"MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN".

A rhetorical analysis of campaign and presidential speeches by Donald Trump in 2016-2017.

Yannick Lahti

Viestinnän maisterintutkielma

Kevät 2018

Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos

Jyväskylän yliopisto

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Faculty FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES	Department DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION STUDIES
Author Yannick Lahti	
Title "Make America Great Again". A rhetorical analysis of campaign and presidential speeches by Donald Trump in 2016-2017.	
Subject Communication	Level Master's thesis
Month and year Spring 2018	Number of pages 134

Abstract

The objective of this study is to describe and explain the rhetoric of the 45th US president Donald Trump, both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The rhetoric of Trump is approached through Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism with the use of all its key concepts. The method of analysis is conducted as a textual rhetorical analysis and the obtained results are discussed in relation to the theory of dramatism, but also to political communication in general, presidential rhetoric, campaign communication and populism. The selected data for this study consists of six different speeches given by Donald Trump during 31.8.2016 – 28.2.2017.

The results systematically indicate that the rhetoric of Donald Trump does not change in a consequential way as his status changes from a campaigning presidential candidate to the president of the United States of America. Through the obtained results we are able to observe and explain in detail the nuances between the different campaign and presidential speeches. In addition, we are able to explain some of these differences for example through the institutional requirements of the presidency and factors which are related to campaign communication. Based on the results, both Donald Trump's campaign and presidential rhetoric is formed by describing an encompassing state of ruin and destruction of the USA and its people, to which the only deliverance is Trump's own presidency. The results of this study demonstrate that Trump technically communicates rhetoric which is unambiguous and simultaneously composed of the cyclical blaming of others, whilst lacking any indications of self-criticism. In addition, based on the results we are able to deduce that the political solutions proposed by Donald Trump are hollow in substance and thus misleading as he does not offer concrete means in order to execute them. The results also elucidate in detail how Trump's apparently unambiguous rhetoric is being constructed word-for-word and by which rhetorical devices he emerges his own identity and faith with the ones of the USA and its people.

The results provide new and valuable information about how Donald Trump's, but also in general the rhetoric of a politician defined as a populist can be both constructed and dismantled, in order to be observed and studied through the concrete and revealing concepts of rhetorical analysis. The results increase our knowledge and understanding on an international level about this current phenomenon, which manifests itself through political communication and rhetoric as populism – here in Europe as well as in the United States of America.

Additional information

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty HUMANISTIS-YHTEISKUNTATIETEELLINEN	Laitos – Department KIELI- JA VIESTINTÄTIETEIDEN
Tekijä – Author Yannick Lahti	
Työn nimi – Title ”Make America Great Again”. A rhetorical analysis of campaign and presidential speeches by Donald Trump in 2016-2017.	
Oppiaine – Subject Viestintä	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Kevät 2018	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 134

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Tässä pro gradu –työssä tavoitteena on kuvata ja selittää Yhdysvaltojen 45:nnen presidentin, Donald Trumpin poliittista retoriikkaa hänen presidentinvaalien sekä presidenttikauden aikaisia puheitaan analysoimalla. Aihetta tutkittiin dramatistisen teorian tarjoamien pääkäsitteiden kautta ja se toteutettiin tekstipohjaisena retorisena analyysinä. Analyysistä saatuja tuloksia peilattiin tulosten pohdintavaiheessa dramatistisen teoriataustan lisäksi myös yleiseen poliittiseen viestintään, presidentti-ja kampanjaretoriikkaan sekä populismiin. Tutkielman aineisto koostui kuudesta Donald Trumpin pitämästä virallisesta puheesta ajalta 31.8.2016-28.2.2017.

Tulosten perusteella voidaan systemaattisesti osoittaa, että Donald Trumpin retoriikka ei muutu merkittävällä tavalla hänen asemansa vaihtuessa presidenttiehdokkaasta Yhdysvaltojen presidentiksi. Tuloksia tarkasteltaessa kyetään syventymään puheiden välisiin vivahde-eroihin ja selittämään niiden syitä muun muassa presidentti-instituutioon sekä kampanjaviestintään liittyvillä tekijöillä.

Tulokset osoittavat, että Trumpin retoriikka sekä ehdokkaana että presidenttinä koostuu kokonaisvaltaisesta Yhdysvaltojen sekä sen kansalaisten väistämätöntä perikatoa kuvaavasta tilasta, jonka ainoaksi pelastukseksi esitetään Trumpin toimiminen maan presidenttinä. Tulokset havainnollistavat Trumpin viestivän teknisesti yksiselitteistä retoriikkaa, joka muodostuu syklisestä toisten osapuolten syyttämisestä sekä itsekritiikin puutteesta. Tulosten perusteella voidaan myös päätellä Donald Trumpin ajamien poliittisten korjausliikkeiden olevan sisällöltään onttoja sekä harhaanjohtavia, sillä hän ei tarjoa konkreettisia keinoja esittämiensä ongelmien ratkaisemiseksi. Tulokset paljastavat myös syvällisemmin sen, kuinka Trumpin näennäisesti yksinkertainen retoriikka muodostuu sana- ja lausetarkkuudella, sekä millä retorisilla tehokeinoilla hän yhdistää oman identiteettinsä sekä kohtalonsa Yhdysvaltojen sekä sen kansalaisten kohtaloon, monitulkintaisemman kokonaisuuden kautta.

Tutkimustulokset tuottavat uutta sekä arvokasta tietoa siitä, kuinka niin Donald Trumpin kuin yleisesti populistiksi määriteltävän poliitikon retoriikka voi rakentua, ja on purettavissa osiin, konkreettisten sekä paljastavien retoristen analysointikäsitteiden kautta tarkasteltavaksi. Tulokset lisäävät ymmärrystämme kansainvälisellä tasolla tästä yhteiskunnallisesti merkittävästä ilmiöstä, joka manifestoituu poliittisen retoriikan sekä viestinnän kautta populismina, niin Yhdysvalloissa kuin meillä Euroopassakin.

Säilytyspaikka – Depository
Jyväskylän yliopisto/Jyväskylän yliopiston kirjasto

Muita tietoja – Additional information

Table of contents

1 Introduction

The United States presidential election of 2016 was in many ways an unprecedented phenomenon in the political history of America. Both the campaigning that occurred as well as the ultimate result of the election arose worldwide interest and astonishment. As a result, an outsider of the traditional political circles and establishment: Donald John Trump – a billionaire businessman and a television personality – became the 45th president of the United States of America. Against all expectations Trump ran against 16 established politicians of the Republican party – the largest presidential primary field for any political party in the US history – winning them all eventually becoming the presumptive Republican presidential nominee. He won the presidential election as the Republican party candidate with 306 electoral votes against his main opponents - veteran politician - Democrat Hillary Clinton's 232. He was sworn into office the 20th of January 2017 – the presidency being the first public office he has ever held in his life. Horowitz (2017, 1) considers Trump's victory in the race for presidency to be a political earthquake.

Trump's presidential campaign ran famously on the major themes of illegal immigration, security and brining jobs back to America. During his campaigning he became quickly well known for his controversial remarks and unconventional political rhetoric on subject matters such as: illegal immigration, women, his political opponents and his views on foreign policy. For his largely considered inappropriate rhetoric and propositions as in building a wall to the US-Mexican border, calling Mexican's rapists, insulting a disabled journalist and suggesting that as president he would imprison his main opponent Clinton, Trump received both worldwide praise and heavy criticism from both sides of the political arena and the public. In his campaign Trump popularized the formerly known "Let's make America Great Again" slogan - which was formerly used by president Ronald Reagan in his 1980 presidential campaign - and changed it into "Make America Great Again".

As well as Trump's campaign, also his presidency has been widely perceived as one of the most controversial ones in modern day US political history - this after his first year in office. The unconventionally fought campaign for presidency led to the disputed result of Trump winning

without the majority of the popular vote, as his main opponent, the Democratic party nominee Hillary Clinton finished 2.1% ahead of him. Even as president Trump has continuously received praise from his core supporters, he has simultaneously been under strong criticism due to his policies which in fact have partly been a distinct realization of promises made during his campaign. In his first year as president, Donald Trump has among other things issued an executive order denying citizens of certain Muslim countries the entry to the United States, determinedly sought for funding and approval for the building of an US-Mexican border wall, announced the US withdrawal from the Paris climate accord, attempted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, known widely as "Obamacare", signed the controversial Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 and promised to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel – a deed that in the context of international relations is widely considered to danger the already fragile prospects of peace in the region.

Aside of policymaking, Donald Trump's presidency has been continuously shadowed by infamous dismissals or withdrawals of various high profile White House staff and other members of high US institutions. These include: White House Chief Strategist Steve Bannon, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, Chief of Staff Reince Priebus, Communications Director Sean Spicer, FBI-Director James Comey, Debuty FBI-Director Andrew McCabe, two National Security advisors Michael T. Flynn and Lt General HR McMaster, Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and Deputy Chief of Staff Katie Walsh - to name a few. In addition, the widely made accusations of the Trump campaign colluding with Russian authorities in order to interfere the US elections and enhance the chances of Trump's victory – charges that have been continuously denied by the Trump campaign, Trump administration and president Trump personally – have reached a climax point. On the 16th of February 2018, the former FBI-Director Robert Mueller, special counsel for the United States Department of Justice has during his conduct of an investigation, pressed several charges - among many others - against Trump's former campaign aid Rick Gates and campaign manager Paul Manafort – the previous admitting a collusion and lying to the authorities during the investigation whilst the latter has denied his complicity. This ongoing investigation on the Trump campaign is again an unprecedented occurrence in modern American political history where it is still up to debate whether a foreign nation has interfered with the presidential election in collaboration with

one of its participants. This factor is yet another element which underlines the uniqueness of the Trump presidential campaign and the Trump presidency.

According to Müller (2016, 1) no US election has ever seen such invocations of populism as the one of 2015-2016. Despite the context of America and the persona of Donald Trump, this phenomenon is not unknown in our 21st century western democracies. Also in Europe various right wing nationalistic populist parties such as France's Front National, Britain's UKIP, Hungary's Jobbik, Italy's Movimento 5 Stelle, Germany's AfD and the Dutch PVV have substantially grown in size in terms of support and visibility. One of the most essential factors that these political movements have in common with Donald Trump's presidential campaign, is the absolute focus on one visible and controversial individual – especially the populistic rhetoric of this individual. The Trump campaign and presidency has in part been a contributing factor to the emerging of the 21st century term: billionaire populism.

The presidential campaign and presidency of Donald Trump is generally in a wider international context a topical and fascinating subject for research, from the point of view of many scientific disciplines. From a communication science point of view - especially from the perspective of political rhetoric - this phenomenon of Donald Trump is interesting when one attempts to observe what and how something has been said and therefore communicated to the public. The questions that arise about how a certain choice of words or sentences have influenced the bigger picture or an image of a spoken message, which then has been communicated to a wider audience with certain results, are in the very core of our school of thought.

In the USA especially, presidential communication and rhetoric is a continual topic of interest and research, due to the concrete political power that the office of the president entails, not to mention the rhetorical requirements that go along with it. Aside to the fundamental institutional and political powers that the president has, she/he always intends to govern and lead through words. This means that the ability to successfully deliver meaningful rhetoric is absolutely necessary to the functional execution of the office. To the field of communication, the realization that skillfully communicated political rhetoric: the ability to communicate complicated policy issues in an

encompassing and interesting way to the masses contains power, makes the topic of this study ever so important today.

In this study the objective is to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The selected data for this study consists of six different speeches given by Donald Trump during 31.8.2016 – 28.2.2017. This time spam enables the selected data to consist of campaign speeches by Trump as a presidential candidate, the victory speech as the president elect and finally the first speeches as president of the United States of America; the inauguration speech and the first speech to joint session of US Congress.

The rhetoric of Donald Trump is researched through Kenneth Burke's (1897-1993) theory of dramatism. In order to achieve the objective of this study, three research questions are posed which are all formed based on the theory of dramatism. The theory of dramatism has been widely used as a method of rhetorical analysis both in the fields of political rhetoric and additionally in corporate communication. In terms of political communication, dramatism has been used in the research of US presidential rhetoric, for example to analyze the justification of the war on terror (Väyrynen 2004), to study the NSA's (National Security Agency) telecommunication investigations (Owens 2007) and the peace process in the Middle-East (Mills 2014).

Even as Chaim Perelman's (1912-1984) and Stephen Toulmin's (1922-2009) theories and models for conducting rhetorical analysis, such as the Toulmin-model are functional and applicable means of conducting research on rhetoric, their work is founded largely on the basis of argumentation and reasoning in communication. Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism however offers a more functional tool for conducting rhetorical textual analysis for this particular study, due to the specificity of the concepts and elements that it offers.

In the field of communication this study falls into the category of political communication and rhetoric with a detailed emphasis on campaign and presidential rhetoric and an additional notice to populistic rhetoric. Even with these specified categories, the relation that this study inevitably has between an orating politician and her/his speechwriting staff is also an interesting one which by the very least bears mentioning. The fact that campaigning politicians, or people involved in a

political campaign – not to mention the president – do not construct their speeches without a team of speechwriters, draws focus and interest to all communication professionals who may seek to learn about the formation of a political address, a persuasive speech or a campaign in general.

In political communication previous topics of research have been campaign influencing, political propaganda and marketing, individual speeches made by politicians as well as political candidates in addition to the analyzing of televised debates between candidates. In fact, one of the largest area of research regarding presidential communication is done with a strong focus on the debates between presidential candidates and their images. For example: Denton (2017): The 2016 US presidential campaign: political communication and practice, Newton and LaMay (2008): Inside the Presidential Debates: Their Improbable Past and Promising Future, Hacker (2004): Presidential candidate images and Kendall (2000): Communication in the presidential primaries: candidates and the media, 1912-2000.

Donald Trump's campaign and presidential rhetoric combined has not been systematically researched through the theory of dramatism or through another textual rhetorical analyzing method of this magnitude ever before. This does not mean however that this subject matter would not have been researched before or that first rate studies would not be under way. Earlier research that has been made on Trump's rhetoric has been focusing on individual speeches alone instead of a wider selection of them. For example: in the thesis of Widyawardani (2016) the presidential candidacy announcement speech of Donald Trump is being analyzed through a rhetorical method which is more directly linked to the concepts originally presented in Aristotle's *rhetoric*. Also, a 2016 paper by Siegmund analyses this same speech with a relatively light support of a theoretical background. Taveira and Nyerges (2016) discuss Donald Trump, propaganda and populism in their article, but do not provide an excessive insight to any communication theories. Also several journalists have done rhetorical analyses of Trump's inauguration speech, but none of these mentioned or any others that I am aware of at the moment of writing this research, are comparable to the study I am conducting in terms of the data, theory or the objectives.

In addition, Donald Trump's communication on twitter, which has also risen to be a phenomenon in itself, offers many potential research topics – not in the least from the point of view of

technologically mediated communication. Trump who has been both applauded and criticized for his "un-presidential"- behavior in regard to his use of twitter and social media in general, responded by claiming his use of social media being "modern day presidential", in a tweet in July the 1st 2017. President Trump's tweets have been studied for example by Liu (2016) in his thesis, but in this case as well, the theoretical background and the data differ greatly from that of this study, also partly due to the different communication medium: twitter vs. live speeches.

If the set objectives of this study are met, then the results and key findings will provide valuable and detailed information on how the campaign and presidential rhetoric of Donald Trump is being conducted and what its relation is to traditional political campaign and presidential rhetoric as well as populistic rhetoric. However, understanding rhetorical mechanisms is not only important to the field of political or presidential rhetoric, but also for the field of communication in a much wider perspective. Efficient and functional ways of communicating among and between people are not a skill or a secret which can be mastered only by a few selected individuals or indeed only by politicians and speechwriters. This is way the subject matter of this study should not be evaluated only by its core focus: Donald Trump's rhetoric.

In addition, as election campaigning is seen as political communication and rhetoric, which aims to make a difference in the attitudes, values, beliefs and behavior of people, the results can provide new and essential perspectives on speech writing and rhetorical delivery. These perspectives could prove to be valuable not only to scholars of political rhetoric and communication, but also to career politicians and speechwriters, not to mention all the various different professional disciplines which are emerging from the field of communication on a growing pace. Indeed, corporative communication consultants, public relations professionals, lobbyists, campaign advertisers and representatives of almost any professional trades can all benefit from an objectively and accurately presented study of communication.

During the process of this study I was awarded a scholarship by the fund of Työväen Opintorahasto on the grounds of its societal importance to our knowledge of communication and rhetoric.

2 Rhetoric in a political context

In this chapter I will present the theoretical background of this study, define the concepts that are used in the analysis and observe rhetoric from a political point of view. First I will briefly explore rhetoric from its history to the present day. After this I will define political, presidential and campaign rhetoric and communication each in their own subchapter. Then I will move on to describe populism and propaganda in terms of rhetoric and finally introduce the main theory which is the base of the analysis conducted in this study: Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism.

2.1 Historical overview of rhetoric to the present day

The roots of rhetoric go as far as Ancient Greece. According to Martin (2014,1): "the ancient name given to the body of knowledge whose object is the practice of speech and persuasion is rhetoric". The most distinguished and famous writing on the topic is considered to be *Rhetoric* by the Greek philosopher Aristotle (384-322 bc). Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is also the oldest systematic written work on the subject which has prevailed intact from the times of Ancient Greece to the present day (Puro 2006, 30). According to Burke (1969a, 49-55) the word rhetoric originates from the ancient Greek word *rhetorike*, which means the skill of persuasive oration by a *rhetor* – a speaker.

Aristotle himself saw (1.2.352a) that rhetoric is a learnable skill which allows its user to discover various different forms of influencing and persuasion. The means of argumentation: *pisteis* by Aristotle can be viewed as the key-concept of his work. In the art of rhetoric one had to analyze what the actual persuasion is based upon (Puro 2006, 32). According to Aristotle rhetoric was a humane skill and he presented the three main parts of *pisteis,* which he saw as essential in the art of delivering a speech: *ethos, pathos and logos*.

The concept of *ethos* observes the characteristics of the speaker, especially how the traits of his/her personality affects the audience in order of creating a sincere and credible image. *Pathos* on the other hand underlines how well the speaker identifies with her/his audience and thus creates a favorable atmosphere between the speaker and the audience. The concept of *logos* refers to the argumentation skills of the speaker and how the speaker is able to influence the deduction and

intelligence of the audience. (Rhetoric 1.2 1356a.) As to the ultimate definition of what rhetoric actually is, Aristotle states the following: "Let rhetoric be the capacity to discover the possible means of persuasion concerning any subject". (Rhetoric 1355b25-26). According to Aristotle becoming convinced – persuasive speech - is based on the audience which is listening as they become affected by the speech they are hearing. (Rhetoric 1.2.1356b).

