

УДК 808.51

Hanna Krapivnyk

## THE IMAGE OF THE ENEMY IN D. TRUMP'S PUBLIC SPEECHES

The paper discusses the repertoire of the language representation of the *enemy* image in the public speeches by US President D. Trump. This image is mythological and facilitates setting clear evaluative emphases by politicians. The analyzed texts confirmed that any public speech is targeted at a specific audience and a specific social-cultural context, which determine the choice of the *enemy* or *enemies* that will be included in the text. It was shown that the political speaker normally assumes a positive role while communicating with the audience. The essential invariant and variable features of the image of the *enemy* were identified. It was indicated that in the presidential speeches the image of the *enemy* is always opposed to that of the *friend*, as well as the *enemy's victim*. From the semantic standpoint, the image of the *enemy* includes a number of characteristics. The *enemy* may be home or foreign, personalized or generalized, historical or present, implicit or explicit, political, economic or mixed. In addition, the typical actions performed by the *enemy* were singled out and considered.

**Key words:** image of enemy, image of ally, public speech, image of victim, audience, social-cultural context.

**Formulation of a research problem and its significance.** Public speeches are nearly always filled with mythological images and symbols. Myth making is highly effective in political discourse and thus extensively used by any authoritarian or liberal democratic regime, though it is mainly aimed at the establishment and legitimation of the current ruling order. Among the key myth-based images relevant to the political speeches today there is, inter alia, that of the *enemy*, which should be considered combined with its semantic opposite, the image of the *friend* (or in military intelligence terms *friend or foe*). This binary opposition implies the availability of the third element and thus may be expanded to become a triangle of the *enemy-friend-victim*. The point is that these roles are not constant but dynamic, dependent on the addresser and the addressee as well as on the specific context. In presidential political speeches, the speaker, normally, assumes the positive role of the Savior (warrior, protector or Defender) who focuses on the ways to tackle existing issues, on the renewal, renovation, growth, prosperity and might of the people he addresses and the country he heads. The national foreign policy requires a well-established and accepted image of the *enemy*, described as the one attacking and threatening the basic values of the people. US President D. Trump follows the above political tradition in his speeches by deploying and verbalizing the images of the *enemy-victim-friend* triad in different ways, since these images are semantically sophisticated and complex.

**The goal and the specific tasks of the article.** The **goal** of this paper is to find the repertoire and the means of verbalizing the image of the *enemy* in D. Trump's public speeches. The **tasks** to be fulfilled include collecting the textual material of the presidential speeches to be analyzed, identifying the scope of semantic features of the *enemy* image in D. Trump's speeches, finding linguistic means used by the US President to describe the image of the *enemy*.

The empirical material for the study included official speeches and remarks of the US President D. Trump, as released on the official website of the White House, for the period from 26.06.2017 till 08.07.2017.

The texts were taken using the method of systematic selection; the study also included the methods of linguistic text analysis and semantic analysis. However, the statistical method was not applied in this work since the volume and period of the analyzed speeches enables to outline the scope of semantics of the *enemy* image, its landscape, whereas it is not sufficient to be representative and proportionate for the research into the frequency of separate linguistic means used to express the image of the enemy (as well as those of the friend and the victim). The analysis involving statistical data may be the area for further research.

**Analysis of the research into this problem.** The issues of myth making and mythological images represented in various texts, including political and other public speeches, have been analyzed in social, linguistic, literary, philosophical and cultural studies [6; 4; 10]. The collected works fully devoted to the

interdisciplinary analysis of the enemy image were published in 2005 [5; 8] etc. The lexical means of expressing the *enemy* image were studied by Yu. Kostylev in [3]. From the sociological cognition perspective the concept of the Evil was considered in [9]. Political speeches by other American presidents have also been studied using the discourse analysis, in particular, in [11].

**Statement regarding the basic material of the research and the justification of the results obtained.** The study involved the discussion of the following issues: identification of the images of the *enemy* and the *friend*, specifying the qualities, properties and activities that they have and perform, finding out who, why and how becomes a *victim* or the victims of the enemy (the importance of the third element is confirmed by the title of one of the events where the president spoke: “Meeting with Immigration Crime Victims”). These images are multilayered, multifunctional and extensively polysemantic.

