize the influence that, for instance, Trump has. Finally, I will explain Hart's analysis of rhetoric and the True Believer. This analysis fills in some of the gaps from Parsons in relation to Trump.

### **2.1 Means of Persuasion**

Aristotle is one of the most influential people in the discussion of rhetoric. Though his words are over 2000 years old, they are still relevant to the discussion today. Therefore, in this section I will set forth and elaborate on the three means of persuasion which can be found in speeches, as set out by Aristotle (ca. 4th century BCE, 2020 edition).

According to Aristotle (2020), the means of persuasion fall into three kinds. The first depends on the speaker's character. The speaker must deliver the speech such that the listeners find the speaker to be worthy of trust and respect. Aristotle states that persuasion by character is "the most effective means of persuasion"(2020:17). If the audience finds the speaker trustworthy, the speaker will not need to rely as heavily on things such as empirical data and will not have to work as hard to persuade the listener that the arguments are reasonable. However, it is not a simple task to present the self as trustworthy. If, prior to the speech, the listener knows about the speaker, and especially has a negative view of the speaker, it will be more difficult for the speaker to persuade the listener of their trustworthiness.

One aspect that could be argued to fit under the category of character is charisma. A charismatic figure, someone with charismatic authority,<sup>2</sup> will have an easier time persuading their listener even when the listener starts out at least somewhat opposed to the speaker's point of view, since the charismatic figure does not have to rely on the same level of respect and trust as those without charisma. They are, in fact, relying on this charisma to change the mind of those listeners with negative views of the speaker. However, there are limits to their ability to do so. If the listener has a strong prejudice against the speaker it is extremely unlikely that the listener will be swayed by the speaker's character.

The second means of persuasion depends on being able to put the listener in a certain frame of mind. Emotions influence the judgments listeners make and therefore the ability to rouse the listeners to a certain emotion by the speech will change the effectiveness of the speech. As a listener, if you are excited as opposed to angry, you will view a statement, for example, "for the first time since 1993, no one was shot over the weekend in this city," very differently. If the speaker is trying to emphasize the achievement aspects of this statement they would want to use a different tone of voice and emphasize a different part of the sentence than if they wanted to focus on the fact that it shouldn't have taken a long time to achieve it. In using this kind of persuasion, the speaker is therefore relying on the emotionally driven reactions and decision making that is caused by emphasizing a particular emotion.

Finally the third means of persuasion depends directly on the speech "in so far as it proves or seems to prove" (Aristotle 2020:17). This is where persuasion is attempted through the use of warrants to justify claims. Warrants are the statements used as proof that claims are true and accurate. The accuracy of the warrant and its application to the claim play an important role in this. For instance, when using data to justify a claim, the justification of a claim will be undermined if the data clearly does not support that claim, or even if the data makes absolutely no sense. For this kind of persuasion the use of warrants must be tailored to the audience. Different listeners will require different types and amounts of proof to back up statements (Hart 1971). This can be due to the nature of the listener:

[...] in dealing with certain persons, even if we possessed the most accurate scientific knowledge, we should not find it easy to persuade them by the employment of such knowledge. For scientific discourse is instruction, but in the case of such persons this is impossible; our arguments and speeches must rest on generally accepted opinions[...]. (Aristotle 2020:11)

There are people for whom the use of science, even when most accurately explained and applied, will not aid persuasion. This is probably quite clear to see in America with the groups who directly ignore and contradict science. Flat-Earthers for instance, who, when given everything that proves the earth to be round, and even when they perform an experiment trying

---

<sup>2</sup> Charismatic authority is the embodiment of a specific set of values. Importantly, it is not a demand for these values to be transformed but to be activated.

to prove the earth is flat and come up with results supporting a round earth, will still argue for a flat earth no matter how sound and rational these arguments are (Triple M Staff 2020).

Another reason for the speaker to modify the type and number of warrants present in a speech is due to the closeness of doctrine (a body of principles or system of beliefs) between the speaker and listeners. In the case that the speaker and listeners share a doctrine, seemingly necessary warrants may be left to the listener to fill in (Hart 1971). Though not necessarily with vocal responses, speakers count on their audience to complete their reasoning without having to back up every single claim. There will still be warrants which cannot be left to the audience, but the speaker chooses to leave out certain information and rely on shared knowledge and norms to fill in the gaps. In a 2020 Speech by Donald Trump in Georgia, he said "These people want to go further than socialism. They want to go into a communistic form of government, I have no doubt about that" (Speech 1). In the lines surrounding, neither before nor after this statement, does he tell the audience why this statement is true. Instead, there is the unvocalized assumption that the listeners already have evidence to support this claim found within their shared doctrine.

These means of persuasion are not independent of each other. For instance, someone feeling strong emotion or who believes they already have all the necessary information may not need as much proof as someone who is calmly listening, even if they do not have a full understanding of the doctrine. In addition, trustworthiness and the need for warrants are closely linked. A listener who doesn't trust the speaker will require more proof which seems to justify the claims than a listener who fully trusts and believes in the speaker.

The three means of persuasion (depending on the speaker's character, the listener's frame of mind, and the speech itself) are important in understanding the tactics used by politicians, as well as understanding the ways in which the audience affects the form and content of a speech.

## 2.2 Ultimate Terms

In his book *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (1953), Weaver proposes the "Ultimate Terms." These are terms which fall at the extremes of respect. The Ultimate Terms fall into three categories: "god terms," "devil terms," and "charismatic terms." These terms can be utilized to manipulate perception based on the perception of the Ultimate Term being used.

"God terms" are those terms which demand the highest respect, embody the ultimate "good," and all others seem inferior in comparison (Weaver 1953:212). "Progress," "facts," "modern," and "efficient" are some of the terms that Weaver places under the category of "god term" since, in his mind, these things are held in high respect.

"Devil terms" are those terms found at the opposite end of the good-bad spectrum. Weaver posits that "un-American" is the closest to being a devil term, though, when a specific enemy is available to be the object of hatred, the term in use may become more specific (1953:222). For example, around World War II "nazi" and "fascist" were the more specific devil terms, and around 1953, when this book was published, "communism" had become the specific devil term (Weaver:222-23).

"Charismatic terms" are terms that "act independently of referential connections" (Weaver 1953:227). This is a term that is no longer connected to the observable and demonstrable, nor is it as strongly connected to historical understandings of the term. Also, a charismatic term is outside of the good-bad spectrum the other Ultimate terms lie on. Weaver places "freedom" in this category, and suggests that "democracy" is moving toward being a charismatic term as well (1953:228). In relation to this category, he brings up an important point about attempts by governments to confer charismatic authority on abbreviated and telescoped forms of terms (such as US or Nazi), which are "nearly always used with even more reckless assumption of authority" (Weaver 1953:229). The concern brought up about this use is that it separates the term from its meanings and connections even more than the unshortened forms.

Though Weaver regularly recognizes that the categorization words as one of these ultimate terms can change over time (and can be inverted in special circumstances), he is not clear as to whether these terms may be dependent on social group, or whether they transcend social groups.

When describing the way in which "American" falls under the category of god term, he considers it to transcend country borders with adequate levels of positive views both inside and outside America, while recognizing that a sense of national egotism is at play within America. However, when he describes "un-American" as a devil term it is specifically in the context of America, and implies that other countries have their own versions that do not transcend borders (Germany having "un-German," Brazil having "un-Brazillian," etc.). Though it is perfectly reasonable that these terms ("American" and "un-American") are not acting in the same way, being different terms and types of terms, it is unclear how he understands this difference to occur.

However, with the discussion of devil terms, Weaver recognizes that there can be different devil terms in existence at the same time, used by different groups (1993:228). During the Civil War, the north and the south would have had different devil terms due to being on opposing sides. Even so, Weaver does not articulate how there can be different Ultimate Terms of a particular type at the same time, only differentiated by social group.

### **2.3 Parsons' Influence**

In his chapter titled "On the Concept of Influence," Parsons (1969) sets forth to analyze the conditions under which opinions are held or changed. Parsons defines influence as a means of persuasion (1969:415). It is used to get the listener to decide to act. Here "facts" are used so that the listener can make their own inferences. Parsons also recognizes here that the "facts" need only justify in terms of the norms and values of the listener, not in their empirical validity. However, Parsons also specifies that the norms referenced must be regarded as binding on both the speaker and listener.

Parsons goes on to describe four types of influence: "(1) 'political' influence, (2) 'fiduciary' influence, (3) influence through the appeal to different loyalties, and (4) influence



oriented to the interpretation of norms" (1969:419). I will not describe all of the four types of influence, instead explaining only one: political influence.

"Political" influence has a "directly significant relation between influence and power" (Parsons 1969:420). Though independent of each other, there is a close connection between political influence and power. This type of influence is based in a leader-follower relationship. Following a democratic system, the leader needs followers to support her so that she can take on a position of power to work (supposedly) in the interest of the followers, and the followers have some power to choose who and what they support. The leader is placed in a position where she is supposed to act as a "voice" for her supporters, and if she fails to do this the followers can choose to stop supporting her.

Influence, as defined by Parsons, falls under the category of persuasion. Under Aristotle's three types of means of persuasion, Parson's political influence would seem to fall under the first kind: depending on the speaker's character.

If we look at Trump, this explanation does not fully explain his following and their loyalty. There are multiple examples of things he said he would do as president, which upon being elected he ignored or worked against. In addition there are people who support Trump who know that he does not plan on following through with many of the things he says he will do. Something else is clearly at play in the dynamic between Trump and his followers, who make up a large portion of the people who have adopted the usage of *socialism* with an understanding (at least) close to Trump's.