In addition to Greece also in Ancient Rome the art of speaking was considered as something essential as the famous Roman orator and rhetorician Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (c. 35-c.100 AD) posed and later answered the question: "First and foremost: what is rhetoric? Knowing how to speak well". (Quintilian, 2.15.1) His predecessor, Marcus Tullius Cicero (106- 43 bc) a distinguished politician and lawyer who also served as a consul, defined rhetoric and eloquence as the single most important virtue a person could possess (Cicero, 1. 17; 3.55). It can be said that rhetoric continually argued for its own centrality to ancient culture - both in Greece and Rome. Such arguments had in fact a great deal of merit, since for a long period of time, to be trained and educated in rhetoric were practically somewhat identical propositions: the ancient curriculum so to speak, started with elementary lessons and came to an end with advanced practical rhetorical exercises. (Gunderson 2009, 7.)

During the renaissance (c. 1400-1700) rhetoric remerged from its downfall of the middle-ages and was at its peak when Ancient Roman literature and humanism were again considered admirable (Plett, 2004, 14-16). Among other works *The Prince* (1513) by Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) can be considered a rhetorical implementation in its own right (Palonen 2003, 45) In his work, Machiavelli writes his ambiguous view on how to conquer and govern a city state (Machiavelli 2009).

Today the concept of rhetoric is multidisciplinary: research varies from the rhetoric of Ancient Greece and Rome to the questions posed by modern day communication scholars, journalists, sociologists and psychologists. The modern trend of rhetorical studies is often referred to as the *new rhetoric.* (Puro 2006, 108). According to Larson (2010) and Puro (2006) Kenneth Burke, Chaim Perelman and Stephen Toulmin are considered to be the most important scholars of the new rhetoric and the fathers of the entire concept. In addition, Kenneth Burke alone is considered as a

significant pioneer who has contributed to the influence and traditions of the discipline of the so called new rhetoric (Enos & Brown 1994; Foss 2004).

The new rhetoric examines influencing and impacts as much as the means that are used to promote them, for example in politics and advertising. As the so called classical rhetoric was about interaction and the skill of speaking in a public context where there is a public and an audience – the new rhetoric sees that public speaking is rather one aspect of the rhetoric and not at all its central core. The new rhetoric scholars wanted to bring analysis, differentiation and interpretation instead of only examining presentation techniques. The new rhetoric is seen as more of a new stage to the classical rhetoric rather than a cyclical continuation. (Puro 2006, 108-109). Also Herrick states that the distinction between the classical and new rhetoric can be seen in their different focus points: as the classical rhetoric was more about the examination of the most effective methods of persuasion, the scholars of the new rhetoric are more interested in wider topics such as the cultural context and the general structures of rhetoric. (Herrick 2004, 223.) The concepts of rhetoric and political communication are often very close to each other: the concept of rhetoric contains itself a political charge and it has been present in the arenas of political debate since the times of Ancient Greece (Gronebeck 2004, 136-137).

It can be stated that according to the classical definition of rhetoric it is first and foremost a skill. Everybody is able to speak, offer their opinions and present arguments, but in terms of skill, the correct use of rhetoric makes the distinction between a good and a bad speaker. Rhetoric thus is considered to be the use of appropriate and skillful means of influencing and persuasion. (Puro, 2006, 31). However, the definitions of the school of thought called the new rhetoric, go far beyond as seeing rhetoric merely as a set of powerful presentation techniques. As the scholars of the new rhetoric do recognize the elements of persuasive speech as an essential and traditional part of rhetoric, they are willing to broaden the contexts of it to a wider length.

2.2.1 Political rhetoric

Political rhetoric can be seen as a fundamental part of political communication. In the view of Martin (2014, 168) political rhetoric has an essential role to play in orienting people towards issues.

However, before I discuss political rhetoric and communication any further, it is essential to briefly define the concept of *politics*.

For politics itself there are various different definitions and it can just as well be seen as a contest for power, a promotion of interests, negotiation and "taking care of common affairs". (Paloheimo & Wiberg 1997, 193.) Also a somewhat more abstract definition of politics goes as follows: "Politics is conversations flowing through institutionalized channels punctuated by the vote". (Paletz 1996, 109). In the language used by politicians itself, politics has never been a concept which can be defined simply by an entry in a dictionary or academic textbook on the subject. (Wiesner, Haapala & Palonen 2017, 3.) Some people such as the Italian poet and journalist Gabriele d'Annunzio (1863-1938) have gone even as far as merging esthetics into politics by stating that politics is nothing more than drama which has its own beauty and style (Kunnas 2014, 124) In terms of communication Mazzoleni and Schulz (1999, 250) emphasize that without communication itself there is no politics. The purpose of political communication is purely political influencing. The word influential refers generally to a form of communication which aims to make an impact or change in its receivers (Jowett & O'Donnell 1986, 24). In addition, it has also been stated that politics is communication (Deutch 1963; Meadow 1980). Wiesner, Haapala and Palonen (2017, 1) view politics as an activity and debate which essentially includes rhetoric and communication, as a means of politics.

As the concept of politics has been briefly defined I can now proceed to the definition of rhetoric in the modern day context of politics. The word rhetoric often refers to vacuous spoken language and on the other hand to language that contains a number of metaphors and other rich figures of speech. Generally and widely rhetoric can be defined as an unique human skill by which people communicate with each other and additionally as an action that manifests that particular skill (Foss, Foss & Trapp 1985, 11); Foss 1996,4). According to this definition rhetoric is regarded as a symbolic action which is used to enable communication between individuals. As this definition is by all means not groundless and therefore bears mentioning in this context, it must be however stated that it is rather outdated in its delivery and utterly obsolete in its subjectively presented narrow view on rhetoric.

Rhetoric is used more generally in order to enable change, to coordinate thinking and actions into a specific direction, as well as to present new alternatives and in order to name things (Hart 1997, 13-16). The changes that rhetoric suggests to its listeners are voluntary, but in the other hand rhetoric always pursues to narrow the action and thinking alternatives of the listener by only suggesting certain action-and thinking patterns (Hart, 1997, 7). The previous of course suggests that rhetoric in its core is a medium to influence and to persuade.

The concept of rhetoric mergers with the concept of political by the way its subject matter and use are being defined. Political rhetoric handles public issues, which are regarded as political and its aspiration is to change attitudes and opinions towards political issues (Bitzer 1981, 225, 231; Denton & Hahn 1986, 5-6). Political rhetoric is not only the message which the politician delivers to her/his citizens. It additionally is interpretation inside the head of each listening individual. Every citizen who reflects and conducts their own meanings about public issues, is in fact exercising political rhetoric (Bitzer 1981, 228.)

Foster (2010, 4) states that political communication is largely defined by its relation to voters and their voting behavior. Also Denver (2007) states that interaction from a politician to a potential voter, in the form of communication and rhetoric, which aims to persuade and influence the behavior of the voter, is as a phenomenon as old as politics itself. (Denver 2007, 125). According to Martin (2014, 1) the art of rhetoric is essentially the art of persuasion. He adds that it is difficult to imagine politics without persuasion or in other words: without rhetoric, since by the very nature of politics it requires choices, options and decisions being made. Rhetoric reveals to us the actual character of the political. (Martin 2014, 2.)

Rhetoric also gives political institutions an opportunity to resolve conflicts and put in affect political trends either by activating or passivating other political agents such as voters for example (Smith & Smith 1990, 226-227). One use of political rhetoric is to direct the citizens' ideas of individual needs towards communal needs and to fill their heads with communal thoughts, beliefs, values and experiences (Hart 1987, 69). Martin (2014, 3) views that a political institution such as democracy has little value without free speech in public or private, without the chance to express our views, to persuade others of their value or to hold politicians and governments accountable

while demanding answers from them or even ourselves to become leaders. This means that without a true freedom of speech – an open forum for the orating of one's own opinions - democracy is without substance. In this perspective political rhetoric and communication holds a key role in the ways we view and value our western democracies.

In the field of political communication, many studies focus on understanding how voters are led or persuaded by elected officials or how officials use the art of argumentation and strategy on the campaign road (Gonzàles & Tanno 1997, 3). According to Palonen (1997, 75) rhetoric itself in the field of politics works as a research method as well as a viewpoint to it. In addition to these, Foster (2010) emphasizes the increasing role of media and technology in terms of political communication research as Martin (2014) underlines the cornerstone of it all: the rhetoric itself – from classic to the new - in all political interaction.

2.2.2 Presidential rhetoric

Presidential rhetoric is an essential part of political rhetoric. As the rhetorical leader of the nation, the president seeks to lead through words. (Medhurst & Aune 2008, 132.) The research of presidential rhetoric examines how the popularity of a president changes by her/his symbolic behavior. The actual power of a president is in many cases greatly symbolic and its base lies upon the fact how strongly the citizens identify with the image of reality created by their president. (Denton & Hahn 1986, 8.) The importance of presidential rhetoric as such can be valued already by the quantity of academic research that has been made on the subject. Its magnitude is manifested especially in the US where research on presidential rhetoric has a deep tradition. The academic disciplines of speech and communication have contributed substantially to the field of presidential rhetoric since for the past 90 years, scholars have analyzed how language functions to achieve certain goals for speakers. (Medhurst & Aune 2008, 4.) One of the cornerstones in the studies of US presidential rhetoric is considered to be the work by Jeffrey K. Tulis: *The Rhetorical Presidency* in 1987. In his work the term "rhetorical presidency" was coined and made popular of its original 1981 form. The term is still widely used today to emphasize the importance of the president's direct rhetorical powers in relation to the American public, on the expense of the institutional US government bodies and the United States Congress. (Tulis, 1987).

The presidency is more than just the individual (and her/his characteristics) who holds the office: the presidency is an institutional, cultural and symbolic role, which to a large degree limits the behavior of whoever is in office, due to the institutional requirements (Smith & Smith 1990, 237; Denton & Hahn 1986, 9-10; Denton & Woodward 1990, 215). In case of the president of the United States of America for example, when it comes to her/his speech delivering, these ceremonial and institutional requirements play a key role. The two official speeches that are regarded as the most significant political addresses that the US president regularly delivers are: the *inauguration speech* and the *State of the Union Address.* In the inauguration speech it is a custom that the new president in office presents his views and objectives on policy and where her/his focus will lie during the coming presidency. In a State of the Union Address it is instead a tradition to present the means on how to concretely achieve the set goals chosen for the current administration. (Nelson & Riley 2010, 123, 133).

Speechmaking is a central part of the duties of a president, so the ability to successfully deliver meaningful rhetoric is essential to the execution of the office. The speech of a president is a public media event in which the president should be able to conduct strong images to which the audience can identify with. Thus it can be stated that everything a president says is possibly influential communication: communication that means to influence and persuade. (Denton & Hahn 1986, 60.) For example, by referring and comparing to historical events, a president can try to achieve approval to her/his policies from the citizens (Kiewe 1994, xvi, 203).

The presidency can also be seen as a certain rhetorical narrative, which is being constructed by symbolic communication, based on factual matters and imagination with the purpose of influencing people –these factual matters and imagination are constructed only in the minds of the people (Fisher 1980, 120-126). According to Denton and Hahn (1986, 11) the presidency is first and foremost rhetorical, since it is being constantly defined by public communication. For a rhetorical presidency it is characteristic to be depend strongly on speechmaking and identify the rhetoric with actions - this turns speech into a message and an act (Hart 1987, 4, 14-15, 45-46; Hart 1997, 40).

Today the presidency as an institution is more rhetoric than ever before since the presidency is being determined by media publicity, the transformation of political processes into media spectacles and the building of images (Kiewe 1994, xxvi). As modern technology changes and improves rapidly so do our politicians as a consequence. Politicians have adapted their means of campaigning and governing to the standards of today in terms of technology. (Trent, Friedenberg & Denton 2011, 302). It can be understood that in order for a modern day politician to be successful, it is essential for them to take advantage of the modern day technology and different forms of media that is at their grasp. This applies also to their use of political rhetoric in terms of political communication. By emphasizing the importance of speechmaking in regards to the presidency, it has made rhetorical abilities into one of the most important skills of any modern president. Rhetorical presidents lean strongly on their public attractiveness and they are simultaneously creators of mental images as they are seeking to define situations and create realities which they hope will then be approved by their public. (Kiewe 1994, xvi.)

Especially the presidency of the United States of America is widely considered to be a rhetorical role, which cannot fulfill its purpose without the use and understanding of mass media (Smith & Smith 1990, 234). According to Torkki (2006, 30) the president of the US has the ability to use his rhetoric in order to achieve her/his political goals and that in political rhetoric the most important thing is to break the former perceptions, convictions or decisions of the audience and additionally provide them with a new perspective. It is important to note that when examining presidential speeches – especially those of the US presidents – that the they themselves do not necessarily portray the personal rhetoric of the president, but the rhetoric of the presidential institution as most of the speeches have been written by political advisers while the presidents donate the last personal touch (Denton & Woodward 1990, 232).

The influence of modern day mass media has made the publics larger than ever as well as made the possibilities of receiving news and messages imminent, hence the role of political rhetoric is even more emphasized today. During the last decades the mass media have merged into a key factor in communicating messages for political campaigns (Stiff & Mongeau 2003, 284). The mass media in its current form is also reporting rapidly of the stance of support each distinguishable politician holds at all times, which is not a matter of no relevance. The higher the support of a

president happens to be the easier it is for her/him to execute effective policy. For example: when republican president George W. Bushes (US president 2001-2009) approval ratings were up to 70% it was not challenging for him to push through legislation in the congress. In contrast when his approval rating was down to 40%, his acts for legislation proceeded slowly if at all. (Denton & Kuypers 2008, 262-263.) Of course this was also the case with Bushes successor democratic president Barack Obama (US president 2009-2017) and it is important to note that the consistence of the house of representatives as well as the senate plays a significant role in the matter of supporting the president's bills of legislation. For example: during 2003-2007 the republican party held a majority both in the house of representatives and in the senate, which in effect made the actual power of president Bush strong (Whitney 2009, 608-615). So as much as the various constitutional and democratic political aspects define the powers of a president, so do the effects of the mass media and communication.

According to Nimmo and Combs (1983) the presence of mass media has also presented negative factors: because of mass media, the broadcasted messages should always be presented according to a sense of a dramatic aspect where evident occurrences, characters, plots, motives and locations are present. Nimmo and Combs also suggest that between these different elements there should appear a dramatic conflict. This observation by Nimmo and Combs (1983) about presidential rhetoric is an interesting one especially in regard this study, as it consists a great deal of the same aspects on rhetoric as does Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism. Burke (1969a) noticed the special role of the president as the unifier of a nation. According to Burke the president faces the paradox of togetherness-difference, according to which he should make attempts in order to unify the nation, but not too well. A unity that would be too strong does not leave space to identification and therefore no space to influence. As an example of effective means of identification Burke presents the all-encompassing motive or creating of a situation. With this identification method the president can compose a common goal or a slogan which presents an enemy. (Burke 1969a, 392).

In the research of presidential rhetoric, emphasis is being put on how the president achieve, maintain or lose the public support by using symbols. The symbolic power of the president is largely based on the skillful political use, composition and elaboration of symbols: the way how

strongly a public can identify and stand behind an image of reality presented to them by the president. Theoretically everything that a president says or does is potentially aimed to influence and it can contain certain meanings to some groups of people. Symbols that are meant to influence politically are effective since they are often semantically ambiguous and wide, which makes them more likely to rouse feelings of unity in their listeners. (Denton & Hahn 1986, 8, 52, 60, 63.)

In addition, a great deal of research regarding presidential communication is done with a strong focus on the debates between presidential candidates and their images. For example: Denton (2017): The 2016 US presidential campaign: political communication and practice, Newton and LaMay (2008): Inside the Presidential Debates: Their Improbable Past and Promising Future, Hacker (2004): Presidential candidate images and Kendall (2000): Communication in the presidential primaries: candidates and the media, 1912-2000.

2.2.3 Campaign communication and rhetoric

Elections are the core of democracy and essentially important because they enable the people by active participation to select their own leaders. Nowhere in the world are a greater number of people more freely a part of the active and responsible participation in their choice of selecting their own political leaders than in the United States of America (Trent, Friedenberg & Denton 2011, 1). In addition, according to the views of Terrill (2015, 1) the interdependence of rhetoric and democracy has already long been understood in our western society.

Election campaigning is political communication and rhetoric, which aims to make a difference in the attitudes, values, beliefs and behavior. Lilleker describes (2006, 49) political campaigning as a chain of planned events which aim to communicate a certain message to a specific crowd of people and by influencing them attempts to receive the support of these people. The interaction and conversations between a nominee and a voter which take place during a political campaign, are often targeted in order to convince the voter that the candidate is in fact qualified and reliable (Finstad & Isotalus 2005, 20). According to Burgoon, Hunsaker and Davidson (1994, 7) influencing is a conscious, symbolic actions which targets to create, shape, and strengthen beliefs, opinions, values, attitudes and the behavior of people. In a political campaign the targeted audience is continuously subjected to campaign messages: the messages themselves are often a part of a

specifically planned entity and strategy, which aims to achieve certain objectives (Stiff & Mongeau 2003, 282).

Larson (2013, 334, 311) says that the re-emerging characteristics of a political campaign are its attempts to influence and persuade, agenda setting, to execute strategic and tactical aspects as well as the aim to conduct a certain image of a specific issue among the people. According to him, campaigning is a chain of various different communicational acts during a certain period of time: the campaigns often proceed by a planned fashion firstly by catching the people's attention, then preparing them to decide and finally to propose them to act. In addition, Larson (2001) argues that a five stage-model of international politics developed by Binder (1971) can be usefully applied in the context of persuasive communication campaigns. (Stiff & Mongeau, 2003, 284).