First of all, it is to be noted that the notion and the image of the Other (or the Alien) as an aggressive opponent and wicked (fundamental) enemy cannot be attributed to totalitarian regimes only. It is more the manifestation of long and deeply established prejudices since the beginning of the nineteenth century [1, 192]. Today among the researchers of various humanitarian fields there is no unified definition of the *enemy* – whether it is a part of the *we-they* opposition representation, or its relative concepts of the opponent, customer, rival, other etc., which might be considered separately. For the purpose of the political domain quite an accurate definition was offered by O. Buchbender who considered the image of the *enemy* the product of propaganda, which, using semantic, optical and graphical means demonizes the political and ideological opponent (normally) in order to legitimize their own rule” [7, 18].

Although stating that in the traditional military science the enemy is a required party, modern researchers indicate that this name is losing its popularity in the political rhetoric. It is widely replaced with the concepts “*of opponent and competitor, or even the economically suitable concept of customer. We live in dangerous times: wars do not longer pop up in political speeches or rhetoric; and the enemy “no longer exists”, yet at the same time military battles are fought around the world, violations of human rights are commonplace and the arms industry is well off*” [8, 128]. However, President Trump’s speeches under analysis do include a number of military terms including the *enemy* itself along with their synonyms or euphemisms.

It is highly important to realize why the image of the *enemy* is vital for managing the crowds and masses of people. Lev Gudkov mentions that “the diagnosis of the “enemy’s presence” implies establishing a double generalizing setting: firstly, there emerges suspiciousness, mistrust or, to be more correct, alertness as the principle of social organization, and secondly, the conscious “horizon” of “ours” is set up, i. e. social definition of masses lacking qualities (ours as “non-enemies”)” [2, 16].

The study showed that despite the variety of different enemies mentioned in the considered speeches, the primary deep mythological *enemy* image has common features expressed in nearly all specific enemies mentioned (they may also be called *invariants*). These are purely negative evaluative as well as at times stylistic connotations, which activate the above image in addressee’s consciousness based on the background knowledge with its archetypes and stereotypes. In the texts studied this common core properties of the *enemy* are described as *bad, criminal, dangerous, disgusting, horrendous, illegal, obstructing, threatening, vicious*, etc.

Regarding the differentiating characteristics of the *enemy* image, the following aspects are to be singled out. First of all, the enemy may be either *home* or *foreign*. **Home enemies** include, specifically for D. Trump, mass media, and traditionally for any president the other major party (in this case Democrats), even a part of the Republicans who do not always support the President, officials and top civil servants who also sometimes act against the President’s will and expectations, as well as illegal migrants and terrorists, acting inside the country, but inspired from outside (thus they combine the features of the home and foreign enemies). On the other hand, **foreign enemies** include the terrorism, extremism, ISIS, Russia, North Korea etc. Both home and foreign enemies may be of political (inter alia, military), economic (enemies here are rather rivals and competitors, including China, South Korea, India etc.) or mixed type.

Out of the speeches analyzed in this work, President's weekly addresses to the nation are regular texts obviously focused on the American audience and thus the emphasis is also made on the *home enemies*. For example, in his address of June 30, 2017, Trump naturally mentions the achievements he and his team had made as well as the achievements of his home allies. He also invited his home political enemies – Democrats – to cooperate (thus trying to unite the nation making it stronger). However, before asking Democrats to act together, the president implicitly criticized the previous president and officials supporting that old position: *"Every single one of these deaths was preventable. These beautiful American lives were stolen because our government refused to do its job. If the government had simply enforced our immigration laws, these Americans would still be alive today"* [14]. Instead, Trump positions himself here as the defender and protector of the country: *"since the day I took the oath of office, I have been restoring the enforcement of our immigration laws and the protection and defense of our borders"* [14].

In his meeting with Republican senators Donald Trump again repeatedly mentioned one of his major notorious home problems (a kind of an enemy), which, in his opinion, was created by the previous Democratic government: *"Obamacare is a total disaster"* [12] and the following day during the Energy roundtable Trump touches upon this problem again: *"Obamacare is dying. It's essentially dead. If you don't give it the subsidy, it would die within 24 hours. It's been a headache for everybody. It's been a nightmare for many. <...> It would be a tremendous reduction in costs from what Obamacare is"* [13].