## 2.4 Hart: True Believer

In his essay "The Rhetoric of the True Believer," Hart analyzes 54 speeches on six different topics each by a different speaker, which he then separates into five "genres," then proceeds to analyze more deeply a particular genre labeled as "doctrinal" (1971). Hart describes the features of the doctrinal genre as:

(1) indoctrinated listeners are counted on to make rhetorical contributions; (2) doctrine defines the intellectual resources used by its spokesmen; (3) doctrine defines the rhetorical role of the speakers; and (4) doctrine defines the nature of the rhetorical relationship or bond maintained between doctrinal spokesmen and their listeners. (Hart 1971:251)

As I have said before (section 2.1), doctrinal speakers count on the indoctrinated audience to fill in seemingly necessary warrants (justifying statements) which are left out of the speech, as well as inferences, reducing the need for the speaker to include as many warrants to back up statements compared speakers with indoctrinated audiences. In this way doctrinal speakers can often be inexplicit.

In addition, doctrinal speakers act with a special confidence in their audience. When speaking to indoctrinated audiences, they already know the listeners consider the doctrines to be

the "best" and incomparable, therefore, as long as it is understood to be in line with the doctrines, the speakers can expect their listeners "to make their own comparative inferences and draw their own comparative conclusions" (Hart 1971:254).

Most doctrines define what is considered to be trouble and what is considered to be the best course of action to get out of that trouble (Hart 1971). Following this assumption that the audience will be able to fill in the answers through their knowledge of the doctrine, speakers place their emphasis on the "trouble," manipulating tension and anxieties. This emphasis, often accompanied with a withholding of the solution while the tension mounts, is a tactic regularly used by doctrinal speakers. This returns to Aristotle's second means of persuasion as it is used to destabilize the audience's emotions. In a way, this process both works to instill in the listener that whatever is described as "troubles" should be fought against, and that the solutions backed by the doctrine, and often the speakers who are interpreting and reminding the listeners of the doctrine, are the only ways to deal with the troubles. However, to the unindoctrinated as well as those who are much more inclined to believe quantitative data, these claims and solutions may seem either unsatisfactory or illogical, which can show just how much doctrine is relied on by a particular speaker.

### **3 What is *socialism*?**

What is socialism? It is important to understand the various elements informing both personal and public understandings of socialism within the US to understand the ways it is being used by Republicans in an attempt to influence the American public. In varying degrees, American views toward the term *socialism* have been informed by the historical uses by governments, ideas associated with the term, and actual theory.

#### **3.1 Theoretical socialism**

There are multiple iterations and interpretations of socialism, but a consistent theoretical understanding of it includes social ownership of the means of production and cooperative management of the economy (Rowcroft 2017). In addition, there are also "strong political dimensions" to socialism, as it has played an important part in securing social reform and gains in rights, especially for workers (Rowcroft 2017). The difficulty of pinning down a definition of socialism comes from the variability of it. Some varieties are more tied to Marx<sup>3</sup> than others; some are seeking a more accommodating form of capitalism where others are seeking its total overthrow; and some even include an ecological aspect. Though related, communism is not as variable as socialism, but the two are often conflated.

---

<sup>3</sup> Karl Marx, co-author of *The Communist Manifesto*, played a large part in the formation of the theories of Marxism, communism, and socialism. However, since his time many other voices have contributed to and adapted these theories, especially the latter two, resulting in a wide variety of interpretations.

In addition to the theoretical there have been multiple attempts at a government under the label of socialism. However closely these attempts originally were to the theoretical version of socialism, they end up closer to authoritarianism and fascism. Venezuela and Cuba, as well as the USSR (which plays an interesting role since the American conflation of *communism* and *socialism* in part comes from the Cold War), are often referenced and have played a part in the understanding of the term. This is true for anyone living through times when these have been widely discussed in the news, but especially for those with firsthand experience of these governments.

### 3.2 Americans and *socialism*

So what do Americans consider *socialism* to mean? There is not a consensus between Americans as to what socialism is. Understandings of socialism include (but are not limited to): communism or modified communism, government ownership or control of production and services, equality, being social, liberal government, and restriction of freedom (Newport 2018a). Republicans are more likely to view socialism in relation to negative understandings (or those that could be understood negatively) such as restricted freedom or government control, as well as other non-specific derogatory views.

There is a stable net-negative opinion of socialism across all Americans (Newport 2020). Democrats are more positive toward socialism than Republicans, and Republicans especially have a view of socialism that emphasizes government control and the undermining of and incompatibility with the current US system (Newport 2020). In addition, historical failure of systems labeled socialist also plays into the (especially Republican) views toward socialism. Importantly, Republicans are more likely than Democrats to use derogatory terms to describe socialism, and less likely to have no opinion toward it (Newport 2018a).

In the US there are Democratic Socialists, for instance Bernie Sanders and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who, while associating with the Democratic party and running as Democratic candidates, set themselves apart from the Democratic party through the association with the term *socialist*. Democratic socialism is an umbrella term for multiple different forms of socialism, and, being a form of socialism with democratic values, it is supposed to avoid some of the issues that past attempts at socialist states have had.

Though the scope of this paper is less interested in the actual outcomes of use of the term in an attempt to influence, it is important to still consider the fact that some portion of the opinions toward socialism held by Republicans may have come out of the sometimes extreme use of the term by Trump and Conservative public figures. Even if the average Republican doesn't have a specific idea of what socialism is and how it could affect the US governing system, they have continually been confronted with media and uses that have given a pejorative aspect to the term, which can make it difficult to have absolutely no opinion on the term.

This is not to say that Democrats are not confronted with the same media and use of the term. As someone who voted Democrat, I have been confronted multiple times with

anti-Fetterman ads (Fetterman is the current Pennsylvania Democratic candidate for the Senate) in the lead up to the 2022 elections. However, as soon as I realize the political views of the ad are not in alignment with my own I immediately tune out. This is, of course, only one perspective, and there are many who rely on the media input and ads to help them make their choices. However, there are both Democrats and Republicans who, upon finding out that the political statement they are seeing or hearing is in support of the other party, stop paying attention or taking it seriously. Therefore, I would suggest that these ads are directed at an audience made up of Republicans and those who are undecided.

### 3.3 Republican Usage

Considering the varying understandings of the term 'socialism' in the US, it is understandable that there is no specific view of the term in relation to ideas and ideals. However there are two ways in which it is used by Republicans that are related only slightly to the theoretical term. One of the ways it is used is to define "good" and "bad". Considering the stronger negative views Republicans have toward the term, it should not be surprising that *socialism* is used to describe things that should be considered as bad and opposed to American Republican values. Reforms which would go against what the Republican politicians are fighting for or Democratic candidates are labeled as socialist, and if there are "facts" put forth to support these claims they are in line with the negative understandings of the term. In this way the term *socialism* is acting as a devil term by the Republican community.

The other way I want to bring up here is its use to define "us" and "them". This is done through an understanding that there is an opinion toward the term *socialism* which is shared by all "real" Republicans and not by Democrats. Gorski and Perry tell us that this term has "become a critical dog whistle for white Americans who adhere to nationalist ideology, helping to identify the 'them' who pose such a grave threat to 'us'" (2021:43). Therefore the use of the term under this understanding is done to define the groups of "us" the "real" Republicans with America's best interests in mind, and "them" the ones who seek to overthrow (and possibly even bring under communism) the American system. What I have just described is maybe not the most common use across America, but it is consistent with the use by Trump and others who follow him (see section 5.3).

Understandings of the term *socialism*, especially by Americans, are quite variable and inconsistent. In addition it seems that these understandings can be informed and influenced by past governments which have called themselves socialist, use by politicians in both negative and positive ways, and level of understanding what the original ideas behind the term were. These understandings inform the way that Republican politicians attempt to use these terms to suggest to their followers and the American public as a whole that they consider a particular policy or candidate to not be working in the interest of the American people.

## 4 Method

Having set out the theoretical background in section 3 and elaborated on the source of American understandings of the term *socialism* in section 4, I will explain both my method for selecting speeches, and the rhetorical tools I will use to analyze these speeches.

### 4.1 Sample

My sample is made up of thirteen transcripts, nine from political speeches and four from the 2020 Republican National Convention (RNC) nights that have multiple speakers. In addition to the 4 RNC night transcripts, two of the speech transcripts are also from the 2020 RNC. The speeches span a timeframe from 2016 to 2022, and are by a variety of speakers, though they are all Republican (or Republican affiliated). Importantly, Donald Trump is a speaker for five of these.

These speeches and their transcripts were found on and copied from Rev.com and C-span.org (links to the original are given for all of them). Other than taking out irrelevant sections, I have left the transcripts from Rev.com unedited,<sup>4</sup> but I have edited the transcripts from C-span.org as there were many mistakes and omissions in the original transcripts. Due to this and the analysis of certain direct quotations in relation to their surroundings, I have chosen to include the excerpts from these speeches in the appendix.

Three things played a part in how I chose the speeches: speaker, timeframe, and terminology use. I chose speeches from events or speakers that were known to be Republican and politically active. Since my focus is on language use by Republicans, especially surrounding the use of *socialism*, I chose speeches which included the use of that term. Finally, I chose a timeframe of 2016-2022 to keep the focus on current rhetorical strategies. The selection of these particular speeches was based on ease of finding them and their transcripts.