In the view of Trent and Friedenberg (2008) political campaigning is perceived as something that is constructed by different faces which then follow one and other in a natural fashion. According to them (2008, 22) a political campaign can be traditionally seen as something that is being executed in a four stage plan, all stages containing various communicative functions. The first stage is called *surfacing*, during which the candidates aim to create an image of themselves as potential candidates, provoke public interest and bring forth their potential preliminary opinions. The second stage is the occurrence of possible *primaries*, where certain candidates of their own group are being selected to run officially. In the third stage the candidates announce officially their candidacy, this stage is called the *nominating conventions*, which often consists of official ceremonies and the presentation of the candidate's campaign-schedule and slogans. During this stage a great attempt for the highest possible media coverage is often taking place. The final stage *the general election*, is the part which requires the most from the candidate in terms of interaction. In this stage the candidate, delivers speeches, meets with people actively, talks with the voters and tries to prompt his political agenda as visibly as possible. (Trent & Friedenberg 2008, 22-69).

This four stage political campaign pattern manifests itself greatly in the context of American elections, especially the election for the president. It of course needs to be stated that not all political campaigns start and run in clockwork fashion as there can be various different ways a potential political candidate makes themselves known these days. It is also a custom for a potential

candidate to observe the general political situation and flirt with the idea of running for a political office for any number of time before actually declaring their candidacy. According to Trent, Friedenberg and Denton (2011, 27) the 2004 US presidential election, like many of its predecessors for example, saw various unofficial campaign starts and they add that the presidential campaign for the 2000 started as early as May 1997.

Today with the active and spread use of different forms of social media, the interactional part and communication via technology is being underlined when examining the communication patterns between candidates and voters. The ways that politicians have changed in their ways of campaigning and governing is a straight consequence to the speed in which our society and technology is changing (Trent, Friedenberg & Denton 2011, 302). For example, during the US presidential election of 2008, the campaign team of Barack Obama greatly exploited the opportunities that new digital communication technology and the different platforms of social media offered; they were used especially, to revive local campaigning. (Foster 2010, 53)

Despite the technological aspects in political communication, it still seems that most of the definitions of political campaigns emphasize the importance of the interactions and conversations that the candidates have with the potential voters - this applies both to the traditional face to face communication as to the technology based forms of communicating. So instead of dethroning the traditional ways of political campaigning and political communication, technology seems to have become an essential part of it.

In addition, Finstad and Isotalus (2005, 20) emphasize the interactional nature of all political campaigns. According to them political campaign communication in terms of elections should not be observes solely as communication from a candidate to her/his potential voters, since also the needs, expectations and hopes that the candidates have, plays a significant role in a successful political communication campaign. Additionally, Borg and Moring (2005, 47) define political campaigning as a multileveled and interactional chain of events in which the candidates and their potential voters are given a chance to meet each other and exchange their visions. Isotalus adds (1998, 8-9) that political campaigning has changed all over the globe in the past decades due to the changes of the political culture: politics is more and more centralized into being personified

which has led to the outcome where individual politicians play a far more visible role than the traditional parties. So we can assume that in today politics and political campaign communication and rhetoric, the images of the individual politicians are being emphasized above all other matters such as policy, values, solutions etc.

The discussed aspect of planned stages in forms of political campaigning by Trent and Friedenberg (2008), is an interesting one, especially when considering the candidacy and presidency of Donald Trump. Rather similarly to their view, also in Binder's (1971) five stage plan of international politics – which can also be used in campaigning – the first phase is called *identification*. The importance of developing an identity in the minds of the voters is being emphasized as fundamental. The presidential campaign of 1976 by Jimmy Carter (US president 1977-1981) is presented as an example: Carter's campaign depended greatly on the stage of identification since the American people had little previous knowledge of who he was and which political issues he was prompting. (Stiff & Mongeau, 2003, 284).

It must be stated that Donald Trump has been a public figure and a celebrity since the 1980's - more than 35 years before his election - , but even with his status of fame he has not been viewed as a serious potential political candidate until his announcement to run for presidency in 2015 (and even not after this since Donald Trump never held a political position before). So it can be argued that whether or not a person is well known by the public, in order for them to be perceived as a plausible presidential candidate in the US, there are means to do so in terms of campaign communication.

2.2.4 Populism and propaganda in rhetoric

Not another US election campaign, presidential or other has seen as many exploitations of populism as the presidential election of 2016, where both Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders were labelled as populists. (Müller 2016, 1)

Before I define the meanings of populism and a populist I will first take a look at the aspects of propaganda in the fields of political influencing, communication and rhetoric. Even as populism

and propaganda as concepts cannot be comprehensibly tied together in a definitive way they are however linked to each other. For example: Taveira and Nyerges (2016) discuss Donald Trump, propaganda and populism in their article *Populism and propaganda in the US culture industries.* They examine the issue of Donald Trump's "demagogic populism" and wonder how the institutionalization of Trump's rhetoric could possibly convert the ways of his self-promotion to a concrete political end. Their question: "what is the interface between the populist energies of propaganda, as it moves through the public sphere, and the institutions of the US state?", shows that when examining political communication and rhetoric in the case of Donald Trump: populism and propaganda are two major concepts which cannot be justifiably separated. (Taveira & Nyerges 2016, 4.) In addition, (Schulz & Saussure 2005) address the elements of populism and propaganda together in their work *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind.*

In the view of Snow (2014) Propaganda has emerged as an inseparable part of the modern American society of today. According to Lasswell (1969, 3) propaganda can be defined and viewed as a means of changing attitudes of people as well as a process. In this case propaganda is the transferring of certain attitudes to a community which sees those attitudes and beliefs as contrary to the ones they currently have (Laswell 1969, 13). The French Jacques Ellul (1912-1994) a significant scholar in the field of propaganda research, famously defined propaganda as "a set of methods employed by an organized group that wants to bring about the active or passive participation in its actions of a mass of individuals, psychologically unified through psychological manipulations and incorporated in an organization". (Ellul 1965, 61.)

Jowett and O'Donnell (1986, 16) define propaganda from a communicational point of view as a measured and systematic attempt to shape views, manipulate cognition and direct behavior in a way that creates a reaction, which supports the objectives and pursuits of the user of propaganda. This of course might not be in the core interests of those subjected to the propaganda unlike in a more interactional form of rhetoric. The objective of Propaganda from the point of view of the institution or organization that actively executes it, can be seen as the preservation of their own legitimacy and thus reassure the justification of their own actions. In addition, propaganda attempts to embody information from certain narrow field. Reactions to propaganda are being manipulated by maintaining the points of focus on these narrow fields of information without encouraging the

public to ask any questions of any other subject area. (Jowett & O' Donnell 1986, 19-20, 155.)

The shapes of propaganda vary from mellow information manipulation to direct lying. (Black 2001) Foulkes (1983, 11) underlines the concept of *political propaganda*, stating that it emerges when a group of people – often a government or one of its organizations – use forms of influence in an attempt to achieve objectives which are vividly distinguished and precise. In the view of Lasswell (1969, 13) the objectives of anyone using propaganda are to redefine attitudes towards certain objects by controlling the available symbols.

As a word, propaganda does without a doubt have a negative tone to it, thus it is interesting to observe what Laswell said about the matter: "Propaganda as a mere tool is no more moral or immoral than a pump handle". (Sproule 1997, 69.) Also according to Taylor (2003, 2) propaganda as a process of communication should be first and foremost be viewed as value neutral. These views argue that propaganda in itself is a neutral tool of communication, but are not naive about the fact that the intensions which often occur behind propaganda are themselves potentially harmful. In reference to the previous subchapter, it is notable to recognize that any forms of propaganda can be used in a political campaign especially from a communications point of view.

As various definitions to the question what propaganda actually is, are being presented above, I will conclude this minor topic to the conclusions merging from the words of Snow (2014, 13): "Regardless of how we end up defining propaganda, it inevitably brings us to information designed to influence someone. It may be intended to convince you to purchase a commercial product, espouse a philosophy or ideology or support or oppose a political cause, but it seems to always end up with behavior".

Neither the definition of populism is unambiguous since it has changed its meaning in the course of years as politics and political culture has evolved. Also geographical and anthropological elements play a part in the definition. The terms which define a populist in Europe and maybe even in the US might not resonate in the same way in Latin-America. In this study I will however offer a few definitions of scholars who define the term from a European and North-American point of view.

Rosanvallon describes the core of populism which rises from our western democracies, in the

following fashion: Populism can be interpreted firstly through the tensions of representation. Populism suggests solutions to the struggles imposed by the people by conjuring an image about the unity and wholeness of a nation, simultaneously maintaining a great distance to everything which is seen as contrary to this concept of a united nation. These contrary elements are: foreigners, enemies, oligarchy and the elite. Populism attempts to strengthen itself by deepening this division and continuously condemning in ever so harder ways that which it regards to be essentially something else than "the people". (Rosanvallon 2006, 210.) Populism, when used by politicians in their rhetoric is - among many other things - a fashion of communicating. It paints simplified pictures of unity on the other hand and division on the other – explaining and justifying this splitting by characteristics of "us the people" and "those foreigners and enemies".

Taguieff (2015) sees populism as a political and rhetorical anti-elite style. According to him the word populism should however be redefined since he makes a clear distinction between the so called post world war protest populism, nationalistic identity populism and the populism which is very common to most politicians today and is not as such harmful or vindictive. Taguieff emphasizes in his work that it is alarming if populistic rhetoric used by politicians, underlines nationalism and open hostility towards the faith of Islam.

Additionally to the views of Rosanvallon and Taguieff, also Müller (2016) sees that the element of anti-establishment is in the very core of populism, adding that populism itself is the shadow of the modern European representative democracy. According to (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2012, 8) populism is an ideology which is thin in its substance as it claims that our society is to its essence divided into two groups: the homogeneous and pure people and the antagonistic corrupt elite. Palonen (2016) on the other hand sees that exactly because of the lack of substance populism sees to suffer of, it is a bendy ideology. This means that it can be used by both left and right wing politicians, as it can be exclusive and inclusive at the same time.

The analysis of populism as a thin and empty ideology which can be used by politicians from any traditional political background (left to right) is interesting especially in terms of political rhetoric and propaganda. Also the so called theory of populism by Laclau (2005) is based fundamentally on the skillful use of empty meanings lacking any actual substance. Laclau explains that populism channels and gathers inside itself unattached demands, which receive a unifying meaning. An

empty meaning in Laclau's definition refers to an expression which is empty because it is prospectively so full of meanings that in the end it does not stand for anything, or on the other hand everyone in principle can approve of it. Laclau also adds that he sees populism as "the very essence of the political". (Laclau 2005, 222.)

Laclau's definition can in its simplicity explain the charm and fascination of modern day populism here in Europe as well as in the USA. All the presented definitions of populism do emphasize an ideology that offers an effortlessness view on complex and multilayered societal problems drawing clear lines which in themselves do not require explaining. Müller suggests that the attractiveness of populism lies in the promises of democracy which have not been fulfilled as the crucial promise of populism instead is that the people – not the elite – can rule. (Müller 2016, 76.) Rosanvallon sees that the rise of modern day populism can partly be associated with the crisis of democratic representation, which itself is an indication of the fact that the society of today is more difficult to comprehend, since the old class structures are vanishing and the so called traditional parties are unable to express current issues in meaningful ways. (Rosanvallon 2006, 211.)

As for defining a populist I can state referring to the presented definitions of populism that a politician is a populist if he uses ambiguous language and rhetoric over complex societal issues, which is actively anti-elite and prompts visions of national unity and hegemony while vindicating everything that is foreign and not a member of "us" according to the definitions made by the populist. In their rhetoric this sort of a populist can portray political values which on the traditional left-right-axel can originate from either side.

As some of the mentioned scholars like Laclau and Taguieff weigh populism as an essential part or at least a byproduct of modern day democracy, others like Müller and Rosanvallon see it more clearly as a threat and an unhealthy element. As populists however tend to be gifted narrators in the art of rhetoric, it is interesting to examine what Martin (2014, 3) says about the matter from the point of view of this study: persuasive speech can function as both the poison as well as the cure for democracy.

2.3. Kenneth Burke's rhetorical theory

The American Kenneth Burke (1897-1993) is widely considered to be one of the most influential rhetorical theorists of his own lifetime (Larson 2012, 83). He is also regarded as one of the key figures in the creation of the school of thought called *the new rhetoric* (Enos & Brown 1994; Foss 2004). By the publication of his perhaps two most famous works: *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) and *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950) Burke legitimated a new rhetorical perspective and even more importantly, US communication departments continued onwards with their teachings of rhetorical practices (Palonen 2003, 133).

According to Puro (2006, 122) Burke can however not be considered as a scholar of rhetoric alone due to the broad variety of work he produced as well as the strong philosophical approach he wrote them with. This in itself is not at all that surprising as according to another famous scholar of rhetoric Chaim Perelman (1912-1984): "The relations between rhetoric and philosophy have been essential to the destiny of rhetoric". In the opinion of Perelman, Kenneth Burke rose as single handedly the best analysist ever in argumentative usage of literary techniques. (Perelman 1982, 91, 153). Also Bygrave (2003) defines Burke among many other things as a literary critic. However broad Burke's legacy might be, he still remains best known for his body of work which is considered the foundation for the modern study of rhetoric. (Crable, 2012).

2.3.1 Dramatism by Burke

Burke's own view on rhetoric contains fundamentally the assumption that spoken language embodies an emotional charge. According to Burke not a single word can be neutral in its meaning and as a result the attitudes of people, their emotions and ability to judge transpires as immutable in their used language. (Littlejohn 2002, 155.) Burke saw first and foremost that rhetoric as such is present everywhere where there is an attempt to influence. Secondly he stated that rhetoric is identification and the creation of identification. Thirdly Burke explained that rhetoric is communication, because without interaction between a speaker and her/his audience there cannot be rhetoric. (Burke 1962, 562-563, 570.) All human actions are in essence generally manifested through rhetoric, since action is always about the relationship between a speaker and her/his

audience which is associated with a particular goal (Burke 1962, 528). These views of Burke suggest us to believe that communication in itself is the basic requirement of rhetoric.

The theory of dramatism can be considered as an approach to study and examine ways of influencing and a way to find the elements, which people use in order to influence others (Burke 1969b, 43). The word dramatism was Burke's favorite word in describing what occurs when people open their mouths in order to communicate and interact with each other (Griffin 2010, 289). Subsequently dramatism has become a sort of a hypernym for the whole approach of Burke's rhetoric (Puro 2009, 125). However, some scholars such as Shultz (2000, 254) see the theory of dramatism from a more practical point of view: as a mere tool for rhetorical analysis.

Burke (1968, 445) noted that dramatism was the most direct way in to the exploration of human relationships and their motives. The fundamental concept in dramatism is the examination of human actions and these actions can occur as symbolic or concrete deeds, which then are being analyzed further. Dramatism's foundations lie in the principal thought that life can be compared to drama in addition to events which we are familiar with due to theatrical plays, which are of course fictional. With this comparison, relationships and life can be analyzed in the same fashion as the plays that are being acted out in theatres. (Blakesley, 2002.) In Burke's own view: the fundamental basis of his theory of dramatism are the symbols which people continuously use as they communicate through speaking. Through these symbols one can study and examine the concept of motive in all human interaction. Burke saw that the concept of motive behind the actions of people was absolutely essential in order to analyze and find out why people do and say as they do and say. (Burke, 1969.)

It can be stated that the whole starting point of dramatism is the view of human beings as creatures who use, create and misuse symbols (Bobbit, 2004). The entire reality of human beings is constructed by symbolic structures since we are considered as creatures who use symbols. Because we are human it means that we create our realities through the construction of language. (Burke 1966, 5-6.) The usage of language is in itself a form of symbolic action and the most essential quality of human interaction is the implementation of experiences, actions and intentions into linguistic expressions (Burke 1966, 14-15). According to Burke, the symbolic system separates us from animals since if the world consisted only of movement and materialistic elements, the

examination of human behavior would be impossible. This is why Burke stated that the so called animalistic physical movements – bodily functions – are not to be considered when examining human actions in his theory of dramatism. The humane actions conduct the foundations for the drama which is being developed as the research method of dramatism (Foss, Foss & Trapp 1985, 166.)

Burke's perception of human beings as creatures who use symbols, is in the very core of the theory of dramatism: symbols are the executors of our actions. It is exactly the human ability to exploit and use symbolic structures that makes us human. We humans use symbols in ethically questionable ways, carelessly and often without a clear perception of all the meanings that are embodied in them, but it is precisely this symbolic attribute which guides us forward in our lives. Therefore, based on the previous the idea of us being often the only audience of our own rhetoric is being explained. (Puro 2006, 126.)

Even rhetoric is purely based on the basic functions of language: using language as a symbolic instrument in order to make other creatures, who also use and react to symbolic structures, to work together. This kind of a rhetoric motive for action can be found from all language that is aimed to persuade and influence – in all aspects of life. (Burke 1962, 567-568.) This means that a speaker -in an attempt of influencing or persuading another person or persons – uses lingual strategies with the most fitting symbols in order to transmit the message he wants to transmit to her/his listeners. With these strategies and symbols the speaker aims to persuade the listeners that his attributes are similar or even identical to the attributes of the people in listening. This creates a merging of substances and identification between the speaker and the listeners. (Day 1960, 272.) When this sort of merging of substances and identification takes place between a speaker and her/his audience – a politician at a campaign rally for example – then it is possible that the speaker is capable of persuading his listeners.

In terms of persuasive rhetoric and communication also in the political context of this study, it is interesting to observe how Burke himself emphasized the meaning of free will. According to him any kind of persuasion always involves a choice from the point of view of the person who is about to be persuaded. This choice is of course a manifestation of a person's free will to choose. Therefore, as Burke (1969a, 50) said: Persuasion always involves choice, free will: it is directed

to a person only in so far as this person is free to choose.

We can therefore make the assumption that a person who is being persuaded due to identification or the merging of substances, is also theoretically open to being persuaded. In the political context of this study it is of course vital to note that at campaign rallies a great deal of audience members are already supporters of the speaker. Therefore, the level of persuasion conducted by the speaker can be even more effective as members of the audience do not hold an inner opposition to reject the message delivered by the speaker. It goes without saying that with a vividly favorable audience, the speaker is also able to put less effort to his means of persuasion.

As the theory of dramatism is seen as concretely applicable in order for one to conduct a functional textual rhetorical analysis, it has however also been often under criticism. Many scholars of rhetoric have perceived dramatism as a rather confusing and an excessively complex theory (Foss, Foss & Trapp, 1991). It is true that as Burke's theory is not only rather aged, it is also constructed on the complex definitions of very specific and sometimes ambiguous concepts. The problems of the potential challenges in comprehending the theoretical background of dramatism do not lie on the univocal complexity of its concepts, but merely on the fact that in order to understand them truly, one must dedicate a great deal of time to it. The overall understanding of Burke's theory becomes even more difficult when one realizes that he often uses words and concepts –which as such are simple enough to comprehend – in different contexts in different works of his. So one great and deserved point of criticism is Burke's somewhat challenging style of writing and his lack of functional self-referring.