In his address to the nation made on July 07, 2017, President Trump evidently accuses his predecessors of neglecting the situation with job creation at home in America: *"For decades, American jobs have been ripped out of our communities, industries and towns have been stripped bare, and the entire communities have been uprooted and left"* [15]. This hidden inner economic enemy *ripped out/ stripped bare/ uprooted and left* [15]. Achievements of the new administration were also mentioned, as a compulsory attribute of any presidential speech analyzed: *"Industry confidence has soared to the highest level ever recorded"* [15].

The enemy(-ies) may be named and **personalized** or **generalized** as it is in the case of regimes or entities (as opposed to innocent people and nations). Regarding the **identity of the enemy**, in the speeches under consideration D. Trump mentions, in particular, the following ones: the enemies are (*radical Islamic*) *terrorists, criminals, opponents, aliens, strangers, they* (as opposed to *we* and *us*), *others, adversaries, illegal immigrants, competitors, foes, enemies, mass media, problems, obstacles, bad people* etc.

Whether deliberately or not, D. Trump uses simplified vocabulary and thus implicitly shallows the interpretation of the created in the specific speech political landscape in order to divide people into the two camps of good and bad. For instance, speaking about a home criminal gang enemy, the President formulates his ideas as follows: *"MS-13 is a prime target. They are bad people"* [16]. The actions taken by the authorities in this respect are described in a military fashion: *"...we're freeing up towns. We're actually liberating towns, if you can believe that we have to do that in the United States of America"* [16]. The Government also encourages the House to pass the *No Sanctuary for Criminals Act*. This bill is against people who are, according to D. Trump *dangerous/vicious/ disgusting/horrible criminal aliens/gang members*: The *No Sanctuary for Criminals Act* *"blocks federal grants to cities that release dangerous criminal aliens back into the streets, including the vicious and disgusting and horrible MS-13 gang members"* [16].

Continuing the topic of the enemies *at home*, D. Trump mentions that he would like the bill on strengthening the illegal immigration policy to be enacted: *"The first bill, Kate's Law, is named for Kate Steinle, who was killed by an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. This law will enhance criminal penalties for those who repeatedly re-enter our country illegally"* [14]. In this case the victim of the crime committed by an illegal immigrant (whose name is left unknown) is personalized and emphasized as her name is taken as the unofficial title of the bill thus showing that the President himself values each life of the American citizens.

The home enemies are frequently characterized as those who destroy the *safety* and *security* the country needs, therefore, D. Trump repeatedly focuses on that verbally, e.g. *"We need security. We need safety in our country"* [14]. Within this context, the President speaks about the victims of illegal

immigrants: *“They’ve had members of their family killed by illegal immigrants and, really, people with multiple – in some cases, multiple deportations”* [16].

Moreover, in this social context American citizens are openly shown in the role of victims, partially, due to the previous government of the Democrats who did not comply and apply the existing laws, let alone passing the new ones.

Another urgent domestic issue, which may be considered as an enemy for D. Trump is mass media – this is his “pain in the neck” that is represented by the intended repetition of the word *fake* (in total, 5 times within this short excerpt): *“But we now know that was all a big, beautiful myth. It was fake. Don’t we love that term, «fake»? What we’ve learned about fake over the last little while – fake news, CNN. Fake”* [16].

Addressing both the foreign and home audiences the President always points out that America is the first, the strongest, the most powerful, dominant etc., in other words – it is in the “driving seat”: *“We are really in the driving seat. And you know what? We don’t want to let other countries take away our sovereignty and tell us what to do and how to do it. That’s not going to happen”* [17]. However, Democrat enemies are mentioned here as well: *“Full potential can only be realized when government promotes energy development – that’s this guy right here, and he’ll do it better than anybody – instead of obstructing it like the Democrats”* [17]. The objective of the speech is obviously to persuade those who are not for the speaker to join him and his team in the activities for the good and prosperity of the nation in its fight against the adversary forces.