### 4.2 Rhetorical Tools

There are many rhetorical tools employed by public speakers, however, for the sake of brevity and relevancy I will list and define those tools which I directly saw use of within the speeches though not all will be discussed in the analysis (section 5). These tools are from various areas of linguistics, such as syntax or semantics. Some of these tools are well known and their definitions are simple so they have been gathered in a bullet point list. Others require a lengthier description which follows the bullet points. These rhetorical tools and their definitions were gathered from Pieniążek-Niemczuk (2016) and Jasim and Mustafa (2020).

- Climax: a special arrangement of words or phrases used to increase an importance of them

---

<sup>4</sup> For the Rev.com transcripts, the timestamps have not been edited to reflect the exact start time of the section in the speech, even when I have removed sections, as the timestamp is still helpful in locating the section.

- Metaphor: describes things that are not similar by asserting that in some way they are
- Parallelism: some parts of sentences are created by means of a similar pattern
- Tricolon: a list of three words, phrases or clauses

There are three other rhetorical tools which require a lengthier explanation to truly define: lexicalization, pronouns, and repetition. Lexicalization plays an important role in political speech. Jasim and Mustafa "a visible way of how politicians see and describe themselves and others" (2020:429). This is a word selection process politicians use to portray themselves positively and their opponents negatively. Although this process can be easily recognized within political speeches, some of its uses can be much subtler than expected.

Pronouns are critical to how a politician relates self to audience, self to others, and the audience to others. It tells the audience who is and isn't included, as well as who is and isn't on their side. Although on the surface pronouns might seem simple, they play an important and complicated role as a rhetorical tool.

Bramley, however, explores pronouns in detail, stating that using the pronouns in the political discourse does not only reflect the traditional linguistic functions of person, number, and gender. Instead, they are involved in what is called "identity work" of presenting the "self" and the "other" (Bramley, 2001, p. V). (Jasim and Mustafa 2020:429)

Pronouns can be used to tell an audience that the speaker is on their side, that the speaker's opponent is not, and that the speaker is one with the audience. They can also be used to define the limits, who is and isn't included. In speech 2, Trump brings up his concerns about immigrants and the current border policies in place, describing both the immigrants and the current administration as *they* and separate from Trump and his audience.

Repetition is another important and often used rhetorical tool. Simply it can be defined as multiple occurrences of the exact same thing. In the examples I look at, this is mainly a word, phrase, or part of a phrase. Because repetition can be used to describe a large variety of things, there are terms used to describe various narrower types of repetition, including:

- Anaphora: deliberate and conscious repetition of the first part of a sentence or phrase to evoke certain emotions
- Antistrophe: deliberate repetition of words or phrases at the end of consecutive clauses
- Symploce: a word or phrase is repeated both at the beginning and the end of consecutive clauses

However, repetition is not necessarily as simple as the initial definition. Repetition plays a special part in rhetorical situations:

Repetition is generally defined as "doing, saying or writing the same thing more than once" (McArthur, 1992, p. 861). But in politics, repetition may hold a rhetorical dimension since it is used to enhance the process of perceiving the discourse and to draw

the recipients' attention. Besides, it is a strategic tool that manipulates the recipients to make up an "ideology" and convince them of its credibility (David, 2014, p. 167). (Jasim and Mustafa 2020:429)

This tool of repetition can be seen everywhere, especially in its role of manipulation, in both political and non-political situations. Ads for instance, are not just relying on interest with the first viewing instance. They are also relying on the repeated viewing or hearing of the ad to get their point across.

## 5 Analysis

The time has come to analyze the speeches, pulling out examples of where the use of rhetorical tools coincides with the use of the term *socialism* and other words directly associated with it. I will focus on three areas of use: repetition, war speech, and us vs. them. There are more rhetorical tools than the ones listed in 4.2, and there are more instances of these tools uses than the ones I have pulled out for examples. However, these tools and these examples provide critical insight into the rhetorical patterns of Republican politicians.

### 5.1 Repeat: Socialism

The terms *socialist* and *socialism* are used 45 times in these speeches as opposed to the 7 uses of *communism* and *communist*, and 2 uses of *Marxist*. Although a part of this difference may be attributed to the sample selection process, that is clearly not the only thing at play. The regular usage of the term *socialist* on its own may be considered use of the tool of repetition. However, regular usage is not necessarily as much intentional repetition as it is regular use of a defined term. Better for identifying the use of the rhetorical tool, intentional repetition can be quite noticeable. Each of the three consecutive sentences in (1) have *socialism* in them:

- (1) They peddle dangerous ideologies, cower to global progressives, and normalize socialism to dismantle our constitution. Let me assure you, socialism doesn't offer opportunity. socialism deprives. (Speech 11: Jeanette Nunez)

This repetition has to be intentional, even if only for the third, because of the way that we normally replace known information with pronouns in regular English speech. For me, and many others it is much more comfortable to replace the final *socialism* in (1) with *it*, because of the assumed known information, so its retention is intentional, and used to draw special attention to the term. A similar pattern can be seen in (2):

- (2) Very simply, you will decide whether your children will grow up in a socialist country or whether they will grow up in a free country, and I will tell you this, socialist is just the beginning for these people. These people wanna go further than socialism. (Speech 1)

Although the first and second instances of the term do not seem forced (though the second is a bit awkward), the third in some way doesn't fit right. As before, if it were following the usual patterns of English speech, the final *socialism*<sup>5</sup> would be replaced with an appropriate pronoun. Repetition like this is used to more concretely direct the focus at the repeated term since the audience cannot forget it when it is being constantly repeated, over and over. This coupled with the ad campaigns, television discussions, news articles, etc. which all also use the term, drilling it into the heads of the audience until, like a radio jingle or television catchphrase, it gets permanently lodged in the listeners' minds.

## 5.2 Warlike Speech

Many of these speeches use the language of war, not just to discuss actual wars (which are brought up multiple times), but as a metaphor for things in the political sphere especially in relation to election processes. The use of warlike speech to discuss politics can be obvious, as will be seen in the following subsections, or it can be a more subtle association, as (3) shows. This quote is located immediately after a discussion of the American military in the preceding years. The direct shift into a discussion of politics leaves the audience in the mindset of war allowing for the association to take place without directly calling politics a *battleground*.

- (3) But if and when military force is needed we should use overwhelming force, kill the enemy, and then get the heck out. [applause] So let's talk politics. (Speech 5: Ted Cruz)

I want to focus especially on two aspects of warlike speech I noticed in the speeches. The first is the use of various forms of the terms *radical* and *extremist* to describe the political opponents of the speakers. The second is the many appearances of forms of *fight* throughout the speeches and the different ways that it is used.

### 5.2.1 Radical and Extreme

The terms *radical* and *extremist* (and their other forms) are regularly used to describe Democrats and their policies throughout the speeches. These terms are closely related as can be seen by the Merriam-Webster entries for *extremism*<sup>6</sup> and *radical*<sup>7</sup> which have the other terms in

---

<sup>5</sup> Some might argue that this does not work since the first two are *socialist* and the final is *socialism*, but just because it shifted from being a term that describes an individual who practices socialism to the term for the theory itself, does not mean that the information is lost by the audience.

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/extremist>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/radical>



their definition or synonym. Especially important to these instances, the terms *radical* and *extremist* have regularly been used to describe terrorists and enemies of the United States, bringing a negative connotation to many uses of the term (especially for *extremism*). The use of these terms as descriptors for *socialism* and Democrats is therefore lexicalization, associating their negative connotations with the things they are modifying. (4) is a great example of this.

- (4) Kelly's opponent, Raphael Warnock, is a dangerous extremist, who is radically opposed to your values. (Speech 1)

*Extremist*, modified by *dangerous* to add emphasis, is used by Trump to describe Warnock, a Democrat. This can lead the audience to associate what they consider an *extremist*, especially a *dangerous* one, to be with the person it is describing. In addition, the use of *radically* also adds emphasis especially when in association with the other terms. Over and over these terms are used throughout the speeches, this repetition solidifying the association between the meanings of *radical* and *extremist* and Democrats or the left or *socialism*.

- (5) When the Democrats tried to order me around, I was ready, willing and able to say I've had enough with their radical socialist agenda. Do you really believe Joe Biden is ready, willing and most of all able to do the same? As Joe says, "Come on man." Joe Biden is being told what to do by the radicals running my former party, the same radicals trying to install him as their puppet president. (Speech 13: Jeff Van Drew)

In (5) we see this repetitive use of *radical* playing a few different roles here. It is associating the connotation of *radical* with both *socialism* and *Democrats*, as well as associating *socialism* and *Democrats* with each other (with the help of *their*). In the last sentence of (5), *radical*, instead of directly modifying a term, is used in the noun form to remove any words which could dampen the desired effect of the use of *radical*.

### 5.2.2 Fighting for...

Various forms of *fight* appear 22 times across the excerpts from nine of the speeches. Though not all relating to the Republican-Democrat relationship, many of these and the other mentions of war and uses of warlike speech are used to describe this relationship. This is mainly done by using these terms in relation to the election process or in relation to devil terms such as *communism*, *leftist*, or *socialist*. However, some of the appearances are not directly correlated to this relationship, though through interpretation they could be.