In addition, it can be argued that as the main purpose of Burke's dramatism is to explain the human motives that are behind symbolic interaction, his theory is as ambitious as it is too wide in scope. His detailed concepts which each include sub concepts or in other words: elements of their own, allow any scholar of communication to dig deeply into their chosen rhetorical subject matter. It is however clear that in order for anyone to make objective and justifiable results in their rhetorical analysis with the use of dramatism, they must pay special attention both during the conduct of their research, but also when they represent the obtained results.

It should be clear that dramatism does not offer an objective truth to any given issue, even as its core purpose is to reveal the hidden motives of the speaker. Therefore, dramatism should never be seen as the only way to conduct textual rhetorical analysis, but rather one of the many ways. In my opinion the great strength and the greatest weakness of dramatism lies in its partly ambiguous and somewhat intangible concepts. At the same time, it offers a serious and a functional tool for a thorough rhetorical analysis, but it comes with the responsibility of understanding that the conducted analysis is as much as worthless if the presentation of the used method and results is not sufficient. Therefore, the difference between an excellent and a poor use of the theory of dramatism can come down to two things: the motivation and necessary humility of the researcher.

2.3.2 The dramatistic pentad

The dramatistic pentad is both an instrument and a theory which Kenneth Burke created in order to analyze and understand texts (Fox, 2002.) With the use of the dramatistic pentad, one is able to examine and study symbolic actions. To Burke himself both verbal and nonverbal elements of language seemed as naturally persuasive and he saw them as the functions of social actions and processes. (Dickinson 2009, 126.) Burke's method offers either a way to uncover and comprehend human motives or then it is a vehicle to realize the attributing of motives through the use of language. (Enoch & Anderson 2013).

By using the dramatistic pentad as an instrument for analysis, one can examine the actions of people by analyzing the used symbols in their language and which potential motives are hidden behind the use of these particular symbols (Hansen 1996, 56). In other words, by the utilization of the dramatistic pentad method, one can identify and name the motives hidden beneath the actions. The method was developed by Burke based on the perception that people live in an active functional world, which is a realm for people who specifically use symbols. These symbol using people have a unique ability to plan their actions before actually executing them. (Walker & Monin 2001, 269.)

The dramatistic pentad consists of five elements of drama which are then used in order to analyze and examine the chosen text. The elements of the dramatistic pentad are *act*, *agent*, *scene*, *agency* and *purpose*. According to Burke (1969a xi) in order to make justifiable interpretations about the

motives of the speaker, one has to be able to name the act (what has occurred in ideas or actions) and the scene (background of the situation and the scene itself where the act has occurred). In addition, one has to be able to define the agent (who, which person or someone in the nature of a person executed the act) and the agency (what means did the agent use in order to do the act) and additionally: what was the purpose of the act. (Burke 1969a xi) (Burke 1962, xvii).

The presentation of the five elements below elucidates the use of the dramatistic pentad. The actual order of the elements does not bare much of significance since the fundamental idea of the method is about the wholeness and entity of the pentad: all five elements together. It is of course essential to name the act before the agency in order for the actual entity to make sense as a tool for credible analysis. The questions posed after the named elements are not a part of the theoretical background, but a mean of visualization, in order for the reader to comprehend the purposes of the elements of the dramatistic pentad in a clear fashion.

The elements of the dramatistic pentad:

1. Act – what is happening?
2. Agent – who is executing the act?
3. Scene – where and when is the act taking place?
4. Agency – how is the act being executed?
5. Purpose – what is the motive of the act?

With the use of the dramatistic pentad model as a tool of analysis, one is able to define and name the different levels of influencing and identification. According to Puro (2006) Burke's aim was to get researchers using the method to exert themselves with each element sufficiently enough and on the other hand to recognize the correlative connections between them. The element of agency has been chosen on the basis of the purpose – the motives behind the agency. Instead the element of act requires the scene and the agent, which all guide the agency. Burke himself underlined the importance of understanding the elements of the dramatistic pentad as a whole. (Puro, 2006, 129-130. Things, actions and situations are never identical, so by referring to them with an identical word, leaves the definitions always somewhat unclear (Burke 1969a, xix)

Even as Burke (1962; 1969a) explained that the dramatistic pentad is a tool to find out the motives of a speaker, one cannot only put emphasis on the last element of the pentad: purpose. The motives of a speaker through an analysis is obtainable only by the coherent use of all elements as has been explained above. Also Brock, Scott and Chesebro (1990) underline the importance of the understanding of this when using the method. When covering the concept of a human and her/his motivations, one has to include all elements of the dramatistic pentad.

As far as these elements are being presented as elements, it is possible to detect a sort of division between them. In some cases of analysis, one element might emerge as a more dominant one, than the other elements and this can mean that the others are deriving from this ruling element. On the other hand, there is also a great deal of unity between the elements. The dramatistic pentad as a tool and method of analysis is capable of expressing possibilities, division and unity. (Brock, Scott & Chesebro 1990, 190.) The aspects of unity, division and the possible dominance of one element can potentially lead to a situation where some elements are somewhat overlapping due to the particular nature of these certain elements. For example, when detecting the elements act and agency, it is comprehensible to see how they might be overlapping since the element of act explains what is happening and the element agency explains how the act is happening.

In his study of symbolic action through dramatism called "Land of No Motives" Clark Rountree (2010) discusses the elements of the dramatistic pentad in their relation to revealing the motives of a speaker. When the motives are metaphorically reverted to our world, our ability to answer the five questions posed in the dramatism returns to us. The five questions posed by dramatism are: who, what, when, where, how and why. When analyzing life through the scope of dramatism, one should note that its fundamental principle is constructed by the idea that we should be able to see the difference in things and set them apart from each other. This leads to various levels of hierarchies where things are being classified into ranking orders. As symbol using creatures we do not only detect the differences in things, but we also create, compare and express them – consciously and unconsciously. (Rountree 2010.) According to Burke's theory of dramatism, the elements of the dramatistic pentad should be compared to each other in order to obtain information of the speaker's motives. When one message emphasizes one element over the others, it exposes the world view or the philosophy of the speaker. (Griffin 2010, 291.)

In Burke's own view (1969a) he did not intend to create the elements of his dramatistic pentad as unambiguous or potently consistent. Instead, in order to avoid the creation of enigmatic elements he conducted these presented elements, which reveal the sections in a text from which the true enigmas rise. (Burke 1969a, xvii). This signifies that the proper use of the five elements of Burke unveil the mysterious parts of a speaker's rhetoric and therefore allow the motives behind the speaker to be analyzed.

It bares mentioning that not everyone views the use of this method by Kenneth Burke, as an optimal tool for rhetorical analysis, as the dramatistic pentad has received some amount of criticism as well. It is being criticized for being too heuristic in its approach towards texts. Also claims have been made against the method for its too journalistic stance regarding issues, since it essentially asks the questions who, what, when, where, why and how. Burke himself commented on the matter by stating that journalists and members of the press use their questions for ideas whereas the dramatistic pentad has been composed in order to analyze and understand ready-made texts. (Fox 2002.)

2.3.3 Identification

Identification is the most fundamental concept of Burke's dramatistic theory. He saw identification as the basic process of rhetoric: as a vehicle for rhetoric and the objective of it (Burke 1962, 522.) According to Burke (1962, 19-23) identification as a concept is more relevant than the classical concept of rhetoric: influencing and persuading. Also Puro (2006, 124-125) defined identification as one of the most essential concepts of dramatism. Burke stated that the methods of classical rhetorical studies, which emphasize the importance of influencing and persuasion, are not able to explain the ways how a group creates social unity by rhetorical actions. He argued that the study of traditional rhetoric does not concentrate on the relation of opinions and actions, but on the relation of opinions and truth. (Burke, 1962, 578).

Identification itself is the process in which the substances and interests of different people meet. It can also be the process where people believe that the substances and interests meet or then they are made to believe that this happens. Burke (1962, 544-545). In this context of identification, the

word substance is used to describe the principles, feelings, ideas, experiences, perceptions, attitudes, values and images of an individual (Burke 1962, 545.) In the view of Burke's dramatism (1962, 337) the substance describes how a person has been symbolically constructed. These substances reveal themselves when a person uses certain vocabulary in the way they describe people, things and problems (Larson 2010, 128).

Burke described rhetoric as an attempt of a speaker to identify her/himself with the audience with the most desirable way possible, in order for the audience to accept his perceptions of reality as an objective reality and truth (Burke, 1962, 561, 569). Without the desire for a speaker and the audience to identify with each other there would be no influencing, this means that the need to identify is a basic requirement for rhetoric (Burke, 1962, 544-545).

The opposite concepts of identification are division and dissociation (Littlejohn 2002, 155). This contradiction can be explained with the following example: there would be no need for rhetoric if people where absolutely unified creatures. If people actually were all a part of the same substance, then the most perfect form of communication would be a part of their deepest essence. (Burke 1962, 546.) This means that rhetorical identification in a certain sense equalizes and balances the natural differences of people. If these divisions and differences between people did not exist, it can be argued - based on Burke's ideas - that then rhetoric would be no longer required. From this point of view rhetoric, through identification can be used as a vehicle of constructing unity amongst groups of people and as a tool of harmonizing different views, beliefs, values and attitudes. This of course is also the case with political rhetoric.

Burke stated that rhetoric is everywhere where identification and its opposite dissociation appear simultaneously. The internalization of a rhetorical motive through identification can be conscious or unconscious, planned or unplanned. (Burke, 1962, 559.) It is however important to notice that identification does not mean the same as identical. People do not change into the same as they are simultaneously unified through certain shared substances and not by other substances. The whole concept of identification should be regarded as a gradual process rather than absolute. Through identification the speaker thrives to convince her/his audience and to create a particular community and a communal feeling of unity, which she/he is part of. When the speaker and the audience are made to appear as the same then also the interests, values and attitudes of the speaker and the

audience start to appear as the same. (Burke 1962, 544-545.)

We identify a person we see as a teacher, a police officer or a politician for example and based on our observations we conduct a perception and norms by how we expect this person to behave and act. Rhetoric uses this process of thought to its advantage: "When a politician tells us he is "one of us", he attempts to identify himself with "us". In addition, when a makeup commercial says: You are worth it", the viewer is being made to identify with the object." (Puro 2006, 124.)

In addition, Burke himself provides an example of identification in his book *A Grammar of Motives and A rhetoric of Motives*: A is not identical with his colleague B, but as far as their interests or pursuable desires are the same A does identify with B. A can also identify her/himself with B even if their interests are contradictory, but in this case A should assume that this is not the case or she/he will be persuaded to think in this fashion. (Burke, 1962, 544.) Furthermore, Burke offers an even more transparent example of a speaker attempting to create identification: when a politician meets a farmer and states: "I was a farm boy myself", the politicians aim to find common substance in terms of a shared identity is evident.

However, in the theory of dramatism, the means to conduct and create identification between a speaker and her/his audience are more numerous and specific than these examples might suggest.

In Table 1 on the following page, I present the six most common means of identification used according to Burke.

Method of conducting identification	What does this concretely signify?	An example of use [39]
1. Identifying	Adjusting the language and attitudes of the speaker with the language and attitudes of the audience.	When talking to a religious group of people the speaker emphasizes traditional religious values and metaphors.
2. Formal Patterns	A use of language that tempts the audience to participate into the shape and form of talking which makes the association with the subject matter also easier.	The use of confrontational language and repetition in the rhetoric in order to emphasize the importance of the matter in question.
3. Framing	A use of language which by the execution of certain ideas or images defines people or things through different subjects, in a frame that creates unity.	By referring to an audience with the words "us" or "our", which automatically excludes everyone else into the category of "all the others". For example: "We the British people.
4. Ambiguous symbols	Language that uses symbols which can be interpreted in various different ways.	By using complex and abstruse things as justification for one's own opinions or actions.
5. Mystification	By hiding the situational motive by a universal or general motive.	Justifying actions by defending the honor of someone (universal motive) whilst the situational motive is in fact revenge.
6. Scapegoating	The transferring of responsibility of a bad situation on the shoulders of someone else by symbolic means: blaming others.	Certain politicians in Britain blaming the economic challenges as the fault of immigrants and the EU bureaucrats in Brussels.

TABLE 1. The most common methods of identification used.

The first way to create identification in the audience is to identify one's own manners with them. A speaker can do this by the use of the same language (dialect's and tones of voice), same gestures, images, attitudes, ideas and hierarchies. Burke states that identifying is the easiest form of creating identification between a speaker and her/his audience. He also states that when examining rhetoric this form of an analysis only produces lists of the things and methods that people in general consider as credible. This Burke concludes is very much in the nature of classical rhetoric which he of course attempted to develop to a more progressive direction. (Burke, 1962, 579-580, 589-591.)

The second way is called the formal patterns. The use of formal patterns tempts the audience first and foremost to participate into the shape of the conversation that is being conducted and then to take part into what is being said. A speaker can for example use very confrontational language which then after resonating well with the audience tempts them to take part in the use of this language. The unifying effect the shape of the speech has to the substance of the speech, explains why the use of formal patterns is quite functional in creating identification. (Burke 1962, 582-583.)

The third way is framing, which according to Burke (1962, 610) means the use of such ideas, images and perceptions which allow the speaker define or associate a person or a reason to whatever other issue, object or person the speaker wishes to. For example, when national socialist German politicians in the 1930's used terms like "true Germans" and "the pure Aryan people" in their rhetoric, to create a sense of national and racial unity as a contrast to the ones who were "not German".

The fourth way to create identification is through the use of ambiguous symbols. The human ability to create, use and misuse symbols is largely based on the fact that the ambiguousness of symbols can be manipulated in order to create an understanding of a certain issue. Burke said that without the ambiguousness of symbols a change of perception cannot. (Burke 1962, xxi.) An example of the use of ambiguous symbols could be for example referring to "common values" without actually specifically defining them.

The fifth way is called mystification. Burke explained that mystification occurs when universal and general motives such as the will of god or honor, are being used to conceal the actual situational motives. (Burke 1962, 634-635).

The sixth and last of the most common used ways to create identification by Burke is called scapegoating. Scapegoating which effectively means putting blame on other people or a certain group of people creates unity in social communities. This is due to the fact that all the possible challenges and tragedies that are occurring inside the community can be blamed on the scapegoat. In this fashion the community purifies itself in a certain sense and is able to be reborn into this new state of unity. (Burke 1962, 406-407).

Due to the diversity and variety of the concept of identification it is not hard to comprehend why it is regarded as the key concept in Burke's theory of dramatism. As Burke himself saw that rhetoric with the use of identification can be a tool for creating unity amongst people – for good and bad – it is interesting to observe from the political communication point of view in this study that according to Griffin (2010, 290) without identification there is no persuasion. This in mind identification can be regarded as a fundamental concept towards all speeches which aim to influence the opinions of people. Whether these speeches are political or not.

2.3.4 The guilt and redemption cycle

In Burke's theory of dramatism, the concept of guilt is fundamental as Burke saw humans as symbol-using and creating creatures. The fact that us humans create, interpret and use symbols, leads simultaneously to the creation of hierarchies, the thoughts of the negative and the element of perfection. The elements of the negative and the perfect eventually lead up to the concept of guilt. Burke saw that the language used by us humans, naturally develops into some form of a social order which is hierarchy. (Bobbit 2004, 34.)

Hierarchies are a structural basis for all dramatistic communities (Brock, Scott & Chesebro 1990, 185). Burke saw drama as a permanent part of all hierarchies and social structures. He explained that the concept of drama is a part of all human interactions because human beings naturally oppose the relationships and actions brought by hierarchies: as a person rejects a traditional hierarchical model without wanting to take part in it, this eventually leads them to feel guilty and unsuccessful about their actions. (Samra 1998.) Accrding to Brummet (1981, 255) these hierarchical grounds in human interaction can be as clear and distinct as the laws that rule our society. In a model of systematic thinking, hierarchical grounds are an essential element (Burke, 1969b, 141).

In Burke's work *Permanence and Change*, he presents the guilt and redemption cycle, which he saw as an important concept in his theory of dramatism.

In Burke's view the world itself was hierarchical in its social structures and thus the theory of dramatism observes the world from the similar standpoint. Based on this standpoint, Burke created the three elements of the guilt and redemption cycle which are: guilt, purification and redemption. The pure existence of hierarchies in our society and in human interactions create acceptance and rejection. Burke saw this element of rejection comparable to the "original sin" and he stated that guilt itself is inherent as people are unable to approve and accept all the various forms of traditional hierarchies with their demands that are placed upon them in our society. The dramatistic actions take place because human beings manage their relationships and actions through these hierarchies. (Burke 1965.)

Also Shultz (2000) sees that people control and manage their lives through hierarchies inside the parameters of their symbolic actions. Burke's view of hierarchical principals explains the human tendency to arrange their lives into hierarchical compartments. As a consequence of these hierarchies, people continuously aim to control their social statuses and an individual uses the cyclical guilt and redemption process in order for them to bring change and growth to their hierarchical situation. (Shultz 2000, 253).

Burke's element of purification – setting oneself free of guilt – can take place only through mortification or victimage. Mortification signifies an action where the guilty party or person sacrifices themselves either by confessing their guilt or by pleading for forgiveness. In this fashion the person calms down the social structures and the balance of the society in which the wrongdoing has taken place. Victimage on the other hand is a form of scapegoating: looking for someone else to blame for the made mistakes and wrongdoings. By putting the collective blame on someone else, the guilty party or person purifies themselves of the guilt through an external factor. In order to successfully execute this method of purification, the sacrifice made through mortification or the blamed scapegoat through victimage, must be at a proportionate level with the so called wrongdoing that has been committed. If the method of purification is unbalanced – the sacrifice or stated guilty party is not sufficient enough to fit the crime – then it will not work and the cycle will be unfinished. (Brock, Scott & Chesebro 1990, 186).

The guilt and redemption cycle is considered to a fundamental part of language and thus essential to being a human (Maddux 2006, 214). As the element of guilt is such an essential part in the definition of the guilt and redemption cycle, one can state that conversations which lead to feelings of guilt are an important part of our rhetorical reality and world. In other words: conversations which allow people to feel guilt will always be in great demand. (Winslow 2007, 3.)