Foreign traditional US and global enemies, namely, *extremism* and *terrorism* are repeatedly verbalized and reminded of by the president: *“During a historic gathering in Saudi Arabia, I called on the leaders of more than 50 Muslim nations to join together to drive out this menace which threatens all of humanity. We must stand united against these shared enemies to strip them of their territory and their funding, and their networks, and any form of ideological support that they may have. While we will always welcome new citizens who share our values and love our people, our borders will always be closed to terrorism and extremism of any kind”* [19]. Thus D. Trump invites the world to unite in the fight against the threat of extremism and terrorism. At the same time he confirms his position on the Travel ban by mentioning *borders*, which are the US borders for newcomers.

In texts the image of the enemy may be expressed either explicitly or implicitly. Firstly, the president clearly identifies the allies in the respective audience: *“On behalf of the American people, let me say that we stand with the Three Seas nations”* [18] and once again: *“The Three Seas Initiative will not only empower your people to prosper, but it will ensure that your nations remain sovereign, secure, and free from foreign coercion”* [18]. In the above speech D. Trump hints but does not name the enemy of his country and its allies: *“We’re here at this historic gathering to launch a new future for open, fair, and affordable energy markets that bring greater security and prosperity to all of our citizens. We are sitting on massive energy and we are now exporters of energy. So, if one of you need energy, just give us a call”* [18]. In this case the enemy mentioned above is Russia, as the supplier of energy resources. Russia’s actions are described as coercive and opposed to those of the USA: *“Let me be very clear about one crucial point: The United States will never use energy to coerce your nations, and we cannot allow others to do so. You don’t want to have a monopoly or a monopolistic situation. The United States is firmly committed to open, fair, and competitive markets for global energy trade”* [18]. Nonetheless, the ambiguity is naturally implied there, since the President repeatedly speaks about the prospects of the USA as the biggest supplier of energy resources. Referring to Russia again, D. Trump applies the technique of appealing to this state and asking to terminate its subversive activities and join the USA, i.e. become its ally in the fight against the common evil of the civilization: *“We urge Russia to cease its destabilizing activities in Ukraine and elsewhere, and its support for hostile regimes – including Syria and Iran – and to instead join the community of responsible nations in our fight against common enemies and in defense of civilization itself”* [19].

In the above cited extensive program speech to the people of Poland President Trump acts in part as a leader who encourages his people before a decisive battle. For instance, he addresses all the allies in fighting current home and foreign opponents and enemies, appealing to the past and referring to the present and future: *“But just as our adversaries and enemies of the past learned here in Poland, we*



*know that these forces, too, are doomed to fail if we want them to fail. And we do, indeed, want them to fail*" [19]. When appealing to the past, the president points at the strengths, praises and encourages the recipients: *"The world has never known anything like our community of nations. We write symphonies. We pursue innovation. We celebrate our ancient heroes, embrace our timeless traditions and customs, and always seek to explore and discover brand-new frontiers"* [19], at the same time emphasizing the harm, brought by enemies thus inviting those who are *with us* to join the struggle against the opponents. This idea is repeated multiple times in Trump's speech to the People of Poland.

When analyzing D. Trump's speech in Warsaw, it is important to focus on the socio-cultural context [11, 167] which determines the topics and specifics of the presidential speeches. Van Dijk mentioned that "what we say and how we say it depends on who is speaking to whom, when and where, and with what purposes" [20, 108]. This effect can be brightly illustrated by the specifics of the image of the *enemy* presented in Trump's extensive speech to the People of Poland. Therefore, in this address the president primarily appeals to the audience by the knowledge of their history, their religiousness and traditions, he emphasizes **historical** enemies – those who divided Polish lands hundreds of years ago but did not succeed in destroying the Polish national identity. He stated that *"For two centuries, Poland suffered constant and brutal attacks. But while Poland could be invaded and occupied, and its borders even erased from the map, it could never be erased from history or from your hearts. In those dark days, you have lost your land but you never lost your pride"* [19]. D. Trump also mentions communists, the USSR, and Nazi Germany. Therewith, it is important to make a link between the **historical** and **current enemies** – in particular, the ideologists and sponsors of terrorism and extremism – which is done by the president as well. In addition, in this speech on the Polish land the US president draws attention to Russia, which manipulates public opinion, consciousness via the mass media, attempts to influence other countries using its economic resources – energy supplies, destabilizes political and socio-economic situation in different countries.