- (6) We must fight to save America now or we may lose her forever. (Speech 10: Matt Gaetz)

In (6) there is no direct reference to who they are fighting against, but both because this was spoken in a political context (at RNC) and because the *fight* is for America it can be inferred that the "enemy" is either a party or policies referenced in other parts of the speech. Another example of this unspoken enemy can be found in a quote from a 2020 speech by Mike Pence:

- (7) Every day, President Trump has been fighting to protect the promise of America. Every day our president has been fighting to expand the reach of the American dream. Every day, President Donald Trump has been fighting for you, and now it's our turn to fight for him. (Speech 6)

Just in this one quote from Pence, the use of the tools anaphora, tricolon, and climax can be seen. Three times Pence repeats practically the same clause, switching out only the thing being fought for, and once, in the second occurrence, the subject, though what is substituted means almost exactly the same thing. This tricolon of phrases with repeated wording, finds climax in the inversion of the last of this clause's repetitions, from Trump fighting for the audience to the audience fighting for him.

In addition, the use of pronouns here is important. As I noted before in passing, in the second repetition of the clause Pence says *our president* instead of *President Trump*. Although to some this may seem like a trivial change just to give a little variation, the use of *our* reminds the audience of their relationship to the president. It means that Trump is not just some random president who may or may not be at all related to or interested in the audience, to someone who has a particular relationship with and cares about the audience. This is further reinforced by the use of *you* in the third repetition of the clause.

There are two directions of the use of *fight* which I want to focus on. The first is its use in relation to devil terms. It is quite logical that the use of warlike speech would appear when referencing devil terms as they are considered entirely opposite to what the particular group upholds and considers right. In the case of Republicans the devil terms take forms such as *socialist*, *communism*, or *leftist*, and this association between devil terms and warlike speech can be seen throughout the speeches.

- (8) President Trump fights against communism in America's backyard and around the world. (Speech 13: Senator Tom Cotton)
- (9) We're fighting a campaign against leftist, socialist, and globalists who want to return to reckless wars, open borders, rampant crime, and totally disastrous one way trade deals. (Speech 9: Donald Trump)

(8) and (9) are clear uses of this, and are especially obvious in their intent. These speakers frame their political party's work as a fight against the things represented by the devil terms. Because these devil terms have been regularly used to describe specific Democrats or the

Democratic party as a whole, their use in these sentences can carry the interpretation that the fight referenced is with the Democrats. This is especially true for (8) as it is clearly describing a political campaign.

The other main direction of warlike speech is to do with elections, and a large portion of the use of *fight* is to do with this. This view that the elections are a battle between parties is not new, nor is it restricted to a particular party. The use of warlike speech to discuss the elections emphasizes and perpetuates the idea that people and candidates from opposing parties are enemies, creating division and making it more difficult to imagine a unified country.

(10) We fight. If you don't get out and vote, they're going to win. (Speech 1: Donald Trump)

(11) We can fight for the presidency and fight to elect our two great senators, and we can do it at the same time. (Speech 1: Donald Trump)

Both (10) and (11) show this use of *fight* in relation to elections which has become natural in the political rhetoric of the United States. The use of pronouns is especially important in these lines, as they are reminding the audience who is on their side and who isn't, as well as emphasizing this division between parties. "We fight or they win" makes it clear that there is no overlap or reconciliation of interests, while also focusing on a sense of urgency about this election (more in 5.3.3).

### **5.3 America and the American**

Now, I want to look at the pictures of America painted by these speakers. This includes what they see America to be now, what they think America should be, and what they think America will be under President Joe Biden and the Democrats. The speakers want to show that their direction for the country is the correct one and in line with the audience's views of what it should be. For this they regularly use the ultimate terms and pronouns to create this black and white contrast between the two futures of the country depending on which party wins.

#### *5.3.1 What is and should be American?*

In defining what America is and the direction it should go, speakers often use god terms and charismatic terms such as *freedom*, *liberty*, *hope*, and *prosperity*. In (12) we also see a contrast between these and devil terms to remind their audience what will happen if their opposition wins.

(12) Forward in freedom or backward in socialism. Forward in prosperity, or backward in poverty. Forward in personal liberty, or backwards in more government control. I know

which direction I'm headed. Join us as the best is yet to come. (Speech 13: Kevin McCarthy)

Although (12) does not explicitly say which political party is headed in which directions, these are implied by both the use of pronouns and ultimate terms. The second sentence "I know which direction I'm headed" locates McCarthy and his party, especially with the use of *forward* and *backward* in the preceding sentences. Because god terms are interpreted as ultimate good and devil terms as ultimate bad, the assumption is made that McCarthy would never associate himself with the devil terms. This assumption is confirmed through the use of *forward*, a direction usually assumed as positive, with the god or charismatic terms and *backward*, usually viewed as negative, for the devil terms.

### 5.3.2 *What they want to do to America*

There are many examples within these speeches of what will apparently happen if the Democrats win elections. Again we find abundant use of ultimate terms and pronouns within these descriptions. However, these do not usually have contrasts between god terms and devil terms within the same sentences like what was seen in 5.3.1. There is also strong reference to the "American dream", an idealized image of what America and being an American is supposed to be.

(13) They want to take away your jobs, take away your borders, take away your freedom, take away your religion, and they want to take away your beautiful Christmas that we just got back. (Speech 1: Donald Trump)

(14) This Election is about the radical left movement that hates America and wants to erase our history and wipe away everything we hold dear. (Speech 1: Donald Trump)

(15) They're gonna tear down a statue of Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, desecrate the most beautiful pieces of art, and they represent our country. (Speech 1: Donald Trump)

These three examples from Speech 1 describe a wide range of consequences of electing Democrats, but all share the theme that Democrats, the opposing party, have plans that would destroy the American dream and the country as it is supposed to be. In addition to the use of devil terms, there is an abundance of pronoun use. Within the scope of these quotations only (14) directly states who would be doing the actions described. In the other examples, *they* takes on this role. The use of pronouns here is to clearly define the separation of the speaker and audience, *we*, from the Democrats, *they*. *They* are in opposition to *us* and "everything we hold dear" and, as we will see in 5.3.3, must be stopped.

### 5.3.3 No Middle Ground

A final aspect I want to discuss surrounding the image of America and the American political sphere painted in these speeches is the extremely binary way in which the outcomes are described. The picture painted is one of certainty that the outcomes described will come to be if the Democrats take power.

(16) If you don't vote, the socialists and the communists win. (Speech 1: Donald Trump)

(17) No matter what label they use, a vote for any Democrat in 2020 is a vote for the rise of radical socialism and the destruction of the American dream. (Speech 8: Donald Trump)

(16) and (17) are clear demonstrations of this in relation to elections, but examples can also be found in previous examples such as (12) and (15). Here, Trump's words show an absolute certainty of what a Democratic win means for the future of America. There is no ambiguity, nor is there a spectrum. If any Democrat takes power in any position, it spells another step toward the destruction of America.

## 6 Discussion

Having looked closely at the use of rhetorical tools in the selected speeches, it is time to turn the focus from the direct application of these tools, and, returning to the theoretical background from section 2, shift to a deeper discussion of the implications of their use.

### 6.1 A certain frame of mind

First, let us explore how the rhetorical tools are used to put the audience in a particular frame of mind. The simplest example of this would be the use of warlike speech. As noted before, by associating the American political sphere with ideas of war it makes it possible for politicians to suggest that the opposition is an enemy it is necessary to defeat, and that integration or compromise will not solve the issue.

Pronouns delineate *us* and *them*. Informing the audience of who is on their side and who isn't. Pronouns are also used to remind the audience that the opposition is working against what they hold dear. This use of pronouns creates a division within the country by implying that Democrats and Republicans are on opposing sides and cannot be reconciled to each other. When combined with warlike speech this leads to the view that the opposing party is an enemy which must be utterly defeated.

These views reflect and are reflected in the binary descriptions of elections and outcomes. There is nothing in between winning and losing and it is therefore even more important and even more urgent that the right people win. To emphasize this, speakers use lexicalization and ultimate terms so that the audience can have no confusion as to who is "good" and who isn't.

All this is done to direct the audience's anger and outrage toward the opposing party and then giving their own party and its agendas as the solutions. In these speeches we see over and over that Democrats are framed in a negative light through their association with the terms *socialism* and *extremist* and their connotations, as well as being described as working toward the destruction of the American dream. This contrasts significantly with the depictions of Republicans and their party agenda found in the speeches. Seen all together, it is clear the ways in which the rhetorical tools are used to focus and manipulate the audience's emotions.

## 6.2 Backing up claims

Next, it is important to address how these speeches seem to prove: the third kind of means of persuasion. The nature of political speeches is to prove to the audience both the importance of voting and the importance of voting for the speaker or the person the speaker is endorsing. These speeches are never ambiguous about their attempt to do so, and are filled with claims which seem to prove these points. The examples in 5.3 are just a few instances of the use of comparison between (apparent) Democratic and Republican futures for the United States being used to prove the importance of voting for the Republicans.

In addition to the comparison between the parties, there is direct comparison between candidates present in the speeches. The excerpts from Speech 1 are full of these comparisons due to the subject of the speech being about the need for voters to vote for the Republican candidates in the 2020 Senate runoffs in Georgia. One of the examples from this speech, (4), shows the comparison quite clearly, especially when looked within the speech as a whole which includes many moments where Trump talks directly about the character of various candidates. Trump tells the audience the many reasons he likes the Republican candidates. At the same time he regularly returns to the idea that the Democratic party and its candidates are *radical*, *extremist*, *socialist*, and want to "wipe away everything we hold dear" (Speech 1).