Us human beings act rhetorically in order to undo our guilt. This guilt that people carry is occurring because they will never obtain the perfect desired version of our world which is being constructed by our symbolic systems (Puro 2006, 127-128.) According to Burke (1969a) this is a manifestation of the imperfect characteristics of the human personality. Deep down a person seeks for purification from guilt for the fundamental reason that guilt is being considered as an unpleasant feeling and state of being. This leads a person to seek for forgiveness – in this case a speaker to his audience - in order to carry on and move forward. (Burke 1965, 279).

These views on the core reasons for the emerging of guilt in our hierarchical society and relationships is a fascinating one especially for the purposes of this study. Through the guilt that is present at all times, a speaker might attempt to form a way of identifying with her/his audience by the means of the quilt and redemption cycle: pleading for forgiveness through mortification or by blaming a common enemy through the means of victimage.

3 Design of the study

3.1 Objective

The objective of this study is to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The selected data for this study consists of six different speeches given by Donald Trump during 31.8.2016 – 28.2.2017. In this study the rhetoric of Donald Trump is researched through Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism.

In the following subchapters I will first offer a brief introduction to the subject matter of this study: Donald Trump. Then I will move on to present and comment on each research question separately in addition to offering an explanation on how they are formed based on the theory of dramatism. After this I will explain how the data of this study is being constructed and on which requirements it has been based on. Lastly I will offer a description and an example as to how I use the theory of dramatism as a textual rhetoric analyzing method, in order to provide justifiable, broad and credible answers to the set research questions.

3.1.1 Donald Trump

Donald John Trump (born June 14th 1946) is the current 45th president of the United States of America. He won the presidential election of 2016 as the Republican party candidate with 306 electoral votes to his main opponent Democrat Hillary Clinton's 232. He was sworn into office on the 20th of January 2017. Before his career in politics he was known for as a billionaire businessman and a television personality for his true television show "The Apprentice". Trump also co-authored with the help of a ghostwriter, journalist Tony Schwartz his bestseller book "The Art of the Deal".

Donald Trump is the son of real-estate developer Fred Trump to whom he started working for after graduating with a degree in business in 1968. The firm eventually became the modern day Trump Organization whose owner and effective leader Donald Trump was until he officially transferred

his position to his two eldest sons in January 2017 in order to avoid a conflict of interests-situation when taking office as president.

Trump is not a traditional career politician since the first public office he has held is the presidency of the United States of America. All though it can be seen that his political career started with his declaration of running for president as a candidate for the Republican party on June 16th 2015, he has been known to make public statements on political issues and endorsing politicians from both of the main parties: Republican and Democratic. In addition, Trump has also been a member of both political parties. Even before Trump's announcement for candidacy, he had been flirting with the idea publicly since the 1980's. For example, the New York Times ran an article on him called: "*Trump gives a vague hint of candidacy*", after Trump had bought three full page advertisements from several major US-newspapers declaring his views on foreign policy (2.9.1987).

In his presidential campaign Donald Trump popularized the formerly known "Let's make America Great Again" slogan - which was used previously by Ronald Reagan in the 1980 presidential campaign - and changed it into "Make America Great Again". Donald Trump's presidential campaign ran on the major themes of illegal immigration, security and brining jobs back to America and he became quickly famous for his controversial remarks and unconventional political rhetoric on illegal immigrants, women, his political opponents and his views on foreign policy. For his rhetoric and propositions such as building a wall to the US-Mexican border, Trump received both worldwide praise and heavy criticism from both sides of the political arena and the public. Even as Donald Trump won the office for president of the United States of America, he did not win the popular vote as his main opponent the Democratic party nominee Hillary Clinton finished 2.1% ahead of him. Trump's campaign and presidency has been widely considered as one of the most controversial ones in modern day US political history.

3.1.2 Researches questions

In order to achieve the objective of this study which is to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches, I have posed the three following research questions:

1. What image of the United States of America arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric?
2. What are the threats in the United States of America that arise from Donald Trump's rhetoric?
3. What solutions are offered to the issues presented in Donald Trump's rhetoric?

As all the three research questions are formed based on the theory of dramatism, it is also sufficient to mention that all the posed research questions are inevitably linked with Donald Trump's own campaign slogan "Make America Great Again". The image of the USA, the threats towards the US as well as the offered solutions are all derived from the ambiguous idea of "making America great again".

3.1.3 Image of America

With the first research question "What image of the United States of America arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric?", I aim to describe the state of America as it is being described in Donald Trump's - both campaign and presidential rhetoric. This question is based on all the key concepts of Kenneth Burke's dramatism: the dramatistic pentad, identification and the quilt and redemption cycle. However, the two concepts: dramatistic pentad and identification are more essential to research question 1 than the concept of the guilt and redemption cycle is. As the guilt and redemption cycle only focuses on blaming either oneself or others, the elements that are offered by the dramatistic pentad and identification provide more sufficient tools in order to analyze the speeches and thus to answer research question 1.

As the dramatistic pentad with its key elements: act, agent, scene, agency and purpose answer the questions of who, what, when, where and why – I am able to take apart the delivered message to the level of individual words and sentences, and analyze them further in order to answer actual the research question. (Dickinson 2009, 126)

The dramatistic pentad allows the researcher to create counterparts to each element for example the act. This means that every element and its counterpart are being examined even further in their relation to one another. However, for narrowing down the theory of dramatism to fit the aims of

this study I will not conduct these counterparts and will instead analyze the data with one element at a time. This means that in the analysis I will go through every speech sentence by sentence and name the elements. Narrowing the theory in this fashion: not creating the counterparts for each individual element is arguable, since in this way the elements will still provide findings which will allow me to answer the research questions thoroughly.

Through Burke's identification and it's six elements: identifying, formal patterns, framing, ambiguous symbols, mystification and scapegoating I can examine which identification patterns Donald Trump uses in his rhetoric and how he uses them.

The element of identifying means that the speaker uses a certain kind of language, tone of voice, similar gestures, mental images, ideas, attitudes and hierarchies as their audience in order to identify with them. In addition, when a speaker delivers a speech to a conservative audience one mean of trying to identify with them would be to refer to traditional values. All of the mentioned ways of identifying or none of them can be used in a speech as they are merely examples.

The element of formal patterns can be used in a speech primarily in two different ways: 1. repetition in order to highlight what has been said and 2. in a way that provokes confrontation.

The element of framing can be used in a speech by referring to the audience, using words like *us* and *we* in an attempt for the speaker to identify with her/his audience. As a speaker identifies with her/his audience using such rhetoric of *us*, it automatically draws a frontier between the speaker and his listeners in contrary to "all the others" - the ones who are not *us* or *we*. Hence this is an excluding rhetorical method. The element of ambiguous symbols can be used in a speech and rhetoric by using abstract concepts or symbols as reasoning or as an argument to support the speaker's own opinion. The element of mystification can emerge in a speech when a universal and a general motive, for example honor or fear of God are, being used to hide a certain contextual motive. Lastly the element of scapegoating under the concept of identification means that the speaker blames someone else for the problems that are being presented. In her/his rhetoric the person delivering the speech is avoiding personal responsibility whenever using scapegoating.

In the analysis I will go through every speech sentence by sentence and name the emerging elements of identification.

By analyzing the speeches using the key concepts of dramatism: the dramatistic pentad and identification, with their own elements, I aim to answer research question 1: What image of the United States of America arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric?

3.1.4 Threats to America

Research question 2: "What are the threats in the United States of America that arise from Donald Trump's rhetoric?", is also constructed by the presented key concepts of dramatism: the dramatistic pentad and identification. In addition, the third key concept of dramatism: the guilt and redemption cycle is an essential part in forming this particular research question. In Burke's dramatism the concept of the guilt and redemption cycle consists of two elements: victimage and mortification. In dramatism victimage means scapegoating and blaming other parties. When a speaker uses victimage in her/his rhetoric it is language that distinctly puts blame on the shoulder of someone else than the speaker and usually its audience. Mortification on the other hand is the opposite of victimage. Mortification means self-sacrifice or self-inflicted punishment as a rhetorical method. This means that a speaker who takes responsibility by blaming her/himself or by enduring a self-inflicted punishment attempts to purify her/himself. In other words, the speaker attempts to receive forgiveness and acceptance from the audience. As has been stated: in a rhetorical method in Burke's dramatism this means that the speaker admits her/his guilt or part in a wrongdoing to her/his audience.

As a general rule "assuming" in research is not arguably justifiable. However, in the case of this study where Donald Trump's rhetoric is being examined it has to be stated that his world-known hard rhetoric is not an assumption, but an essential reason for why this study is being conducted in the first place in terms of its social importance. Therefore, the assumption that there indeed will be threats against the USA presented in Donald Trump's rhetoric is not unjustifiable. As the guilt and redemption cycle searches for guilty parties and self-inflicted punishment as a rhetorical method, it is a key concept for answering research question 2.

3.1.5 Solutions for America

Research question 3 "What solutions are offered to the issues presented in Donald Trump's rhetoric?" is constructed on the arguable assumption that a person involved in a presidential campaign and the president of the USA refers to political issues, current situations and offers solutions in forms of promises and policies in order to justify her/his candidacy or presidency.
In order to achieve the purpose of this study which is to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric in his campaign and presidential speeches, it will be intriguing to see what sort of solutions in form of policies and actual promises he offers in order to justify his candidacy and presidency.

3.2 The data and method of analysis

In this study I use the qualitative research design. In a qualitative research design, the data is being constructed with a focus on the big picture, on the whole. One can say that qualitative research is used to uncover trends in thought and opinions and to dig deeper into the problem (Korrapati, 2015). Its aim is not to make generalizations since the data are always unique, which also has to be taken into account when analyzing the data. (Hirsjärvi & Remes & Sajavaara 2009, 164.)

3.2.1 The speeches of Donald Trump

The data of this study compromises the six speeches held by Donald Trump from 31.8.2016 to 28.2.2017:

Speech 1. 31.8.2016: Phoenix, Arizona (campaign speech as a presidential candidate)
Speech 2. 13.10. 2016: West Palm Beach, Florida (campaign speech as a presidential candidate)
Speech 3. 22.10.2016: Gettysburg, Pennsylvania (campaign speech as a presidential candidate)
Speech 4. 9.11.2016: NYC, New York (victory speech as president elect)
Speech 5. 20.1.2017: Washington D.C. (inauguration speech, as president)
Speech 6. 28.2.2017: Washington D.C. (address to joint session of US Congress, as president)

As president Trump holds the office of one of the most public and influential politicians in the world, he is in fact a public figure. This means that any statements, speeches, radio, television and newspaper interviews etc. given by him are public domain and accessible. This is also the case for the speeches he delivered as the presidential candidate for the Republican party. Even before his straight personal involvement in political campaigning, Donald Trump had been a public figure – a celebrity – since the 1980's. This of course does not apply when examining his campaign and presidential speeches from 2016-2017, but is worth mentioning. As the material, the speeches, that have been used as data for this study are public material, no permits were needed in order for their use in this study.

Speeches 1-3 are delivered at a campaign rally as a presidential candidate. Speech 4 is a victory speech delivered as the president elect- to his campaign supporters in New York City and through the media to the American people and to the rest of the world. Speeches 5-6 are given by Donald Trump as president of the United States of America. All the speeches were delivered in the United States.

For the transparency and clarity for this study, I made abbreviations for each separate speech in which status Donald Trump is acting, when delivering a speech. Therefore, whether he is delivering a speech as a presidential candidate, president elect or the president of the USA, I will use the following abbreviations; PC, PE and PUS. See TABLE 2 Below.

TABLE 2. Abbreviations used

Donald Trump speaking as:	Abbreviation
Presidential candidate	PC
President elect	PE
President of the United States of America	PUS

All the six speeches chosen have been analyzed textually. They can be found also as video recordings from various internet archives and from the sources that I present in TABLE 3. During the conduct of this study I only analyzed the textual speeches, but for ensuring the transparency of

this study, I watched and listened each speech from a recorded video form, to ensure that the transcripts I analyzed were in fact correct word to word. This had to be done also for the unfortunate reason that not all the published transcripts were guaranteed to be found afterwards from the same source. For example, during May 2016 the situation was that Donald Trump's campaign website (https://www.donaldjtrump.com) had deleted all the campaign speeches and news releases, including the ones which mentioned the building of the wall against the US-Mexican border – one of Donald Trump's key campaign promises and themes. By the time this study will be published it cannot be guaranteed whether those speeches can be found from the website since at the moment of writing this chapter the website does not contain any speeches anymore.

However as mentioned, all the speeches that can be found from the sources provided in TABLE 3, have been double-checked word to word by me with the assistance of the video recording. Thus each speech is variable and anyone reading this study can verify the textual content themselves. The speeches can be accessed by using any internet's most used search engines, and by typing the information of each speech provided in TABLE 3. For example: "31.8.2016: Phoenix, Arizona (Donald Trump's campaign speech as a presidential candidate)", and find video-recordings and transcripts that are alike word to word.

TABLE 3. Data collection: the six speeches

Speech number	Location	Date	Word count	Transcript published
Speech 1. PC (Presidential candidate)	Phoenix, Arizona	31.8.2016	6848	Los Angeles Times-website, http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-donald-trump-immigration-speech-transcript-20160831-snap-htmlstory.html
Speech 2. PC (Presidential candidate)	West Palm Beach, Florida	13.10.2016	4757	https://quemadoinstitute.org/2016/10/14/transcript-donald-trump-speech-in-palm-beach-florida-october-13-2016/
Speech 3. PC (Presidential candidate)	Gettysburg, Pennsylvania	22.10.2016	4579	http://educate-yourself.org/cn/Trump-Gettsburg-Speech-Full-Text24oct16.shtml#top

Speech 4. PE (President elect)	NYC, New York	9.11.2016	1616	New York Times website, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/10/us/politics/trump-speech-transcript.html
Speech 5. PUS (President of the USA)	Washington D.C.	20.1.2017	1443	The official website of the White House, https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address
Speech 6. PUS (President of the USA)	Washington D.C.	28.2.2017	4827	Time-magazine website, http://time.com/4686621/trump-congress-address-transcript/

As can be seen the time frame between the speeches vary from the last day of August 2016 to the last day of February 2017. So all of the speeches selected for this study have maximum 6 months in between. The first three speeches 1-3 are from the last months of Donald Trump's presidential campaign. The last three speeches 4-6 are starting from his victory speech as president elect to his first speech to joint session of US Congress as the president. The idea was to collect data, that would consist of both campaign and presidential speeches, with a minimum time gap in between. This ensures that the time frame has been narrowed down as much as possible and thus presents a certain continuity in order to have the last speeches of Donald Trump as candidate and right thereafter his first speeches as president of the US.

3.2.2 Criteria for the selected speeches

The campaign speeches were selected with two requirements: 1 they are not more than 6 weeks apart from each other and 2. by their different context. In the selection process of the campaign speeches there were many options for selecting additional speeches as data, but they did not contextually differ from the three selected ones in any significant way. In the selection process I read through 5 campaign speeches and they were all contextually very similar – including the ones that I eventually chose. Thus the selection of campaign speeches, chosen for data, provide a sufficient and thorough amount of campaign rhetoric by Donald Trump, in order for me to conduct this analysis in a credible way and achieve the objective of this study.

The post campaign speeches 4-6 were selected with the demand that 1 they are the first post-election presidential speeches and 2 one of them is a link between the campaign speeches and the presidential speeches.

In speech 4, Donald Trump delivers his "victory speech" as the president elect, after the official announcement of the election results on November 9th 2016. Therefore, this was an obvious choice for meeting the 2nd criteria mentioned above (link between the campaign and presidential speeches). As the objective of this study is to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric in his campaign and presidential speeches, choosing this victory speech was essential in the context of all the collected data. Since Donald Trump as president elect was neither running for president nor the acting president of the United States of America, it was important to take this one and only speech "in between these two categories" into the analyzed data.

The two selected presidential speeches 5 and 6, were selected due to the mentioned time frame and because they were the first and most important institutional speeches held by Donald Trump as the 45th president of the United States. Selecting the inauguration speech and president Trump's first speech to joint session of US Congress, were a coherent choice in the selection for the data for this study, as the data was to consisting of both campaign and presidential speeches.

It must be noted that as speech 6, - the first speech by president Trump to joint session of US Congress - is by its setting practically identical to the institutional *State of the Union Address*, since both are delivered by a US president to both chambers of the Congress: the House of Representatives and the Senate, it is not officially considered a *State of the Union Address*. This is largely a semantical difference and does not play any significant role in the made analysis since any ceremonial and institutional requirements that can be expected to influence a *State of the Union Address*, apply to Trump's first speech to joint session of US Congress as well.

All of the speeches are being delivered by Donald Trump himself. As is the custom with political campaign speeches and political speeches in general, it is not unlikely that Donald Trump has had the aid of several speech writers in constructing them. This does not interfere with the credibility of my analysis though, since campaigning politicians, or people involved in a political campaign

in general do not construct their speeches without a team of speechwriters – even less so a president. As Donald Trump's campaign themes might be a part of a largely thought of strategic campaign, his rhetoric is nevertheless notoriously genuine. In addition, a person involved in a presidential campaign and the president of the United States of America, always talks with her/his own voice and is the one held responsible for the speech and rhetoric she or he delivers. This in mind, it is important not to give excessive emphasis to the fact that there might be a team of speech-writers involved. Thus despite the political context, customs of speech writing or ceremonial requirements of certain speeches, it is arguably credible to say that Donald Trump is delivering his own rhetoric with his own words. Thereby all chosen speeches delivered by Donald Trump are sufficient as the data for the analysis.

The geographical location had no importance in the selection process of the data as all of the selected speeches 1-6 are being delivered in the USA.

3.2.3 Method of analysis

The analysis is conducted by examining the data, paragraph per paragraph, sentence by sentence and word by word, in order to find the concepts and elements provided by Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism. This has been inherently done in between the parameters of narrowing the theory to suit the object of this study, as has been explained above.