Nevertheless, since it was not closely relevant and significant in the Warsaw speech, D. Trump did not mention such enemies Syrian and Iranian regime, ISIS, and North Korea, whereas speaking to the heads of Japan and China, the president implicitly mentioned them avoiding direct naming. In addition, D. Trump mentions that along with the fact that these countries are not US allies, they are also its economic competitors (in other words – implicitly and partially, economic enemies).

In the presidential speeches under analysis there is an enemy, which is common for the whole Western civilization – the **red tape** that *"strangles the freedom"*. The president speaks about this phenomenon as *"steady creep of government bureaucracy that drains the vitality and wealth of the people"* [19].

For the semantic analysis of the image of the *enemy* it is required to consider those actions, which are typical of the *enemy* and their verbalization in the presidential speeches. The range of such activities is quite wide, including, but not limited to **oppressing**: *"Every one of your nations has an inspiring story. You've overcome years of oppression"* [18], **killing or murdering**: *"Nazis systematically murdered millions of Poland's Jewish citizens"* [19]; **watching crimes**: *"They tried to destroy this nation forever by shattering its will to survive"* [19] in order to break, ruin the spirit of the **victim**: *"The Polish martyr, Bishop Michael Kozal, said it well: 'More horrifying than a defeat of arms is a collapse of the human spirit'"* [19]; **cultivating hatred and violence and neglecting the values of others**: *"We cannot accept those who reject our values and who use hatred to justify violence against the innocent"* [19]; **challenging/undermining/testing**: *"the West is also confronted by the powers that seek to test our will, undermine our confidence, and challenge our interests"* [19]; **assaulting**: *"The enemy never ceased its relentless assault on that small outpost of civilization. And the Poles never ceased its defense"* [19].

**Conclusions and prospects for further research.** The text analysis of the presidential public speeches enabled to outline the main features and specifics of presenting the image of the *enemy*. It was found out that the image under consideration has common and differentiating characteristics, which are determined by the social and economic context, the time and the audience of the speech. In D. Trump's speeches the image of the *enemy* is always given in the opposition to the image of the *friend* or *ally*. Moreover, this opposition makes it easier and simpler to convey intended ideas to the audience. Thus, the

semantic scope of the *enemy* image includes the following features: the enemy may be home or foreign, personalized or generalized, historical or present, implicit and explicit, political, economic or mixed. In terms of the vocabulary, there is a more or less stable scope of attributes and activities related to the image of the enemy. The study may be considered as the initial step in analyzing President Trump's discourse, which might be further completed and confirmed with statistical data and corpus analysis.