This focus on character and intent is meant to prove how important it is for the audience to vote for these Republican candidates, and these claims would seem to prove it. However, within these claims there is an implicit assumption that the audience believes the truth of these claims. Part of that is found in the assumption that the audience trusts the speaker, but it is even more deeply embedded in the doctrine shared between the speaker and audience. The speaker is assuming that the audience needs little or no data or examples to back up these claims about what Democrats want to do and the character of the Democrats described. It leaves out information that others would normally assume to be critical in proving the points made, showing just how reliant on the shared doctrine these speakers are. There is, of course, variation in reliance on the doctrine between the speeches, corresponding to variation in the audiences.

## 7 Conclusion

Having analyzed the speeches both wholly and closely, it is time to bring this thesis to a close. Out of the many directions this research could have gone, I have chosen to focus in on the window of analysis created by a focus on the use of *socialism* by Republican politicians. Many interesting aspects had to be left out both because of this and the timeframe, so before I write about the importance of this analysis, I want to reflect on some of the weaknesses of the thesis, as well as some directions of future research which lead out of these weaknesses.

### 7.1 Weaknesses and Future Directions

One way in which this analysis has suffered is through the choice to only look at transcripts and not prosody. Being a "speech" and not just a piece of writing, the oral aspect of speeches is important. We have, at one point or another, heard speeches delivered, and, I would think, have paid more attention to those that are more dynamic, with changes in tone and speed, than those speeches that are monotone. However, my analysis is focused entirely on the words of the speech and how they are used semantically, syntactically, pragmatically, etc., and have left out the prosodic aspect. This leads my analysis to lack an important part, since prosody is part of the second means of persuasion.<sup>8</sup> What is the intonation of the words *socialist* or *extremist* in these speeches? How loud are these words said, especially in comparison to their surroundings? What about rhythm? These are just some of the ways in which this analysis could be enhanced through prosodic analysis of the speeches. There were also other rhetorical tools I did not explore, and concepts such as dog whistles which a discussion of would have added depth to the analysis.

In addition, the sample for this was not ideal in many ways. I analyzed only thirteen transcripts, six of which were from the 2020 RNC. In addition, Donald Trump is a speaker for five of the transcripts. This creates a certain amount of bias since I set forth not to analyze Donald Trump's rhetoric, but the rhetoric of a wider set of Republicans. Both because this is a qualitative analysis and because of the wide variety of voices within the Republican party, I do not see this bias as avoidable, however I feel it is important to recognize it.

Polarizing language is not used by only the Republicans in America. Though also mainly focused on Republicans, Valentino-DeVries and Eder (2022) reminds us that Democrats also use polarizing language. Therefore it would be useful in the future to repeat this analysis with a wider sample including speeches across all American political parties, to see how the use of rhetorical tools is consistent across the parties, as well as how it differs between them. Depending on the focus another future direction of this analysis could be to look at Republican rhetoric surrounding the term *socialism* along the whole history of the term. This would be to see

---

<sup>8</sup> As one Eddie Izzard sketch seems to show (<https://youtu.be/MwpuJoIvMyA>), the way you look and sound can sometimes be as or more important than the actual words used.

if there have been any shifts in the rhetorical tools used over time and the implications of those shifts.

Finally, this thesis focused on some of the strategies used in the attempt to influence the audience of a speech, and did not look at the actual effects of these attempts. It is important to know not just the strategies at play but the effectiveness of these strategies. Therefore this would be another useful direction for future research.

There are many directions of research and analysis I would have liked to explore within this thesis, but for the time I had to write it, certain compromises had to be made so that the thesis would be manageable. Even so, I have found useful and important aspects to analyze within the confines of these pages.

## **7.2 Why Is This Important?**

I want to end this thesis with an explanation of the importance of such research. I have described the theories which directed my interests and focus, from Aristotle to Hart. I explained some of the different ways *socialism* is understood and viewed throughout America. From there, I have described some rhetorical tools and used them to analyze excerpts from the selected speeches. This includes a look at repetition, warlike speech, and the depictions of America and its future under two opposing political parties. Finally, I have taken a step back from the analysis in section 5 to look at how these rhetorical tools are being used together as means of persuasion. But why is analysis such as this important?

The rhetorical tools being used are not exclusive to Republican rhetoric, nor are the ways they are being used. However, audiences are usually not aware of the level to which these tools are being used in the attempt at persuasion. Therefore, this analysis is to bring greater awareness to some of the intricate ways these rhetorical tools are used.

For some this awareness may take the form of learning how these rhetorical tools are used and adopting them. For others this awareness will take the form of more closely scrutinizing their use and learning ways to better counter them. In a country where every election plays an important role in the formation of policies and the future of its citizens, it is crucial to know what strategies are effective and what strategies are being used to persuade voters.



## Appendix: Transcripts

Timestamps: (hh:mm:ss)

### Speech 1: President Trump Campaigns for U.S. Senate Runoffs in Georgia

Speaker: Donald Trump

December 5, 2020

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?506972-1/president-trump-campaigns-us-senate-runoffs-georgia>

(00:12:30) and this is something that is very important, and you have to get out and you have to vote. You have to make sure you have every vote counted, every vote has to count. You gotta make sure they don't throw away any ballots. You gotta make sure when they collect the ballots and they start bragging about how many ballots they already have, you gotta make sure your secretary of state knows what the hell he's doing, and you got to make sure your governor gets a lot tougher than he's been, he's gotta get a lot tougher, because at stake in this election is control of the U.S. senate, and that really means control of this country. The voters of Georgia will determine which party runs every committee, writes every piece of legislation, controls every single taxpayer dollar. Very simply, you will decide whether your children will grow up in a socialist country or whether they will grow up in a free country, and I will tell you this, socialist is just the beginning for these people. These people wanna go further than socialism. They want to go into a communistic form of government, I have no doubt about that [crowd booing]. Somehow that doesn't suit Georgia too well. That doesn't work too well, I think Kelly, in Georgia, does it? David and Kelly are running against radical Jon Ossoff and Raphael Warnock. [crowd booing]

(00:13:51) Ossoff and Warnock are the two most extreme far left liberal senate candidates in the history of our country and you got them both at one time. How did that happen? I think you both got lucky, but we will see, right? You must go vote and vote early, starting December 14. You have to do it. They cheated and they rigged our presidential election, but we will still win it. we will still win it. [cheering]. We'll still win it. and they are going to try to rig this election, too. [chanting]

(00:44:00) If the other side manages to steal both elections, we will have total one-party socialist control, and everything you care about will be gone, your whole philosophy is gonna be gone. Joe Biden, Kamala, Kamala[unclear]. Crying Chuck Schumer and Nancy Pelosi. They want to take away your guns. I never got it. I never got it. That's one of the reasons I knew. How can you win? No oil, no guns, no god. How they won. I don't think so. Okay? I don't know. We knew that a long time ago. They want to take away your jobs, take away your borders, take away your freedom, take away your religion, and they want to take away your beautiful Christmas that we just got back.

(00:47:32) And I have to give a lot of credit to Carl Allen and the New York Post for what they did, because they went out and they fought them, and they fought them hard. Oldest paper in America, fourth or fifth biggest, and they should be very proud of themselves. But we're doing

the same thing. These two incredible people are doing the same thing. we fight. If you don't get out and vote, they're going to win. Now you know a lot of people, friends of mine, say, "let's not vote. We're not gonna vote. Cause we're angry about the presidential election." And they're friends of mine. They're people that are great people. They're real friends and more than just two. There are numerous people. And It's almost like a protest. But if you do that the radical left wins. Okay? It was sort of an instinct of mine, you know, you're angry because so many votes were stolen or was taken away, and you say, "well we're not gonna do it." We can't do that. We have to actually do just the opposite. we can't do that. We can't do that. We have to do just the opposite. If you don't vote, the socialists and the communists win. They win. Georgia patriots must show up and vote for these two incredible people. And I'm telling you they're two of the finest people you'll ever meet. We can fight for the presidency and fight to elect our two great senators, and we can do it at the same time. [...] This Election is about the radical left movement that hates America and wants to erase our history and wipe away everything we hold dear. They want to rip down our statues. You know I signed a bill. I took an old bill, because we could never get it today in the house headed by crazy Nancy. I took an old bill that said, "10 years in prison" (they use the word prison not jail) "10 years in prison if you take down a statue." I haven't seen it happen lately. Did you notice? [cheering] everyone said, "you can't use that." I'll never forget. I heard they were gonna.. You know they did destruction around... and all the radical left Democrat run cities, by the way, and we're not supposed to go in. If I had to do it again I think I would have sent the military in, you wanna know the truth. We're not supposed to. They're supposed to be able to handle their own affairs. I don't know. But, but, all over they said, "sir, you can't do this bill, it's too tough." I said "Really? They're gonna tear down a statue of Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, desecrate the most beautiful pieces of art, and they represent our country." And now they wanna do it again, they wanna put it in. I told you we can't let it happen.

(01:04:25) Kelly's opponent, Raphael Warnock, is a dangerous extremist, who is radically opposed to your values. He said he believes that, quote, "nobody can serve God and the military." Oh really? An appalling statement that dishonors the memory and generations of American heroes who fought for God and for our country. Raphael Warnock has openly declared his support for socialism, and he has even praised Marxists all over the world. He once hosted the barbaric communistic dictator Fidel Castro. He likes Castro, he thinks he was a good man, he was a good guy, he said. He falsely slandered patriotic Americans as racists. He called police officers gangsters, thugs, and bullies. He supports abolishing cash bail. look what happened to New York with their cash bail, no cash bail, no bail, don't worry about it. You kill somebody, don't worry about it, you're on the honor code. And he's declared, quote, "open up the jails, free the violent criminals, and prey on Georgia, families, children." No, you can't do that. This is not for Georgia, I'm telling you. It might be for some places. And I'll tell you, this is not for Georgia.