The process of the analysis was conducted in four different phases. First all the chosen speeches were read through systematically, without tagging any elements that emerged from the rhetoric in them. During this phase of the analyzing process, all speeches were also checked word by word with the assistance of the video-recordings audio that were available, as has been mentioned in the previous subchapter: 3.2.1 The speeches of Donald Trump. Using the textual transcript and listening to the video-recordings audio I could ensure that each speech was authentic and original word to word. During the whole process of analyzing the data, no emphasis on the visual part of the video-recordings were given. After phase one when the accuracy of each chosen speech could be guaranteed to the purposes of the credibility of this study, I proceeded to phase two were up on the process of analysis was based only on the textual manuscripts of the speeches.

The second phase consisted of examining the speeches and finding all the elements provided by the concept of dramatism: the dramatistic pentad. This way I was able to find and tag the elements: act, agent, scene, agency and purpose from each chosen speech. In the third phase of conducting the analysis I examined every speech in order to find and tag all the used identification strategies from the context: identifying, formal patterns, framing, ambiguous symbols, mystification and scapegoating. In the fourth phase I examined every speech in order to find and tag the two key elements of dramatism's guilt and redemption cycle: victimage and mortification.

As the dramatistic pentad of Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism suggests: the elements act, agent, scene, agency and purpose can be found from any speech. In my process of analyzing the speeches through the dramatistic pentad I created an individual code for each of its element. They are the following: #ACT, #AGENT, #SCENE, #AGENCY and #PURPOSE. During the process of analyzing, I tagged the appropriate element to each sentence where it or they emerged from.

As mentioned, each element of Burke's concept of identification was used in the process of analyzing the data. Also with the concept of identification I created an individual code for each element. The codes for the elements of identification are: identifying (#ID), formal patterns (#FP), framing (#FR), ambiguous symbols (#AS), mystification (#MY) and scapegoating (#SG).

A similar method of creating codes was used in the process of analysis, when I examined the data through the fourth phase: throughout the quilt and redemption cycle and its two elements victimage and mortification. The created codes for the two elements are: victimage (#VIC) and mortification (#MOR).

What now follows in example 1 below, is an extract of one of the analyzed speeches by Donald Trump. Below the extract, the identical text appears again, but this time it includes some of the codes that were created for the process of the analysis as explained earlier in this chapter. I must emphasis that example 1 is not a presentation of any result obtained during the process of analysis. It is an example made for the reader, in order to present how the process of the analysis was conducted.

Example 1 (speech 1. PC):

"They live with these people. They get mocked by these people. They can't do anything about these people, and they want to. They know who these people are. Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone. And you can call it deported if you want. The press doesn't like that term. You can call it whatever the hell you want. They're gone. Beyond the 2 million, and there are vast numbers of additional criminal illegal immigrants who have fled, but their days have run out in this country. The crime will stop. They're going to be gone. It will be over. They're going out. They're going out fast."

With the use of coding:

"They live with these people. #AGENT They get mocked by these people. #AGENT# VIC They can't do anything about these people, and they want to. #AGENT They know who these people are. #AGENT Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone. #AGENT #VIC And you can call it deported if you want. #AGENT The press doesn't like that term. #AGENT # VIC You can call it whatever the hell you want. #AGENT They're gone. #AGENT #FP # VIC Beyond the 2 million, and there are vast numbers of additional criminal illegal immigrants who have fled, but their days have run out in this country. #AGENT # VIC The crime will stop. #AGENT # VIC They're going to be gone. #AGENT #FP It will be over. #FP They're going out. #AGENT #VIC # FP They're going out fast. #AGENT # FP #VIC"

As can be seen from example 1 above, the element of agent #AGENT appeared a total of 14 times. However, in the analysis this does not mean that from a paragraph like example 1, 14 different agents emerge. It only shows the quantity of one agent per sentence. It is frequent that in every sentence there emerges at least one agent, but finding the actual agents from the rhetoric in order to name them, requires contextual understanding of any given speech. In fact, in the analysis it was evident that one sentence can contain several agents in terms of the context. By looking at example 2 below, you see one sentence taken from the exact same paragraph as example 1. In this sentence there are two agents (#AGENT): the word *my* is referring to the speaker – in this case Donald Trump - and the words *those people* refer to illegal criminal immigrants. Thus the agents (#AGENT) emerging from the sentence of example 2 below are: Donald Trump and illegal immigrants. The same sentence in example 2 also contains victimage (#VIC), due to the fact that the context of the whole paragraph (example 1) is about blaming illegal criminal immigrants.

Example 2 (speech 1. PC):

"Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone."

With the use of coding:

"Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone." #AGENT (2), #VIC

The other codes presented after example 1, do not require further explaining as they are not a part of the results of this study, but an example made for anyone reading this study in order to present how the process of the analysis was conducted.

Next in chapter 4. the results of this study will be presented. First I will present the results of the analysis starting with the concept of dramatistic pentad with all the elements it provides. In addition, I will present the results of the analyzed speeches through the concept of identification and its six elements. After this I offer the obtained results through the lens of the concept of the guilt and redemption cycle and its two elements: victimage and mortification.

4 Results of the rhetorical analysis

In this chapter I will present the results of the analysis starting with the dramatistic pentad with all the elements it provides. They are called: act, agent, scene, agency and purpose. In addition, I will present the results of the analyzed speeches through the concept of identification and its six elements called: identifying, formal patterns, framing, ambiguous symbols, mystification and scapegoating. After this I offer the obtained results through the lens of the concept of the guilt and redemption cycle and its elements: victimage and mortification. All the presented analyzed results of this chapter will be discussed further in chapter 5.

4.1 The dramatistic pentad

Differing from the actual order proposed in the theoretical background of Burke's dramatism I will present the results starting from the element of the agent. This is due to the fact that the element of the agent in the dramatistic pentad is fundamentally connected to all of the following key elements and it will be the most adequate medium to observe the results from.

4.1.1 Agent

In all the six speeches analyzed for this study, Donald Trump himself emerged as the most common agent used. In his speeches Donald Trump continuously refers to himself either using his own name in the third person or referring to himself using the following expressions: *I*, *me*, *presidential candidate,* or *Trump administration*. Trump does this cyclically throughout all of his speeches. There is no pattern to this self-referring rhetoric, since he changes the way of referring to himself regardless of the context, whether it is jobs, immigration, political opponents, foreign policy etc. In his campaign rhetoric Trump often refers to himself in the third person, but does not anymore when delivering speeches as president. However, he still continues to refer to himself, just not in the third person: using the word *Trump.*

In the following examples which are extracts of the analyzed speeches, the reader can observe how Donald Trump refers to himself in various contexts in his rhetoric.

Example 3 (speech 1. PC):

"I've just landed having returned from a very important and special meeting with the President of Mexico, a man I like and respect very much. And a man who truly loves his country, Mexico. And, by the way, just like I am a man who loves my country, the United States. We agree on the importance of ending the illegal flow of drugs, cash, guns, and people across our border, and to put the cartels out of business. We also discussed the great contributions of Mexican-American citizens to our two countries, my love for the people of Mexico, and the leadership and friendship between Mexico and the United States. It was a thoughtful and substantive conversation and it will go on for a while. And, in the end we're all going to win. Both countries, we're all going to win. This is the first of what I expect will be many, many conversations. And, in a Trump administration we're going to go about creating a new relationship between our two countries, but it's going to be a fair relationship."

Example 4 (speech 2. PC):

"I will deliver like you've never seen before. I deliver. Whether people like Donald Trump or not, they all say he delivers. Vote for Donald Trump. You're going to see something and you'll be so happy. You'll be so thrilled. This election is about every man, woman and child in our country who deserves to live in safety, prosperity and peace, so true."

Example 5 (speech 3. PC):

"Second, begin the process of selecting a replacement for Justice Scalia whose wife by the way, has a Trump sign. His wife is a phenomenal woman; has a Trump sign in her front yard. Isn't that nice? I just found that out this morning. Isn't that nice? He was great - from one of the 20 judges on my list. You know, we're going to make great decisions from 20 outstanding judges on a list that we submitted, who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Example 6 (speech 6. PUS):

"I have also imposed new sanctions on entities and individuals who support Iran's ballistic missile program, and reaffirmed our unbreakable alliance with the State of Israel. Finally, I have kept my promise to appoint a Justice to the United States Supreme Court -- from my list of 20 judges - who will defend our Constitution."

In addition, Donald Trump also refers to himself through the American people associating him and the US citizens into one single entity. This means that despite the fact that America and the American people seem to emerge as a separate agent in the speeches, they are not separate to

Donald Trump as an agent, due to the way he presents them and their political cause together in his rhetoric. In other words: the main agent in his rhetoric is himself or himself with the American people without distinguishing the two. Trump does this cyclically in his speeches using words as: *our country*, *we, American workers, American lives, American voters our administration, our people, our borders, our laws, our nation, our jobs, our streets*. Trump also speaks directly to the audience using phrases as: *you, you the people, you the American people, folks.* Trump merges himself and the American people often in sentences where he begins talking about himself and then conducts it into the American people in general.

Using words such as: *we, our nation* and *our borders* in a sentence does not automatically make the speaker and his audience into one entity. In this case of Trump's speeches however, the two diverse agents: Trump himself and America (in the various ways he refers to them) are presented as one. This means that whereas America and Americans are being portrayed as an agent in the rhetoric of Trump he presents them as a part of himself.

> Example 7 (speech 1. PC):
>
> "Today, on a very complicated and very difficult subject, you will get the truth. The fundamental problem with the immigration system in our country is that it serves the needs of wealthy donors, political activists and powerful, powerful politicians. It's all you can do. Thank you. Thank you. Let me tell you who it does not serve. It does not serve you the American people. Doesn't serve you. When politicians talk about immigration reform, they usually mean the following, amnesty, open borders, lower wages. Immigration reform should mean something else entirely. It should mean improvements to our laws and policies to make life better for American citizens."
>
> Example 8 (speech 2. PC):
> "This is a struggle for the survival of our nation, believe me. And this will be our last chance to save it on Nov. 8, remember that. This election will determine whether we are a free nation or whether we have only the illusion of democracy, but are in fact controlled by a small handful of global special interests rigging the system, and our system is rigged.

Example 9 (speech 3. PC):

"One thing we all know is that we will never solve our problems by relying on the same politicians who created these problems in the first place. Hillary Clinton is not running against me; she's running against change. And she's running against all of the American people and all of the American voters."

Example 10 (speech 4. PE):

"The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. We are going to fix our inner cities and rebuild our highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, schools, hospitals. We're going to rebuild our infrastructure, which will become, by the way, second to none. And we will put millions of our people to work as we rebuild it.

Example 11 (speech 5. PUS):

"Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I will fight for you with every breath in my body -- and I will never, ever let you down. America will start winning again, winning like never before.   We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams."

I interpreted Trump's referring to a contextual audience also as a means of addressing the Americans. Therefore, when Trump was giving a campaign speech in Phoenix Arizona, West Palm Beach Florida or Gettysburg Pennsylvania and was referring to these locations and its people he was also referring to America in general – attaching himself into the same concept of American people as stated before.

Example 12 (speech 1. PC):
"I love the people of Arizona and together we are going to win the White House in November."

Example 13 (speech 2. PC):
"It's great to be here in Florida, which we love. In 26 days we are going to win this great, great state and we are going to win the White House."

Example 14 (speech 3. PC):
"It's my privilege to be here in Gettysburg, hallowed ground where so many lives were given in service of freedom; amazing place."

In the case of this particular analysis sentences as the ones presented above are considered as sentences where Trump and the American people act as an agent together. It is a normal custom for any political speaker to address her/his audience, but in the case of this study and based on my analysis Trump extended this custom as a rhetorical method by engaging himself with his current audience and then continuing the speech as one agent. In all of the speeches where Donald Trump references an American city in his rhetorical narrative, he does it in the stated way as a method of talking about the American people in general. In his inauguration speech president Trump refers to be physically in Washington D.C. but in the context of an inauguration speech it does not entitle us to assume he is using this as a rhetorical method since he is in fact addressing the entire country of the United States of America.

In addition to the main agents of his speeches: Donald Trump and the American people, there also appear minor agents rising from his rhetoric. These are immigrants/illegal immigrants, Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama/president Obama, Mexico/Mexicans, Isis/Radical Islamic Terrorism and media/journalists.

> Example 15 (speech 1. PC):
> "Since 2013 alone, the Obama administration has allowed 300,000 criminal aliens to return back into United States communities. These are individuals encountered or identified by ICE, but who were not detained or processed for deportation because it wouldn't have been politically correct. My plan also includes cooperating closely with local jurisdictions to remove criminal aliens immediately.

> Example 16 (speech 2. PC):
> "The most powerful weapon deployed by the Clintons is the corporate media, the press. Let's be clear on one thing, the corporate media in our country is no longer involved in journalism. They're a political special interest no different than any lobbyist or other financial entity with a total political agenda, and the agenda is not for you, it's for themselves. And their agenda is to elect crooked Hillary Clinton at any cost, at any price, no matter how many lives they destroy."

> Example 17 (speech 3. PC):
> "I said Mexico's paying for the wall. With the full understanding that the country of Mexico will be reimbursing the United States for the full cost of such a wall. Okay? We're going to

have the wall. Mexico is going to pay for the wall. By the way, I met with the President of
Mexico two-and-a-half months ago."

Example 18 (speech 6. PUS):
"As promised, I directed the Department of Defense to develop a plan to demolish and destroy ISIS - a
network of lawless savages that have slaughtered Muslims and Christians, and men, women, and children
of all faiths and beliefs. We will work with our allies, including our friends and allies in the Muslim world,
to extinguish this vile enemy from our planet."

It is sufficient for now to mention that the naming of the previously stated people, nationalities or
even a professional syndicate in a speech does not automatically make them into an active agent
of the delivered speech. In all of the analyzed speeches in this study Trump names other
counterparts too for example *veterans, the military* and *individual people from his campaign,* but
he does not present them as an active counterpart – aka – an agent on the bases of my analysis.

All of the minor agents emerging from Trump's rhetoric in speeches as presidential candidate 1-3
are represented in an adversarial context and they remain as such also in speeches 4-6 as the
president elect or president of the United States. Only in the case of named agents Hillary Clinton
and Barack Obama, who have previously been victimized strongly, the tone is different in the
postelection speeches by Donald Trump. There are however ceremonial reasons to these changes.
(These points will be examined more thoroughly in the next subchapter 4.1.2 Act and Agency,
where the occurrence and the narrative of Trump's speeches are examined).

The quantity of these emerging minor agents, changes in the analyzed speeches depending on
whether the speech was given during Donald Trump's campaign or after his victory, on November
8th 2016, when he became president elect and thereafter president of the United States. Therefore,
in the two tables presented (Table 4 and Table 5) I have divided the analyzed six speeches into two
categories: speeches delivered as a candidate for presidency (speeches 1, 2 and 3) and speeches
delivered as president elect / president of the United States (speeches 4, 5 and 6). This allows the
reader a clear view of the results on the concept of agent, based on the analysis.

TABLE 4. The element of agent in speeches number 1-3 (speeches delivered as presidential candidate)

Agent	Speech 1. PC	Speech 2. PC	Speech3. PC
Trump himself	73	90	65
Trump and America as one	243	146	203
Immigrants or illegal immigrants	20	2	6
Hillary Clinton	19	27	4
Barack Obama/President	12	8	5
Mexico	8	2	6
Isis/Radical Islamic terrorism	6	2	1
Media/Journalists	6	17	4

As some minor agents are more contextual to some speeches than others, they all are a part of the major themes that are being represented by Donald Trump in his rhetoric. As can be seen for example in speech 1 where Trump explains he is going to deliver a detailed policy address on illegal immigration, this leads to the *illegal immigrants* to emerge as agents at a total of 20 times in different sentences. The agent of *illegal immigrants* or *illegal immigration* as a concept does emerge in the following speeches as well, but not in the same quantity.

TABLE 5. The element of agent in speeches number 3-6 (speeches delivered as president elect and president of the US)

Agent	Speech 4. PE	Speech 5. PUS	Speech 6. PUS
Trump himself	49	2	45
Trump and America as one	65	89	200
Immigrants or illegal immigrants	0	1	8
Hillary Clinton	5	0	0
Barack Obama/president	0	2	0
Mexico	0	0	0
Isis/Radical Islamic terrorism	0	1	5
Media/Journalists	2	0	0

4.1.2 Act and Agency

In this subchapter I will examine the elements of act and agency from the first three speeches given by Donald Trump as a presidential candidate. After this I will proceed to speeches 4, 5 and 6 where he has won the election and is the president elect or the president of the United States of America.

In Burke's dramatistic pentad the elements of act and agency are overlapping in the course of analyzing a speech and also when examining the results. Therefore, I will examine the two elements together. It is also notable to mention that based on my analysis the element of act in Trump's rhetoric shows many similarities with the element of scene which we will examine further in the next subchapter 4.1.3 Scene.

In Burke's dramatism (Burke 1969a) the element of act does not only imply to the act of delivering the speech per se, but also to the context of the speech itself. This means that the possible narrative is been told through the rhetoric (Dickinson 2009, 127.) It signifies that from each speech we can

interpret two different acts: the one that is actually taking place and the one that emerges from the actual rhetoric of the speech. Whereas in all of the speeches delivered as a presidential candidate, Trump is clearly narrating a speech to his supporters at a supporting rally. More emphasis will be put on what he describes is happening in the context. As mentioned above this element is to some degree overlapping with the element of the scene.

In all the analyzed speeches 1-3 by Donald Trump, the element of act emerges as America and Americans being on the verge of division, fundamental ruin and destruction, due to the bad and corrupt politicians that control the media and are being controlled by the so called special interest groups. Bad policy by a corrupt establishment that puts the interests of all but America first, is the prime one cause for the misfortunes of the forgotten American people whose country's infrastructure is being left to rotten. Also the military and its veterans are forgotten, all the jobs of honest Americans are leaving overseas while illegal immigration, Mexico and Mexicans, radical Islamic terror / Isis and a dishonest media establishment are all a concrete threat to Americans and linked to each other.

In this act of ruin that is happening according, to Donald Trump's rhetoric, only he can save America and its people by becoming the next president, who will put America's interests first. In this act of campaigning for the presidency Donald Trump emphasizes his own importance because he is not a politician, but a former insider. He also makes the point on the great self-sacrifice he has endured by running for office, but he contently suffers for the good of America and the American people.