### *Bibliography*

1. Вашик К. Метаморфозы зла: немецко-русские образы врага в плакатной пропаганде 30–50-х годов / Клаус Вашик // *Образ врага* / сост. Л. Гудков ; ред. Н. Конрадова. – М. : ОГИ, 2005. – 334 с.
2. Гудков Л. Идеологема «Врага». «Враги» как массовый синдром и механизм социокультурной интеграции / Лев Гудков // *Образ врага* / сост. Л. Гудков ; ред. Н. Конрадова. – М. : ОГИ, 2005. – 334 с.
3. Костылев Ю. С. Лексические средства создания образа врага (на примере текстов советской массовой печати 1919–1953 гг., освещающих локальные и региональные конфликты) автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / Ю. С. Костылев ; Урал. федер. ун-т. – Екатеринбург : [б. и.], 2012. – 20 с.
4. Лотман Ю. Миф–имя–культура / Ю. Лотман, Б. Успенский // Лотман Ю. М. Избранные статьи : в 3 т. Т. 1 : Статьи по семиотике и топологии культуры. – Таллин : Александра, 1992. – С. 58–75.
5. *Образ врага* / сост. Л. Гудков ; ред. Н. Конрадова. – М. : ОГИ, 2005. – 334 с.
6. Barthes R. *Mythologies* / Roland Barthes ; trans. by Annette Lavers. – NY : Hill and Wang, 1984. – 160 p.
7. Buchbender O. *Zentrumdes Bösen. Zur Genesis nationalsozialistischer Feindbilder* / O. Buchbender // Wagenlehner G. *Feindbild. Geschichte – Dokumentation – Problematik*. – Fr./M., 1989. – S. 18.
8. *Enemy Images in War Propaganda* / Edited by Marja Vuorinen. – Newcastle upon Tyne, UK : Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012. – 170 p.
9. Khagurov T. *Evil as a Subject of Sociological Cognition: Methodological Reflections* / Temyr Khagurov // *Future Human Image*. – 2017. – Vol. 7. – P. 36–45.
10. Neal A. G. *Myth-Making and Religious Extremism and Their Roots in Crises* / Arthur G. Neal, Helen Youngelson-Neal. – Jefferson, NC : McFarland & Company, Inc., 2015. – 216 p.
11. Nobrega J. V. da. *Discourse Analysis: Ronald Reagan's Evil Empire Speech* [Electronic resource] / J. V. da Nobrega // *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*. – 2014. – Issue 4. – P. 166–181. – Access mode : <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.41014>.
12. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump at a Meeting with Republican Senators" [Electronic resource]. – Released on June 27, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/27/remarks-president-trump-meeting-republican-senators>.
13. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump and Secretary of Energy Rick Perry at Tribal, State, and Local Energy Roundtable" [Electronic resource]. – Released on June 28, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/28/remarks-president-trump-and-secretary-energy-rick-perry-tribal-state-and>.
14. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "President Donald J. Trump's Weekly Address" [Electronic resource]. – Released June 30 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/featured-videos/video/2017/06/30/63017-weekly-address>.
15. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "President Donald J. Trump's Weekly Address" [Electronic resource]. – Released on July 07, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/07/president-donald-j-trumps-weekly-address>.
16. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump During Meeting with Immigration Crime Victims" [Electronic resource]. – Released on June 28, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/28/remarks-president-trump-during-meeting-immigration-crime-victims>.
17. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump at the Unleashing American Energy Event" [Electronic resource]. – Released on June 29, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/29/remarks-president-trump-unleashing-american-energy-event>.
18. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump at the Three Seas Initiative Summit" [Electronic resource]. – Released on July 6, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/06/remarks-president-trump-three-seas-initiative-summit-july-6-2017>.
19. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump to the People of Poland" [Electronic resource]. – Released on July 6, 2017. – Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/06/remarks-president-trump-people-poland-july-6-2017>.
20. Wodak R. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* / R. Wodak, M. Meyer. – London : Sage Publications, 2001. – DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>.

### *References*

1. Washyk, Klaus. 2005. "Metamorphozy Zla: Nemetsko-Russkiiye Obrazy Vraga v Plakatnoi Propagande 30–50-kh Godov". In *Obraz Vraga*, compiled by L. Gudkov ; edited by N. Konradova, 191–229. Moskva: OGI.
2. Gudkov, Lev. 2005. "Ideologema "Vraga". "Vragi" kak Massovyie Sindrom i Mekhanizm Sotsyokulturnoi Integratsyi". In *Obraz vraga*, compiled by L. Gudkov; edited by N. Konradova, 7–79. Moskva: OGI.
3. Kostylev, Yu. S., 2012. "Leksicheskie Sredstva Sozdaniia Obraza Vraga: (na Primere Tekstov Sovetskoi Massovoi Pechati 1919–1953 Godov, Osveshchaiushchikh Lokalnyie i Regionalnyie Konflikty)". PhD diss., Uralskii Federalnyi Universitet.
4. Lotman, Yu., and Uspenskii, B. 1992. "Mif – Imia – Kultura". In *Izbrannyye Stati v Triokh Tomakh. Tom. I: Stati po Semiotike i Topologii Kultury*, edited by Yu. M. Lotman, 1: 58–75. Tallinn: Aleksandra.
5. Gudkov, Lev., compl., and Konradova, N. ed. 2005. *Obraz Vraga*. Moskva: OGI.
6. Barthes, Roland. 1984. *Mythologies*. Translated by Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang.
7. Buchbender, Ortwin. 1989. "Zentrumdes Bösen. Zur Genesis nationalsozialistischer Feindbilder". In *Feindbild. Geschichte – Dokumentation – Problematik*, Hg. G. Wagenlehner, 17–38. Frankfurt a/M.
8. Vuorinen, Marja, ed. 2012. *Enemy Images in War Propaganda*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 170 p.
9. Khagurov, Temyr. 2017. "Evil as a Subject of Sociological Cognition: Methodological Reflections". In *Future Human Image*, 7: 36–45.
10. Neal, Arthur G., and Youngelson-Neal, Helen. 2015. *Myth-Making and Religious Extremism and Their Roots in Crises*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc..
11. Nobrega, J. V. da. 2014. "Discourse Analysis: Ronald Reagan's Evil Empire Speech". *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4: 166–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.41014>
12. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump at a Meeting with Republican Senators". Released on June 27, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/27/remarks-president-trump-meeting-republican-senators>.
13. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump and Secretary of Energy Rick Perry at Tribal, State, and Local Energy Roundtable". Released on June 28, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/28/remarks-president-trump-and-secretary-energy-rick-perry-tribal-state-and>.
14. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "President Donald J. Trump's Weekly Address". Released June 30 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/featured-videos/video/2017/06/30/63017-weekly-address>.
15. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "President Donald J. Trump's Weekly Address". Released on July 07, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/07/president-donald-j-trumps-weekly-address>.
16. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump During Meeting with Immigration Crime Victims". Released on June 28, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/28/remarks-president-trump-during-meeting-immigration-crime-victims>.
17. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump at the Unleashing American Energy Event". Released on June 29, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/29/remarks-president-trump-unleashing-american-energy-event>.
18. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump at the Three Seas Initiative Summit". Released on July 6, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/06/remarks-president-trump-three-seas-initiative-summit-july-6-2017>.
19. 2017. The White House President Donald J. Trump. "Remarks by President Trump to the People of Poland". Released on July 6, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/06/remarks-president-trump-people-poland-july-6-2017>.
20. Wodak, R., and Meyer, M., 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>