## **Speech 2: Former President Trump's 2024 Campaign Announcement**

Speaker: Donald Trump

November 15, 2022

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?524197-1/president-trump-announces-candidacy-president-2024>

(00:38:17) When they won we will end Joe Biden's American war on American energy. And you will see when that happens, you will see energy costs come down, and because energy is so big and so important, you will see inflation dropping, dropping, dropping, dropping. You will see a come down, it's a thing of beauty, and you wouldn't think it's that complicated. Now, what has been complicated, a little bit, is what has happened to so many other things, I believe originally started by this energy disaster. We were a dollar eighty-seven a gallon for gasoline, and now it is sitting, five, six, seven, and even eight dollars and it is gonna go really bad. The socialist disaster, known as the Green New Deal, which is destroying our country and the many crippling regulations that it has spawned will be immediately terminated so that our country can again breathe and grow, and thrive like it should. [applause] It's very, very much hurting our country. (00:42:21) [...] When they came in they had three more weeks to complete the additions to the wall, which would have been great, and they said, "no, no, we're not gonna do that." and that's when I realized that they actually want to have this disaster known as open borders. hard to believe, isn't it. But one of the reasons we had so much success at the border was because of the fact that, two things: we got Mexico to give us, free of charge, 28,000 soldiers. That helps. And president of Mexico is a great gentleman by the way. Socialist, but that's ok, you can't have everything. But he is a great man and a great friend of mine. But 28 thousand soldiers while we were building the wall, and then when the wall was finished, that is how we set all these records, we have records that nobody can even compete with. Right now it's a disaster. I believe it's 10 million people coming in, not 3 or 4 million people. They're pouring into our country. We have no idea who they are and where they come from. We have no idea what's happening to our country. We're being poisoned. Within moments of my inauguration, catch and release will be gone forever.

## **Speech 3: Trump Campaign Rally Opening**

Speaker: John H. Sununu

November 7, 2016

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?418203-101/trump-campaign-rally-opening>

(00:33:21) I get asked by the press all the time, "how come you're voting for Donald Trump? How come you're supporting Donald Trump?" and I tell them, "It's very easy. Hilary Clinton makes it easy to support Donald Trump. We have never had a candidate running on the Democratic side that is as close to a full bred socialist as Hilary Clinton. Her two favorite surrogates are the self avowed socialist Bernie Sanders and the not so quite self avowed socialist Elizabeth Warren. That's all you need to know. But there's another reason. The Clinton operation

for a quarter century has instilled in the democratic party a culture of corruption that is unbelievable.

#### **Speech 4: Donald Trump Campaign Event in Westfield, Indiana**

Speaker: Mike Pence

July 12, 2016

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?412572-1/governor-mike-pence-campaigns-donald-trump>

Donald Trump knows that the boundless potential of the American people awaits, and we can make America great again. so we must come together and elect this good man as our next president. We must select this strong leader for one more reason, because Hillary Clinton must never become president of the United States of America. [cheering] You know, you know, I heard Bernie Sanders endorse Hillary Clinton today. [booing] I actually served in congress with Bernie Sanders and let me tell you, he is the nicest socialist I ever served with in Washington, D.C. You know, Hillary and her party have been sliding so far to Bernie's leftist agenda, it's hard to keep track of it. the truth of the matter is i just have to tell you from my heart, after looking at the direction that their party has gone, farther and farther to the left, to paraphrase the director of the FBI, I think it would be extremely careless to elect Hillary Clinton as the next president of the united states. You know, we don't need a president who sees Obama care as just a good start. We don't need a president who promises to put coal miners out of work and raise the utility rates of hard-working Americans. and as the proud father of a United States marine, let me say from my heart we don't need a president who took 13 hours to send help to Americans under fire, and after four brave Americans fell, said what difference at this point does it make.

#### **Speech 5: Senator Ted Cruz Remarks in Milwaukee**

Speaker: Ted Cruz

April 1, 2016

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?407498-3/senator-ted-cruz-remarks-milwaukee-republican-party-dinner>

(00:27:08) But I'll tell you, sheriff, for the jihadists across the face of the globe, come January 2017, a day of reckoning is coming. [applause] We are not gonna weaken, we are not gonna degrade, we are goin' to utterly and completely destroy ISIS. [applause] And you know one of the most shameful aspects of the last seven years has been this president sending our fighting men and women into combat with rules of engagement so strict that their arms are tied behind their back, that they cannot fight, they cannot win, they cannot defeat the enemy. That is wrong, it is immoral, and come 2017, it will end. [applause] America has always been reluctant to use military force. We are slow to anger. But if and when military force is needed we should use overwhelming force, kill the enemy, and then get the heck out. [applause] So let's talk politics. A year ago we had 17 Republican candidates in the field. It was an amazingly diverse, young,

talented, dynamic field. What a contrast with the democrats. [?] The democratic field consists of a wild-eyed socialist with ideas that are dangerous for America and the world and Bernie Sanders. [laughter] [applause] But over the course of the year we've seen what a primary is supposed to do, the field has narrowed. The field has narrowed, and where are we now? Where we are today is there are two candidates that have any plausible path to winning the Republican nomination, me and Donald Trump. Now, Wisconsin is a battleground. The entire country, its eyes are on the great state of Wisconsin.

### **Speech 6: Mike Pence 2020 RNC Speech**

Speaker: Mike Pence

Aug 26, 2020

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/mike-pence-2020-rnc-speech-transcript>

In this election it's not so much whether America will be more conservative or more liberal, more Republican or more Democrat. The choice in this election is whether America remains America. It's whether we will leave to our children and our grandchildren a country grounded in our highest ideals of freedom, free markets and the unalienable right to life and Liberty, or whether we will leave them a country that's fundamentally transformed into something else. We stand at a crossroads, America. President Trump has set our nation on a path of freedom and opportunity. Joe Biden would set America on a path of socialism and decline, but we're not going to let it happen. President Donald Trump believes in America and in the goodness of the American people, the boundless potential of every American to live out their dreams and freedom. Every day, President Trump has been fighting to protect the promise of America. Every day our president has been fighting to expand the reach of the American dream. Every day, President Donald Trump has been fighting for you, and now it's our turn to fight for him.

### **Speech 7: Lara Trump 2020 RNC Speech**

Speaker: Lara Trump

Aug 26, 2020

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/lara-trump-2020-rnc-speech-transcript>

(00:03:37) This is not just a choice between Republican and Democrat or left and right, this is an election that will decide if we keep America America, or if we head down an uncharted frightening path towards socialism. Abraham Lincoln once famously said, America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves. While those words were spoken over 150 years ago, never have they been more relevant. Will we choose the right path and maintain the unique freedoms and boundless opportunities that make this country the greatest in the history of the world? Will we remain the beacon of hope for those around the world fighting oppression, communism, and tyranny? The choice is ours. I know the promise of America because I've lived it, not just as a member of the

Trump family, but as a woman who knows what it's like to work in blue collar jobs, to serve customers for tips, and to aspire to rise.

### **Speech 8: Donald Trump New Mexico Rally**

September 17, 2019

Speaker: Donald Trump

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-new-mexico-rally-transcript-full-speech-transcript>

(01:16:20) Virtually, every top Democrat also now supports late-term abortion, ripping babies straight from the mothers right up until the moment of birth, and that's why I've asked Congress to prohibit extreme late-term abortion because Republicans believe that every child is a sacred gift from God. It's true. Right? I see it. Just like mom, I see it. Democrats are now the party of high taxes, high crime, open borders, late-term abortion, and socialism.

(01:26:09) No matter what label they use, a vote for any Democrat in 2020 is a vote for the rise of radical socialism and the destruction of the American dream. That's what it's about. Look at Venezuela. Venezuela, 15 years ago, was one of the wealthiest countries in the world and today, very sad. No food, no water, no nothing. Socialism. We begin this campaign with the best record, the best results, the best agenda, and the only positive vision for America. And it's not just a little bit positive. Our country is going to be greater than it ever was. That's where we're headed.

### **Speech 9: Donald Trump Dallas Rally Speech**

October 17, 2019

Speaker: Donald Trump

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-dallas-rally-speech-transcript-october-17-2019>

(00:05:52) Crazy Nancy. Think of that. That crazy Nancy. She is crazy. And shifty Schiff. How about this guy? He makes up my conversation, which was perfect. He makes up my conversation. He sees what I said. It doesn't play well because it was perfect. So he made up a totally false conversation with the Ukrainian president and we caught him cold. Everybody knew it anyway. See, we did one thing. You always have to do the unexpected. They never thought I'd released the conversation with the Ukrainian president. I want to get him before Congress and I want to see what he has to say. You know, they say he has immunity. Why would you have immunity for outright fraud? Why do you have immunity? Why? He's a fraud. We're fighting a campaign against leftist, socialist, and globalists who want to return to reckless wars, open borders, rampant crime, and totally disastrous one way trade deals. We're changing that one around very quickly.

### Speech 10: 2020 Republican National Convention (RNC) Night 1

Included speakers: Matt Gaetz, Vernon Jones, Kimberly Guilfoyle, Nikki Haley, and Senator Tim Scott.