> Example 19 (speech 1. PC):
>
> "Our country is a mess. We don't even know what to look for anymore, folks. Our country has to straighten out. And we have to straighten out fast"

> Example 20 (speech 2. PC):
>
> "He's led a very divided nation and it's only gotten worse. And the last thing our country needs is four more years of Barack Obama, believe me. I've seen firsthand the corruption and the sickness that has taken over our politics. You've seen it and I've seen it and we're all watching together. They knew they would throw every lie they could at me and my family and my loved ones. They knew they would stop at nothing to try to

stop me. But I never knew as bad as it would be. I never knew it would be this vile, that it would be this bad, that it would be this vicious. Nevertheless, I take all of these slings and arrows gladly for you. I take them for our movement so that we can have our country back. Our great civilization, here in America and across the civilized world has come upon a moment of reckoning. We've seen it in the United Kingdom, where they voted to liberate themselves from global government and global trade deal, and global immigration deals that have destroyed their sovereignty and have destroyed many of those nations. But, the central base of world political power is right here in America, and it is our corrupt political establishment that is the greatest power behind the efforts at radical globalization and the disenfranchisement of working people. Their financial resources are virtually unlimited, their political resources are unlimited, their media resources are unmatched, and most importantly, the depths of their immorality is absolutely unlimited. They will allow radical Islamic terrorists to enter our country by the thousands."

Example 21 (speech 3. PC):
" I've seen the system up-close-and-personal for many years. I've been a major part of it.
I know how the game works in Washington and on Wall Street. And I know how they've
rigged the rules of the game against everyday Americans. The rules are rigged."

As noted before, in speeches 1-3 the act and the agency are invariable in terms of the description Donald Trump is orating through his campaign rhetoric. However, it should be stated that he also has a minor agenda which in this study I refer to as acts based on the theoretical background of Burke's dramatism.

In speech 1 (31.8.2016: Phoenix, Arizona) Trump proposes to present a detailed policy address on immigration. In speech 2 (13.10.2016: West Palm Beach, Florida) Trump's speech does not contain another official agenda to his general campaign themes, but he does address the sexual harassment charges that emerged during this time period repeatedly. In speech 3 (22.10.2016: Gettysburg, Pennsylvania) Trump proposes six particular measures, which his administration will pursue in order to clean up the corruption in Washington – granted if he gets elected.

In my analysis it is a relevant finding that whichever was Trump's official detailed minor agenda of the given speech in question, the rhetorical substance remained vividly similar. Therefore, it is objectively well grounded not to give excessive emphasis on his minor agendas, but to concentrate on the substance of the general rhetoric of all his speeches, which were as stated before: potently similar.

As the element of act in Trump's rhetoric emerges to be describing the narrative of America's apocalyptic destruction and of himself as the saviour of America, the element of agency, however is delivering a speech which is conducted through blaming and self-sacrifice for the greater good. Based on my analysis "repeating and highlighting" appear to be an essential part of Trump's rhetoric and this also manifests h in the examining of the agency element. Trump's medium is to blame outside parties for the problems he projects in his rhetoric.

In addition to Trumps blaming and self-sacrifice he also emphasizes the importance of this presidential election and strongly urges his supporters to vote in order to change the course where America, according to his rhetoric, is heading to. This element of agency emerged from all the analyzed campaign speeches 1-3.

> Example 22 (speech 2. PC):
>
> "This election will determine whether we are a free nation or whether we have only the illusion of democracy, but are in fact controlled by a small handful of global special interests rigging the system, and our system is rigged. This is reality, you know it, they know it, I know it, and pretty much the whole world knows it."

All three campaign speeches are mostly constructed by sentences that victimize, blame and scapegoat other counterparts. These elements "repetition and highlighting" combined with the elements of "victimization and blaming" are overlapping with other key concepts of the theory of Burke's dramatism which I will attend to in greater detail in subchapter 4.2.6 Scapegoating.

To summarize, the act and the agency elements of the chosen campaign speeches, suggests that the act which emerges from Trump's rhetoric is describing the disastrous state of the American country and its inhabitants, which can all be blamed by others. The agency in the speeches is Trump blaming and exploiting his view which he is committed to share with the American people, urging them to vote for change on November 8th. A part of the agency's blaming element is Trump exhibiting himself as a victim for the cause. This element emerges in his speeches here and there, but not at the same quantity as his blaming and victimizing rhetoric. These two elements of the

agency: blaming and self-sacrifice are evidently connected in his rhetoric and are not completely separable.

> Example 23 (speech 3. PC):
>
> "I'm not a politician and have never wanted to be a politician. Believe me. But when I saw the trouble our country was in, I knew I couldn't stand by and watch any longer. Our country has been so good to me. I love our country and I felt I had to act."

In speeches 4-6 the element of act does not fundamentally change from the campaign speeches in terms of the narrative that emerges from the rhetoric of Donald Trump. The key differences are in the tone of the rhetoric, which is less severe and not as victimizing on a personal level in comparison with the speeches that are given during the campaign. In these speeches Donald Trump also mentions unification thus ending the divisions that are occurring in the USA. The causes for the changes that emerged between speeches 1-3 and speeches 4-6 in terms of the rhetoric are being discussed further in chapter 5.

The act in which America is in, does not differ from the previous speeches. As president elect and president of the United States Donald Trump expresses the similar challenges the country faces as he did on the campaign road. President Trump speaks about bipartisan politics and unification which, indicates to an opposite view to the previous rhetoric of blaming nor victimization, and suggests that the agency is indeed not blaming and victimization. However, when exhibiting the problems as he sees them in the US, he continuously returns to the agency of blaming other counterparts. Therefore it can be stated that as the agency element in the speeches of Trump as president are far less harsh and personal in the case of blaming and victimization; they nevertheless still remain as an essential part of his rhetoric. Also, the addition of referring to unification as well as the ending of division are contradictory due to the confrontational rhetoric that follows them.

> Example 24 (speech 5. PUS):
>
> "For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while

they celebrated in our nation's capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land."

Example 25 (speech 6. PUS):
"I will not allow the mistakes of recent decades past to define the course of our future. For too long, we've watched our middle class shrink as we've exported our jobs and wealth to foreign countries. We've financed and built one global project after another, but ignored the fates of our children in the inner cities of Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit and so many other places throughout our land. We've defended the borders of other nations, while leaving our own borders wide open, for anyone to cross and for drugs to pour in at a now unprecedented rate. And we've spent trillions of dollars overseas, while our infrastructure at home has so badly crumbled."

Example 26 (speech 6. PUS):
"Everything that is broken in our country can be fixed. Every problem can be solved. And every hurting family can find healing, and hope. Our citizens deserve this, and so much more --- so why not join forces to finally get it done? On this and so many other things, Democrats and Republicans should get together and unite for the good of our country, and for the good of the American people."

As in the campaign speeches (1-3) also in the speeches as president elect and president of the United States of America (4-6) there are official agendas – or minor agendas – which influence the context.

In speech 4 (9.11.2016: NYC, New York) president elect Trump addresses his supporters after winning the election. This is a victory speech in which it is a custom to thank the campaign team, the opponent and speak about moving forward. In speech 5 (20.1.2017: Washington D.C.) president Trump delivers his inauguration speech, which traditionally in the ceremonial context is directed to all Americans. In speech 6 (28.2.2017: Washington D.C.) president Trump delivers his first speech to joint session of US Congress, identical to the famous *State of the Union Address* which in the ceremonial context of the American political tradition is primarily directed to the senators, congressmen, the representatives of the high courts and the military. These factors have an impact on the speeches due to their contextual requirements which the campaign speeches were free of.

The only major differences in the element of agency between all the analyzed speeches, emerged from speeches 4 and 6. In speech 4 Donald Trump decreases his victimizing rhetoric substantially

in comparison with all the other analyzed speeches and even endorses the most personally victimized agent of his campaign speeches: Hillary Clinton.

> Example 27 (speech 4. PE):
>
> "I've just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us. It's about us. On our victory, and I congratulated her and her family on a very, very hard-fought campaign. I mean, she fought very hard. Hillary has worked very long and very hard over a long period of time, and we owe her a major debt of gratitude for her service to our country. I mean that very sincerely. Now it is time for America to bind the wounds of division, have to get together. To all Republicans and Democrats and independents across this nation, I say it is time for us to come together as one united people."

It is also notable that in his inauguration speech Donald Trump thanks president Obama – which he strongly criticized during his campaign speeches. In this case as well, the reason is purely ceremonial as the new president often addresses the previous one.

Speech 6, president Trump's "first speech to joint session of US Congress" contains details about what he and his administration have achieved. Out of all the 6 speeches analyzed this speech was the single one that exhibits concrete measures of progress. Then again it also is the tradition in a speech to joint session of US Congress for the US president to comment on current developments, as the president does this annually in the *State of the Union Address.*

> Example 28 (speech 6. PUS):
>
> "It's been a little over a month since my inauguration, and I want to take this moment to update the Nation on the progress I've made in keeping those promises. Since my election, Ford, Fiat-Chrysler, General Motors, Sprint, Softbank, Lockheed, Intel, Walmart, and many others, have announced that they will invest billions of dollars in the United States and will create tens of thousands of new American jobs. The stock market has gained almost three trillion dollars in value since the election on November 8th, a record. We've saved taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by bringing down the price of the fantastic new F-35 jet fighter, and will be saving billions more dollars on contracts all across our Government. We have placed a hiring freeze on non-military and non-essential Federal workers…"

Based on my analysis, also in the case of speeches 4-6, it can be argued not to give excessive emphasis on these ceremonial requirements or minor agendas, but to concentrate on the substance of the general rhetoric in all the speeches by Donald Trump. This is particularly so since the elements of act and the agency appear to vary very little in examining all the analyzed speeches.

To summarize the act and the agency elements of the chosen speeches: the analysis suggests that the act which emerges from Trump's rhetoric is describing the disastrous state of the American country and its inhabitants which can all be blamed on others. He urges his supporters to vote in the coming election which he describes historical. When Donald Trump becomes president the act and agency do not substantially change even as his rhetoric mellows down slightly and he introduces the terms of unity and the ending of division.

In Table 6 on the next page, I present all the elements of act and agency with examples from the speeches.

Speech	Act and Agency	Example
1. 31.8.2016: Phoenix, Arizona. PC (presidential candidate)	The ruin of America and the American people/Blaming others and self-sacrifice	"…Innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty"
2. 13.10.2016: West Palm Beach, Florida. PC (presidential candidate)	The ruin of America and the American people/Blaming others and self-sacrifice	"I will not allow the Clinton machine to turn our campaign into a discussion of their slanders and lies, but, will remain focused on the issues facing the American people."
3. 22.10.2016: Gettysburg Pennsylvania. PC (presidential candidate)	The ruin of America and the American people/Blaming others and self-sacrifice	"They're trying to poison the mind of the American voter. Every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign. Total fabrications. The events never happened, never. All of these liars will be sued after the election is over."
4. 9.11.2016: NYC, New York. PE (president elect)	The ruin of America and the American people/Speaking about unity and mildly blaming	"The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. We are going to fix our inner cities and rebuild our highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, schools, hospitals."
5. 20.1.2017: Washington D.C. PUS (president of the United States)	The ruin of America and the American people/Speaking about unity and blaming others	"The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans. For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military…"
6. 28.2.2017: Washington D.C. PUS (president of the United States)	The ruin of America and the American people/Speaking about unity, achievements and blaming others	"…very simple, but crucial demand, that America must put its own citizens first because only then, can we truly make America great again"

4.1.3 Scene

As has been stated in the previous subchapter: the element of scene from the dramatistic pentad in Trump's rhetoric is very much alike with the element of act. Since the element of act refers to the action that can be interpreted from the rhetoric beyond the fact that an actual speech is being delivered – similarly the element of scene does not simply refer to the time and place on which the speeches in question are being delivered. Thus as the physical location of each delivered speech is a reality, a greater deal of emphasis must be given to the scene that emerges from the rhetorical context of the speech. The primary reason why the elements of act and scene seem to be inseparable in this study is due to the fact that Trump constantly refers to himself and America as one single entity which I have stated and explained in chapter 4.1.1 Agent.

In summary the scenes in speeches 1-3 are physically located where Trump as a presidential candidate delivers them: speech 1: 31.8.2016: Phoenix, Arizona, speech 2: 13.10.2016: West Palm Beach, Florida and speech 3: 22.10.2016: Gettysburg Pennsylvania. The physical locations in these speeches do not in themselves play any important part. Trump does refer to the audiences by mentioning the city or state that they are gathered at, but as has been stated in subchapter 4.1.1 Trump uses this rhetorical method as a mean to suggest to their shared American identity. Therefore, Trump speaks at the same time to his supporters and to all of America as he narrates his vision and scene of the current state of America.

The only physical location that bears special mentioning in this context of the scene is in speech 3, which Donald Trump delivers in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. A location that is famous and sacred in American history due to the battle of Gettysburg (1863) during the American Civil War. In addition, at this location the former American president Abraham Lincoln presented his famous Gettysburg address during the same year months after the battle. Apart from this detail of Gettysburg which I will comment further on in chapter 5, all the campaign speeches contain the same scene of America and Americans on the verge of ruin and destruction based on the narrative that emerges from Trump's rhetoric as has been stated in the previous chapter.

In speeches 4-6 the physical locations are the following: speech 4: 9.11.2016: NYC, New York, speech 5: 20.1.2017: Washington D.C and speech 6: 28.2.2017: Washington D.C.

Even as speech 4 is being delivered in the role of president elect and Trump is targeting his words foremost to his supporters, it is at the same time a speech for all Americans. This means that all the speeches made after the election (4-6) still contain the same scene as the campaign speeches do: The United States of America being on the verge of ruin, and him being the only one who can save the nation and its people. It is needless to say that in the two last speeches (5 and 6) the only notable element that has changed is that Donald Trump is in fact the president in office. This does not however change the scene in which America occurs in the narrative of his rhetoric. In other words: the issues of America that Donald Trump presents during the campaign road and as president do not change in the larger scale. Minor changes in the rhetoric can be detected due to the ceremonial differences and requirements which come in to play when one delivers a speech as a presidential candidate and as the president in office. Trump's agenda and the narrative of himself and the narrative of America does however not change. This leads to the element of the scene also being the same in all of the speeches which have been analyzed for this study. As for the physical locations for the speeches: all of them are being delivered in the US.

4.1.4 Purpose

In this subchapter I will present the last element of the dramatistic pentad: the purpose. The fundamental theoretical substance of the theory of dramatism is summed up into the concept of motive: to the reasons which make people act in the fashion in which they do.

The main purpose that emerges from the rhetoric of Donald Trump can be seen as his thrive to solve all the issues he presents in his speeches. All of the mentioned issues that America faces in the narrative of his rhetoric can be solved, according to him, by electing him as president of the United States of America. Later, in speeches 4-6, where he has won the election these same issues are still his main purpose. As has been stated in the previous subchapters the rhetoric itself overcomes some changes, but the actual substance of the speeches does not.

In the campaign speeches (1-3) Donald Trump continuously refers to the actual election day of November 8th which of course suggests that his purpose is to win the election, become the president and – indeed save the American nation with its people because as stated in the previous subchapters; he sees himself as the only one who can do it.

In the post campaign speeches (4-6), Donald Trump being the president, he still voices the same issues from the campaign road in his rhetoric. The distinct similarity between all the analyzed speeches is the use of the words of Trump's famous presidential campaign slogan: "Make America Great Again". Even though in all of his prior to election and postelection speeches Trump uses a great deal of time articulating the issues of America as well as blaming the guilty parties – he does not present concrete measures in order to fix them. He rather sums up his vision of the current state of America and its people into his promise of solving everything, thus making America great again - if being elected. After his victory he uses the same slogan in order to urge Americans in joining and approving his policies. Donald Trump's number one rhetorical priority and purpose of making America great again is also manifested in the way he accuses his opponent Hillary Clinton of lacking the character of doing so:

> Example 29 (speech 1. PC):
> "She doesn't have the strength or the stamina to make America great again. Believe me. What we do know, despite the lack of media curiosity, is that Hillary Clinton promises a radical amnesty combined with a radical reduction in immigration enforcement. Just ask the Border Patrol about Hillary Clinton. You won't like what you're hearing."

This suggests that in Trump's rhetoric and reasoning, the words "make America great again" in themselves hold all the specifics and details of solving the problems he is voicing. It is also noteworthy to pay attention to the fact that he does not abandon his world famous campaign slogan even when he takes office as the president of the United States of America. Where, as a candidate, he urged all Americans to vote for him under the purpose and pretext of making America great again, as president, he does very much the same, only this time he proposes support for his policies as it can be argued that he seeks justification. Only in speech 4 (the victory speech as president elect) Donald Trump does not mention the words "Make America great again".

The purpose and motives of Donald Trump's actions that emerge from his rhetoric are his volition to save America and its people from the ruin he is explicating. This is his purpose as a presidential candidate as well as the president of the United States of America. This purpose he sums up in his presidential campaign and presidential rhetoric through his slogan: make America great again.

Example 30 (speech 1. PC):
"Together we can save American lives, American jobs, and American futures. Together we can save America itself. Join me in this mission, we're going to make America great again. Thank you. I love you. God bless you, everybody. God bless you. God bless you, thank you."

Example 31 (speech 3. PC):
"I am asking the American people to dream big once again. What follows is my 100 day action plan to make America great again. It's a contract between Donald J Trump and the American voter and it begins with bringing honesty, accountability, and change to Washington DC."

Example 32 (speech 5. PUS):
"We will make America safe again. And yes, together, we will make America great again. Thank you. God bless you. And God bless America."

Example 33 (speech 6. PUS):
"Finally, the chorus became an earthquake and the people turned out by the tens of millions, and they were all united by one very simple, but crucial demand, that America must put its own citizens first. Because only then, can we truly make America great again. Dying industries will come roaring back to life. Heroic veterans will get the care they so desperately need. Our military will be given the resources its brave warriors so richly deserve. Crumbling infrastructure will be replaced with new roads, bridges, tunnels, airports and railways gleaming across our beautiful land. Our terrible drug epidemic will slow down and ultimately, stop. And our neglected inner cities will see a rebirth of hope, safety, and opportunity. Above all else, we will keep our promises to the American people."

4.2 Identification

In this chapter I will present the results of the analyzed speeches through the concept of identification and its six elements: identifying, formal patterns, framing, ambiguous symbols, mystification and scapegoating

4.2.1 Identifying

As has been explained in the theoretical background of this study the element of identifying means that the speaker uses a certain kind of a language, a tone of voice, similar gestures, mental images, ideas, attitudes and hierarchies as their audience in order to identify with them. In addition, when a speaker delivers a speech to a conservative audience one mean of trying to identify with them would be to refer to traditional values. All of the mentioned ways of identifying or none of them can be used in a speech as they are merely examples.