**Крапівник Ганна. Образ ворога в публічних промовах Д. Трампа.** Розглянуто репертуар мовної репрезентації образу *ворога* в публічних виступах Президента США Д. Трампа. Цей образ – міфологічний і допомагає політикам ставити чіткі оцінні акценти. Текстуально підтверджено: кожний публічний виступ орієнтовано на певну аудиторію і певний соціально-культурний контекст, що детермінують вибір образу конкретного *ворога* або *ворогів*, які будуть фігурувати у тексті. Продemonстровано позитивну роль, яку, зазвичай, приймає на себе політичний спікер у процесі спілкування зі своєю аудиторією. Виявлено ключові інваріантні й варіативні характеристики образу *ворога*. Зазначено, що у виступах Президента образ *ворога* завжди протиставляється образам *друга* і *жертви ворога*. З семантичного погляду, образ *ворога* містить кілька характеристик, зокрема: *ворог* може бути внутрішнім або зовнішнім, персоналізованим або узагальненим, історичним або існуючим зараз, імпліцитним або експліцитним, політичним, економічним або змішаним. Крім того, виявлено й розглянуто типові дії, які виконує ворог.

**Ключові слова:** образ ворогу, публічний виступ, образ друга, образ жертви, аудиторія, соціально-культурний контекст.

**Крапивник Анна. Образ врага в публичных речах Д. Трампа.** Рассмотрено репертуар языковой репрезентации образа *врага* в публичных выступлениях Президента США Д. Трампа. Этот образ – мифологический и помогает политикам ставить четкие оценочные акценты. Текстуально подтверждено, что каждое публичное выступление ориентировано на определенную аудиторию и определенный социально-культурный контекст, которые детерминируют выбор образа конкретного *врага* или *врагов*, что будут фигурировать в тексте. Продемонстрировано положительную роль, которую, как правило, принимает на себя политический спикер при общении со своей аудиторией. Выявлены ключевые инвариантные и вариативные характеристики образа *врага*. Отмечено, что в выступлениях Президента образ *врага* всегда противопоставляется образам *друга* и *жертвы врага*. С семантической точки зрения, образ *врага* обладает несколькими характеристиками, в частности: *враг* может быть внутренним или внешним, персонифицированным или обобщенным, историческим или существующим в настоящее время, политическим, экономическим или смешанным. Кроме того, выявлены и рассмотрены типичные действия, выполняемые *врагом*.

**Ключевые слова:** образ врага, публичное выступление, образ друга, образ жертвы, аудитория, социально-культурный контекст.