Aug 25, 2020

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/2020-republican-national-convention-rnc-night-1-transcript>

- Matt Gaetz
  - (00:44:48) President Trump is the first president since Reagan not to start a new war. Biden has foolishly cheered decades of war without winning, without end. President Trump knows we are strongest when we fight hardest, not in distant deserts, but for our fellow Americans. We must fight to save America now or we may lose her forever. Joe Biden might not even notice. Settle for Biden, that's the hashtag promoted by AOC and the socialists. The woketopians will settle for Biden because they will make him an extra in a movie written, produced, and directed by others. It's a horror film really. They'll disarm you, empty the prisons, lock you in your home and invite MS-13 to live next door.
- Vernon Jones
  - (01:31:11) The democratic party has become infected with a pandemic of intolerance, bigotry, socialism, anti law enforcement bias, and a dangerous tolerance for people who attack others, destroy their property and terrorize our own communities. That's what this election is all about. That's why right now, more than ever, more than ever before, America needs Donald Trump in the oval office for another four years. God bless you and vote Donald J. Trump. Thank you.
- Kimberly Guilfoyle
  - (01:42:36) Good evening, America. I'm Kimberly Guilfoyle. I speak to you tonight as a mother, a former prosecutor, a Latina, and a proud American and yes, a proud supporter of President Donald J. Trump. Why? Because he is the president who delivers for America. He built the greatest economy the world has ever known for the strivers, the working class and middle class. As commander in chief, he always puts America first. President Trump is the law and order president. Now, presidential leadership is not guaranteed. It is a choice. Biden, Harris and the rest of the socialists will fundamentally change this nation. They want open borders, closed schools, dangerous amnesty, and will selfishly send your jobs back to China while they get rich. They will defund, dismantle and destroy America's law enforcement. When you are in trouble and need police, don't count on the Democrats.
  - (01:43:46) As a first generation American, I know how dangerous their socialist agenda is. My mother, Mercedes, was a special education teacher from Aguadilla, Puerto Rico. My father, also an immigrant, came to this nation in pursuit of the

American dream. Now, I consider it my duty to fight to protect that dream. Rioters must not be allowed to destroy our cities. Human sex drug traffickers should not be allowed to cross our border. The same socialist policies, which destroyed places like Cuba and Venezuela must not take root in our cities and our schools. If you want to see the socialized Biden-Harris future for our country, just take a look at California. It is a place of immense wealth, immeasurable innovation and immaculate environment and the Democrats turned it into a land of discarded heroin needles in parks, riots in streets and blackouts in homes. In President Trump's America, we light things up. We don't dim them down. We build things up. We don't burn down. We build things up. We don't burn them down.

- Nikki Haley
  - (02:18:15) A Biden/Harris administration would be much, much worse. Last time, Joe's boss was Obama. This time it would be Pelosi, Sanders, and the squad. Their vision for America is socialism and we know that socialism has failed everywhere. They want to tell Americans how to live, what to think. They want a government takeover of healthcare. They want to ban fracking and kill millions of jobs. They want massive tax hikes on working families. Joe Biden, and the socialist left would be a disaster for our economy, but President Trump is leading a new era of opportunity. Before communist China gave us the coronavirus, we were breaking economic records left and right. The pandemic has set us back, but not for long. President Trump brought our economy back before and he will bring it back again.
- Sen. Tim Scott
  - (02:48:37) Ladies and gentlemen, people don't always see those failures because they think we're having a policy debate on two sides of an issue, that is not what is happening. Our side is working on policy, while Joe Biden's radical Democrats are trying to permanently transform what it means to be an American. Make no mistake, Joe Biden and Kamala Harris want a cultural revolution, a fundamentally different America. If we let them, they will turn our country into a socialist utopia. And history has taught us that path only leads to pain and misery, especially for hardworking people hoping to rise. Instead, we must focus on the promise of the American journey. I know that journey well. My grandfather's 99th birthday would have been tomorrow. Growing up he had to cross the street if a white person was coming, he suffered the indignity of being forced out of school as a third grader to pick cotton and he never learned to read or write.

### **Speech 11: 2020 Republican National Convention (RNC) Night 2**

Included speakers: Rand Paul and Jeanette Nunez

Aug 26, 2020



<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/2020-republican-national-convention-rnc-night-2-transcript>

- Rand Paul
  - (00:24:05) To those of you who want to stand up and fight the socialists poisoning our schools and burning our cities, join me in supporting President Trump. Let's rebuild America together.
- Jeanette Nunez
  - (01:31:29) Fellow Americans, the fabric of our nation is in peril. Daily, the radical left systematically chisels away at the freedoms we cherish. They peddle dangerous ideologies, cower to global progressives, and normalize socialism to dismantle our constitution. Let me assure you, socialism doesn't offer opportunity. Socialism deprives. It is a falsehood that feigns promises for its masses and consistently yields only misery. President Ronald Reagan warned, "If we lose freedom here, there's no place to escape to." Truer words had never been spoken.
  - (01:33:50) We must continue to support our commander in chief who has a bold agenda that safeguards the rights and freedoms protected under our constitution. Today, more than ever, that means supporting our men and women in law enforcement and our heroes in uniform. It means fighting to provide the best quality education, by empowering parents and preserving school choice, and it means rejecting the socialist takeover of our nation that will destroy innovation, economic vitality, and freedoms we hold so dear.

### **Speech 12: 2020 Republican National Convention (RNC) Night 3**

Included speakers: Elise Stefanik, Burgess Owens, Madison Cawthorn, and Mike Pence

Aug 27, 2020

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/2020-republican-national-convention-rnc-night-3-transcript>

- Elise Stefanik
  - (01:04:26) This attack was not just on the president. It was an attack on you, your voice and your vote, but the American people were not swayed by these partisan attacks. Our support for President Trump is stronger than ever before. We know what's at stake in this historic election. Americans from all walks of life are unified in support of our president. It's why more Republican women than ever are running for office this year. We understand that this election is a choice between the far left Democratic socialist agenda versus protecting and preserving the American dream. President Trump is working to safely reopen our main street economy. He understands that the engine of our country is fueled by the ingenuity and determination of American workers, entrepreneurs, and small businesses. Joe Biden wants to keep them locked up in the basement and crush them with \$4 trillion in new taxes. We face a critical choice. Joe Biden's far left failed policies

of the past 47 years, or President Trump who will stand up for the American people and the Constitution.

- Burgess Owens
  - (01:29:33) This November, we stand at a crossroad. Mobs torch our cities while popular members of Congress promote the same socialism that my father fought against in World War II. We have a Democratic candidate for president who says that I'm not black if I don't vote for him. Now more than ever, we need leaders who stand by their principles, they won't compromise their values for political opportunities. Now more than ever, we need leaders who will stand up to the lawlessness supported by the radical left. This November, we have an opportunity to reject the mob mentality and once again be the America that my great great grandfather believed in. During the Trump administration, business ownership among blacks, Hispanics, and females have reached all time highs. Those same groups enjoyed record low unemployment and unprecedented prosperity, and we're just getting started. I ran for Congress because we don't need more career politicians, we need a few more chimney sweeps. We need more leaders like president Trump, who understand the freedoms that make up the fabric of America.
- Madison Cawthorn
  - (01:35:45) 100 years ago today, the 19th Amendment was ratified, granting the right to vote to every American woman. And since that day, incredible strides have been made by women in America. From Amelia Earhart to Rosa Parks and Sally Ride, women shaped our history and are part of what has made our country the most exceptional nation in the world. I often think back to my 24 year old self, driving alone in my car from North Carolina to New York City. And I think about what I'd tell myself now, as we head towards the most critical election in modern history. This is not just a choice between Republican and Democrat or left and right, this is an election that will decide if we keep America America, or if we head down an uncharted frightening path towards socialism. Abraham Lincoln once famously said, "America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroy it ourselves." While those words were spoken over 150 years ago, never have they been more relevant. Will we choose the right path and maintain the unique freedoms and boundless opportunities that make this country the greatest in the history of the world? Will we remain the beacon of hope for those around the world fighting oppression, communism, and tyranny? The choice is ours.

### **Speech 13: 2020 Republican National Convention (RNC) Night 4**

Included Speakers: [Unknown] Speaker 1, Kevin McCarthy, Jeff Van Drew, Rudy Giuliani, Senator Tom Cotton, and Donald Trump

Aug 28, 2020

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/2020-republican-national-convention-rnc-night-4-transcript>

- Speaker 1
  - (00:00:32) The freedom to do what is right and good, for yourself, for family. To reap the blessings of hard work, to accomplish dreams, to live securely, to help others, not by force of government, but by goodness of heart. Where rights are not granted by government or claimed by identities, but are unalienable as members of the human race. Today, America's greatness is challenged by those with extreme notions. Defunding law enforcement as lawlessness abounds. Hateful rhetoric, telling you what to wear and when you can work. Limiting free speech and freedom of worship. Old ideas of socialism repackaged in redefined words. Let us restore the values that made America great.
- Kevin McCarthy
  - (00:06:45) Joe Biden and Kamala Harris think this election is about the government. They're wrong. It's about your family and your future and to secure what really matters. We will call on the bedrock of what makes us the greatest country in the world, the American promise. A promise that everyone is equal under God, under the Constitution, and under the law. A promise that government is accountable to we the people, a promise that if you work hard and play by the rules, your opportunities are endless. As Republicans, it's our mission to renew the American dream, restore our way of life, and rebuild the greatest economy in the world. The socialist Democrats have a different agenda. They will dismantle our institutions, defund our police, and destroy our economy. So as you cast your vote this November, remember this. Four years ago, President Trump promised to be your voice. He kept that promise, but there's still so much more to do. The choice before you could not be clearer. Forward in freedom or backward in socialism. Forward in prosperity, or backward in poverty. Forward in personal liberty, or backwards in more government control. I know which direction I'm headed. Join us as the best is yet to come.
- Jeff Van Drew
  - (00:18:21) Soon after, I met with President Trump, and he made me feel more comfortable and welcome in the Oval Office than Nancy Pelosi ever made me feel in her caucus and a few days later, I officially changed parties and I became a Republican. Let me tell you about Joe Biden. When the Democrats tried to order me around, I was ready, willing and able to say I've had enough with their radical socialist agenda. Do you really believe Joe Biden is ready, willing and most of all able to do the same? As Joe says, "Come on man." Joe Biden is being told what to do by the radicals running my former party, the same radicals trying to install him as their puppet president. When I'm at my local diner, I tell people that America is

the best nation in the world and that President Trump has helped make it that way. Republicans, Independents, and even Democrats, they all know that in President Trump's America, we have a strong military, strong support for our police, strong support for our veterans, and strong support for our seniors. In President Trump's America, we have a strong supply chain, good schools, we're energy independent and we protect our environment.

- Rudy Giuliani
  - (01:06:25) New Yorkers wonder, "How did we get overwhelmed by crime so quickly, and to climb so fast?" Don't let Democrats do to America what they have done to New York. Again, the Democrats are urging you to vote for an obviously defective candidate. Biden has changed his principle so often, he no longer has any principles. He's a Trojan horse with Bernie, AOC, Pelosi, Black Lives Matter, and his party's entire left wing, just waiting to execute their pro-criminal, anti-police, socialist policies.
- Senator Tom Cotton
  - (01:14:16) So let's compare the records of Joe Biden and Donald Trump. Joe Biden slashed defense spending again and again. President Trump rebuilt our military, and added the space force. Joe Biden let ISIS terrorists rampage across the Middle East. President Trump eliminated ISIS's leader and destroyed its caliphate. Joe Biden opposed the mission to kill Osama bin Laden. President Trump avenge the murder of hundreds of Americans by killing Iran's terrorist mastermind, Qasim Solaimani. Joe Biden sent pallets of cash to the Ayatollahs. President Trump ripped up the dangerous Iran nuclear deal. Joe Biden treated Israel like a nuisance. President Trump moved our embassy to Jerusalem, and brokered peace deals in the Middle East. Joe Biden cuddled socialists dictators in Cuba and Venezuela. President Trump fights against communism in America's backyard and around the world.
- Donald Trump
  - (02:02:59) We will defeat the virus, end the pandemic, and emerge stronger than ever before. What united generations past was an unshakeable confidence in America's destiny and an unbreakable faith in the American people. They knew that our country is blessed by God and has a special purpose in this world. It is that conviction that inspired the formation of our union, our westward expansion, the abolition of slavery, the passage of civil rights, the Space Program and the overthrow of fascism, tyranny, and communism. This towering American spirit has prevailed over every challenge and lifted us to the summit of human endeavor. And yet, despite all of our greatness as a nation, everything we have achieved is now in danger. This is the most important election in the history of our country. Thank you. At no time before have voters faced a clearer choice between two parties, two visions, two philosophies, or two agendas. This election will decide

whether we save the American dream or whether we allow a socialist agenda to demolish our cherished destiny. It will decide whether we rapidly create millions of high paying jobs or whether we crush our industries and send millions of these jobs overseas as has foolishly been done for many decades. Your vote will decide whether we protect law-abiding Americans, or whether we give free reign to violent anarchists and agitators and criminals who threaten our citizens. And this election will decide whether we will defend the American way of life or whether we will allow a radical movement to dismantle and destroy it. It won't happen. At the Democrat National Convention, Joe Biden and his party repeatedly assailed America as a land of racial, economic, and social injustice. So tonight I ask you a simple question; how can the Democrat party ask to lead our country when it spends so much time tearing down our country?

- (02:38:09) Democrat leaders talk about moral decency, but they have no problem with stopping a baby's beating heart in the ninth month of pregnancy. Democrat politicians refuse to protect innocent life, and then they lecture us about morality and saving America's soul. Tonight, we proudly declare that all children born and unborn have a God-given right to life. During the Democrat Convention, the words under God were removed from the Pledge of Allegiance. Not once, but twice. We will never do that. But the fact is, this is where they're coming from. Like it or not, this is where they're coming from. If the left gains power, they will demolish the suburbs, confiscate your guns, and appoint justices who will wipe away your Second Amendment and other constitutional freedoms. Biden is a Trojan horse for socialism. If Joe Biden doesn't have the strength to stand up to wild eyed Marxists like Bernie Sanders and his fellow radicals, and there are many, there were many, many, we see them all the times. It's incredible, actually. Then, how is he ever going to stand up for you? He's not. The most dangerous aspect of the Biden platform is the attack on public safety. The Biden-Bernie manifesto calls for abolishing cash bail, immediately releasing 400,000 criminals onto the streets and into your neighborhoods. When asked if he supports cutting police funding, Joe Biden replied, "Yes, absolutely." When Congresswoman Ilhan Omar called the Minneapolis Police Department a cancer that is rotten to the root, Biden wouldn't disavow her support and reject her endorsement.

## References

- Aristotle. [1926] 2020. *Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by J. H. Freese, revised by Gisela Striker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fortenbaugh, William W. 1992. "Aristotle on Persuasion Through Character." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 10(3):207-244.  
<https://doi.org/10.1525/rh.1992.10.3.207>.
- DoctorOz. 2022. "Crazy Ideas From Radical Politicians." YouTube Website. Retrieved October 18, 2022. <https://youtu.be/4DYZO22uk08>.
- Forbes Breaking News. September 5, 2022. "Spoiled And Entitled Socialist Loser Who Leached Off His Parents!: John Fetterman Ripped By Trump." YouTube Website. Retrieved October 18, 2022. <https://youtu.be/5j8XaVZ3wIU>.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge: and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gorski, Philip S. and Samuel L. Perry. 2022. *The Flag and the Cross: White Christian Nationalism and the Threat to American Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hart, Roderick P. 1971. "The Rhetoric of the True Believer." *Communications Monographs* 38(4):249-261.
- Hart, Roderick P., Sharon E. Jarvis, William P. Jennings, and Deborah Smith-Howell. 2005. *Political Keywords: Using Language that Uses You*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jasim, Raid Muhammad, and Sabah S. Mustafa. 2020. "A Semantic and Rhetorical Study of Manipulation in Two English and Arabic Political Speeches." *Arab World English Journal* 11(4):426-444.
- NBC News. July 10, 2020. "Trump Claims Biden Will Try To Impose 'Socialism Plus' If Elected | NBC News NOW." YouTube Website. Retrieved October 18, 2022.  
<https://youtu.be/MOyMvGihFkI>.
- Newport, Frank. 2018a. "The Meaning of Socialism to Americans Today." Gallup.com. [news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/243362/meaning-socialism-americans-today.aspx](https://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/243362/meaning-socialism-americans-today.aspx). Accessed 16 September, 2022.
- Newport Frank. 2018b. "Democrats More Positive About Socialism Than Capitalism." Gallup.com. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/240725/democrats-positive-socialism-capitalism.aspx>. Accessed 16 September 2022.
- Newport, Frank. 2020. "Public Opinion Review: Americans' Reactions to the Word 'Socialism'." Gallup.com. <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/287459/public-opinion-review-americans-word-socialism.aspx>. Accessed 16 September 2022.

- Oparinde, Kunle, Maleshoane Rapeane-Mathonsi, and Gift Mheta., 2021. "Exploring Manipulative Rhetorical Choices in Nigerian Political Speeches." *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1864913>.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1969. *Politics and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Pieniążek-Niemczuk, Elzbieta. 2016. "On the Linguistic Features of American Political Discourse." *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*, 13:68-77. DOI: 10.15584/sar.2016.13.7.
- Rowcroft, Andrew. 2017. "Socialism and Communism." Pp. 787-791 in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Political Behavior*. Edited by Fathali M. Moghaddam. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483391144.n359>.
- Rozina, Gunta, and Indra Karapetjana. 2009. "The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation." *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (The Journal of Social Sciences)*, 19:111-122. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/117981>.
- The Independent. September 29, 2020. "Trump accuses Biden of being a 'socialist' moments into presidential debate." YouTube Website. Retrieved October 18, 2022. <https://youtu.be/W7JqTrBAELg>.
- Triple M Staff. 2020. "When Flat Earthers Spent \$20,000 Trying To Prove Earth Is Flat And Accidentally Proved It's Round." Triple M Website. Retrieved December 9, 2022. <https://www.triplem.com.au/story/flat-earthers-spend-20-000-trying-to-prove-earth-is-flat-accidentally-prove-it-s-round-129953>.
- Valentino-DeVries, Jennifer, and Steve Eder. 2022. "For Trump's Backers in Congress, 'Devil Terms' Help Rally Voters." *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/10/22/us/politics/republican-election-objectors-rhetoric.html>. Accessed November 19, 2022.
- Viglucci, Andres, David Smiley, Lautaro Grinspan, and Antonio Maria Delgado. "People believe it.': Republicans' drumbeat of socialism helped win voters in Miami". Miami Herald. November 8, 2020, <https://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/article247001412.html>. Accessed September 15, 2022.
- Weaver, Richard M. 1953. *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company.
- Weber, Max. [1947] 1964. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, Introduction by Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press.