However, in a rhetorical analysis the art of detecting identifying elements from a speech can be challenging since the attitudes, hierarchies or typical uses of language (for example dialects) of the audience cannot be interpreted based on the speeches which are the data and the base of this study.

Elements of identifying nevertheless emerged from the speeches in the way how Trump refers continuously to Americans and himself in the form of "us Americans", which has been discussed in the previous chapter 4.1.1 Agent. As this element of identifying in which Trump refers to the American people and himself as one entity is strongly overlapping with another element of identification: framing, I will discuss this particular element of identifying in the coming subchapter 4.2.3 Framing.

One element of identifying which did not overlap with any other elements of the theoretical background did emerge from Trump's speeches. In one of his campaigns, and one presidential speech Donald Trump refers to particular people by naming them and sharing their story. This he does as a mean to identify with his audience and to support his arguments on particular issues.

For example: in speech 1 where Donald Trump, in his own words, delivers a detailed policy address on illegal immigration at one of his campaign rallies, he tells the stories of five different American individuals all from different ages and both sexes. All the mentioned people have been victims of crimes committed by illegal immigrants.

Example 34 (speech 1. PC):

"Then there is the case of 90-year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten and left to bleed to death in his home, 90 years old and defenseless. The perpetrators were illegal immigrants with criminal records a mile long, who did not meet Obama administration standards for removal. And they knew it was going to happen. In California, a 64-year-old Air Force veteran, a great woman, according to everybody that knew her, Marilyn Pharis, was sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions but was never, ever deported, despite the fact that everybody wanted him out."

In addition to referring to these real life victims of crime, that has been committed by illegal immigrants, Trump also shares his stage with so called "angel mums" and other relatives of victims. Angel mum or angel mothers in this context is a term used to describe a mother who lost their relative to a murder committed by an illegal immigrant. In speech 1, Trump allows several of these angel mothers to share their story to the audience. Based on the analysis this is a clear method of trying to identify with the audience since the speaker – in this case Trump- shares the podium for a moment with members of the audience. Out of all the examined speeches, speech 1 was the only one where Donald Trump stood aside for a moment and let someone else speak.

In speech 6 where president Trump delivers his first speech to joint session of US Congress, he refers to a young American woman who is in the audience. Trump shares the story of this particular young woman and her father who struggled to fight for his daughter's life since she was diagnosed with an incurable disease.

Example 35 (speech 6. PUS):

"On receiving this news, Megan's dad, John, fought with everything he had to save the life of his precious child. He founded a company to look for a cure, and helped develop the drug that saved Megan's life. Today she is 20 years old -- and a sophomore at Notre Dame. Megan's story is about the unbounded power of a father's love for a daughter. But our slow and burdensome approval process at the Food and Drug Administration keeps too many advances, like the one that saved Megan's life, from reaching those in need. If we slash the restraints, not just at the FDA but across our Government, then we will be blessed with far more miracles like Megan. In fact, our children will grow up in a nation of miracles."

Both of these examples from speech 1 and speech 6 indicate the use of the element of identifying. Donald Trump shares these stories of the named people to his audience. In the case of the first

speech to joint session of US Congress, he has even invited the person in question to join him and the audience to hear him deliver his speech.

In speech 3 president Trump also refers to the former president Abraham Lincoln and he does so again in speech 6 where he mentions president Dwight D. Eisenhower. By naming these two famous republican presidents Trump is distinctly referring to America's traditional values and its past as to the past of the republican party's tradition with its notable presidents. Both Abraham Lincoln and Dwight D. Eisenhower were prominent political figures at the crossroads of American history. The fact that speech 3 is being delivered in Gettysburg Pennsylvania can also be seen as a mean of identifying with the audience by bringing forth the historical significance of the physical location in regard to American history as I have stated in subchapter 4.1.3 Scene.

> Example 36 (speech 6. PUS):
> "Another Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, initiated the last truly great national infrastructure program: the building of the interstate highway system. The time has come for a new program of national rebuilding."

The fact that Trump mentions these presidents and the chosen people are a way of prompting his political agenda, but nevertheless it is simultaneously a mean of identifying with the audience of his speech – in this case Americans.

In speech 4, Donald Trump's "victory speech", he also shares the podium with members of his family and the campaign crew and in addition refers to some of them. This however is a very conventional custom in a victory speech of any kind, thus it has no significance in the analysis.

The analysis shows that identifying is not a strongly emerging rhetorical method of Donald Trump in terms of quantity, but it is nevertheless to be found from both his campaign and presidential rhetoric. He also uses identifying in the same fashion: through real life examples.

4.2.2 Formal patterns

Based on Burke's dramatism formal patterns can be used in a speech principally in two different ways: 1. repetition in order to highlight what has been said and 2. in a way that provokes confrontation. The element of confrontation emerged strongly from Trump's rhetoric and it was manifested through continuous blaming in his speeches. Because the element of blaming is completely similar with the 6th element of identification called scapegoating and similar with the concept of Burke's quilt and redemption cycle I will present the results that cover the findings about victimization and scapegoating in the chapter 4.3 Guilt and redemption cycle.

The element of repetition in order to highlight what has been said emerged strongly from Trump's rhetoric. This element was strongly evident in both his speeches as a presidential candidate as well as the president of the United States of America. As has been stated before: the ceremonial requirements of a presidential speech are a factor that restricted the speeches in some ways.

When examining campaign speech, it is more evident that Trump wanders away from the "script of the speech and topic at hand" than in his speeches as president. Nevertheless, repetition is constantly present in all of Trump's speeches. The style in which Trump uses repetition differs somewhat in different parts and different speeches. It is a frequent way for Trump to add one or two word sentences after a longer one for example using adjectives such as *beautiful* to emphasize the previous sentence. One of Trump's most frequently used two word-sentence is: *"Believe me"*. In addition to these Trump asks rhetorical questions from the audience after stating an opinion.

> Example 37 (speech 1. PC):
> "Another reform, involves new screening tests for all applicants that include, and this is so important, especially if you get the right people. And we will get the right people. An ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people. Thank you. We're very proud of our country. Aren't we? Really? With all it's going through, we're very proud of our country."

> Example 38 (speech 1. PC):
> "These are amazing people, and I am not asking for their endorsement, believe me that. I just think I've gotten to know so many of them, and many more, from our group. But they are incredible people and what they're

going through is incredible, and there's just no reason for it. Let's give them a really tremendous hand. That's tough stuff, I will tell you. That is tough stuff. Incredible people."

Example 39 (speech 2. PC):
"While other lives, including General Petraeus and many others, have been destroyed for doing far, far less. This is a conspiracy against you, the American people, and we cannot let this happen or continue. This is our moment of reckoning as a society and as a civilization itself. I didn't need to do this, folks, believe me believe me."

Example 40 (speech 2. PC):
"The new, highly respected Rasmussen poll just came out this morning. Just released. Shows up nationally 2 points ahead, Trump. Beautiful. Just came out"

As Trump becomes president elect and president of the United States he still uses repetition in his speeches, but in an all-encompassing way. This means that his post campaign speeches lack the so called "filler words" and adjectives which were presented in the previous examples. The repetition in order to highlight what has been said emerges in sentences that have more substance than the ones Trump delivered during his campaign.

Example 41 (speech 4. PE):
"We have a great economic plan. We will double our growth and have the strongest economy anywhere in the world. At the same time, we will get along with all other nations willing to get along with us. We will be. We will have great relationships. We expect to have great, great relationships."

Example 42 (speech 5. PUS):
"America will start winning again, winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams. We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation. We will get our people off of welfare and back to work -- rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American."

Example 43 (speech 6. PUS):
"When we have all of this, we will have made America greater than ever before. For all Americans. This is our vision. This is our mission. But we can only get there together. We are one people, with one destiny. We all bleed the same blood. We all salute the same flag. And we are all made by the same God."

As can be seen, the element of formal patterns through repetition is strongly present in Trump's rhetoric both on the campaign road and after the election as president of the United States of America.

4.2.3 Framing

According to Burke's dramatism framing can be used in a speech by referring to the audience, using words like *us* and *we* in an attempt of identifying with them. As a speaker identifies with their audience using such rhetoric of *us*, it draws automatically a frontier between the speaker and his listeners in contrary to "all the others" - the ones who are not *us* or *we*. Trump uses this rhetorical method continuously as it has been stated previously in this study in subchapters 4.1.1 Agent and 4.2.1 Identifying.

As was mentioned in subchapter 4.1.1 Agent and can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2 Trump uses this manner of framing continuously throughout all of his speeches in large quantities. Trump does this in his speeches using words as: *our country*, *we, American workers, American lives, American voters our administration, our people, our borders, our laws, our nation, our jobs our streets*. In addition, Trump also speaks directly to the audience using phrases as: *you, you the people, you the American people, folks.* As has been discussed before: Trump merges himself and the American people often in sentences where he begins talking about himself and then conducts it into the American people in general. This way of speaking allows Trump to use rather general words such as *a job, a factory* or *a street* as a mean of referring to *us* in converting them in his own context into "us Americans" by saying: *our jobs, our factories* and *our streets*.

> Example 44 (speech 1. PC):
> "And by the way, and by the way, we're going to make great trade deals. We're going to renegotiate trade deals. We're going to bring our jobs back home. We're going to bring our jobs back home."

> Example 45 (speech 3. PC):
> "At home, we have our great veterans dying while waiting for medical care. Change has to come from outside of our very broken system. Our system is broken. The fact that Washington and the Washington establishment has tried so hard to stop our campaign is only more proof that our

campaign represents the kind of change that only arrives once in a lifetime. The system is totally rigged and broken."

Example 47 (speech 5. PUS):

"But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential."

Example 48 (speech 6. PUS):

"Everything that is broken in our country can be fixed. Every problem can be solved. And every hurting family can find healing, and hope. Our citizens deserve this, and so much more - so why not join forces to finally get it done? On this and so many other things, Democrats and Republicans should get together and unite for the good of our country, and for the good of the American people. My administration wants to work with members in both parties to make childcare accessible and affordable, to help ensure new parents have paid family leave, to invest in women's health, and to promote clean air and clear water, and to rebuild our military and our infrastructure. True love for our people requires us to find common ground, to advance the common good, and to cooperate on behalf of every American child who deserves a brighter future."

In Table 7 I present the quantity of sentences in all of Trump's speeches that contain framing in terms of referring to "*us Americans*" in all the various ways that are explained and presented.

TABLE 7.

Speech	Quantity of framing appearing in sentences
1. (PC) Phoenix, Arizona,	243
2. (PC) West Palm Beach, Florida,	146
3. (PC) Gettysburg, Pennsylvania,	203
4. (PE) NYC, New York,	65
5. (PUS) Washington D.C.	89
6. (PUS) Washington D.C.	200

As mentioned the method of framing is overlapping with the element of identifying – both key to Burke's dramatism's concept of identification. In addition, with the fact that they are also overlapping with the element of agent in Burke's concept of the dramatistic pentad, it is important not to overlook the fact that in which ever form of element under which ever concept these findings do emerge from – they are a substantial rhetorical method used by Donald Trump in all of his speeches. And this is a key finding in my analysis.

4.2.4 Ambiguous symbols

Based on Burke's dramatism ambiguous symbols can be used in a speech by using abstract concepts or symbols as reasoning or as an argument to support one's own opinions.

Donald Trump does not use words and sentences which can be interpreted as a use of ambiguous symbols. In other words: this means that in his rhetoric as a presidential candidate and as president he does not hide or conceal his personal or political opinions behind abstract expressions or sentences. At the rare occasion where a somewhat abstract or ambiguous word or sentence appears in Trump's rhetoric it is without exception a metaphor which, after objective examination, is a potently clear one. Therefore, such use of words and metaphors cannot be arguably considered as an emerging example of an ambiguous symbol. To emphasize the previous: Donald Trump does not use ambiguous symbols in his rhetoric assessed by the fact that an ambiguous symbol should conceal the true intention of the speaker in a more concrete way.

What now follows in this subchapter are examples of sentences which could have been interpreted as ambiguous symbols, but were in fact not. The reason for presenting them is that because an ambiguous symbol could emerge through metaphors in a speech, the metaphors used by Donald Trump are worth a brief examination. This will be discussed more thoroughly in chapter 5.

For example: in speech 1 the only sentence which could be at first considered as an emerging of an ambiguous symbol contains the metaphor of the *Trojan horse*. In speech 2 the *Trojan horse* is mentioned again also with the metaphor of *dark clouds*. As the concept of the *Trojan horse* and the metaphor of *dark clouds* are evident and culturally known metaphors as they are, they are

worth mentioning in this context of the results, but cannot be considered a true finding of use of ambiguous symbols. Donald Trump uses these phrases in the context of his speeches in such a fashion that his true opinions are not hidden. The fact that he does use metaphors such as these is interesting due to the nature of ambiguous symbols. Nevertheless, I must emphasize that they are not considered ambiguous symbols in my analysis.

> Example 49 (speech 1. PC):
> "Most incredibly, because to me this is unbelievable, we have no idea who these people are, where they come from. I always say Trojan Horse. Watch what's going to happen, folks. It's not going to be pretty."

> Example 50 (speech 2. PC):
> "They will allow radical Islamic terrorists to enter our country by the thousands. They will allow the great Trojan horse — and I don't want people looking back in a hundred years and 200 years and have that story be told about us because we were led by inept, incompetent and corrupt people like Barack Obama and like Hillary Clinton. We don't want to be part of that history."

> Example 51 (speech 2. PC):
> "The corrupt establishment knows that we are a great threat to their criminal enterprise. They know that if we win, their power is gone, and it's returned to you, the people, will be. The dark clouds hanging over our government can be lifted and replaced with a bright future."

In speech 3 Donald Trump's choice of location: Gettysburg in the state of Pennsylvania is symbolic in itself, but again the intention to connect with the history of the location is clear as has been discussed in subchapter 4.1.3 Scene.

In the speeches where Donald Trump is president he again uses metaphors and language that at first sight raises the question whether they can be considered as ambiguous symbols or not. However, as I pointed out before after assessing these metaphors I have decided not to consider these as ambiguous symbols. It is nevertheless an interesting observation to point out that Donald Trump uses more of these sentences with metaphors as he drops the essential campaign rhetoric and speaks as a president.

> Example 52 (speech 4. PE):
> "We must reclaim our country's destiny and dream big and bold and daring."

Example 53 (speech 5. PUS):

"We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries and technologies of tomorrow. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions."

Example 54 (speech 6. PUS):

" Then, in 2016, the earth shifted beneath our feet. The rebellion started as a quiet protest, spoken by families of all colors and creeds - families who just wanted a fair shot for their children, and a fair hearing for their concerns."

4.2.5 Mystification

Based on Burke's dramatism mystification can emerge in a speech when a universal and a general motive, for example honor or fear of God are, being used to hide certain contextual motives. As has been explained in the theoretical background; this element can emerge in a speech through rhetoric which justifies a certain action for example defending someone's honor while the actual contextual motive would be revenge.

In none of the selected speeches from 1-6 does Donald Trump does use any rhetoric that indicates to the element of mystification. This means that all of the actions and measures or opinions he is proposing are not hidden or concealed into any indefinite argumentation. In other words: Donald Trump as a presidential candidate and as president of the United States of America uses straightforward and obvious sentences in his rhetoric.

4.2.6 Scapegoating

Based on Burke's dramatism the element of scapegoating under the concept of identification means that the speaker blames someone else for the problems that are being presented.

As has been stated in subchapter 4.1.2 Act and Agency Donald Trump's rhetoric throughout his speeches as presidential candidate and as president of the United States is strongly composed of blaming other parties thus scapegoating. This element of scapegoating however overlaps with

Burke's dramatism's final key concept; the guilt and redemption cycle. Therefore, I will examine the concept of scapegoating in the next chapter 4.3 The guilt and redemption cycle.

4.3 The guilt and redemption cycle

In this chapter I present results through the last key concept of Burke's dramatism: the guilt and redemption cycle and its two elements victimage and mortification.

4.3.1 Victimage

In Burke's dramatism victimage means scapegoating and blaming other parties. When a speaker uses victimage in her/his rhetoric it is language that distinctly puts blame on the shoulder of someone else than the speaker and usually its audience.

As has been stated previously in subchapter 4.1.2 Act and Agency, Donald Trump's rhetoric throughout his speeches 1-6 as presidential candidate and as president of the United States is strongly composed of blaming other parties. Based on my analysis it can be said that Trump's medium of delivering a speech is to blame other people or other entities, those who in his rhetoric are not with and not for the American people. As I have previously presented in subchapter 4.1.1 Agent, Trump names the guilty parties for America's current state as follows: *immigrants or illegal immigrants, Hillary Clinton, President Obama, Mexico and Mexicans, Isis or Radical Islamic terror and Media/Journalists.*

Hence, Donald Trump continuously blames the - from his point of view - guilty parties all over his speeches. This means that he does not have a special part of his speech dedicated only for the blaming or exploiting the wrongdoings of others, but he repeatedly returns to the blaming of certain individuals, ethnic groups or institutions even when he already has concluded his points earlier on in his speeches. This is what makes Trump's rhetoric so coherently constructed by victimage. Regardless of his agenda or the agenda of the particular speech that is being delivered, his medium of delivering a speech is through cyclical blaming. In other words: victimage.

Example 55 (speech 1. PC):

"Hillary Clinton has pledged to keep both of these illegal amnesty programs, including the 2014 amnesty which has been blocked by the United States Supreme Court. Great. Clinton has also pledged to add a third executive amnesty. And by the way, folks, she will be a disaster for our country, a disaster in so many other ways. And don't forget the Supreme Court of the United States. Don't forget that when you go to vote on November 8. And don't forget your Second Amendment. And don't forget the repeal and replacement of Obamacare. And don't forget building up our depleted military. And don't forget taking care of our vets. Don't forget our vets. They have been forgotten. Clinton's plan would trigger a constitutional crisis unlike almost anything we have ever seen before. In effect, she would be abolishing the lawmaking powers of Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office. And you see what bad judgment she has. She has seriously bad judgment."

Example 56 (speech 2. PC):

"Again, this is nothing more than an attempt to destroy our movement and for the Clintons to keep their corrupt control over our government. When I declared my candidacy, I knew what bad shape our country was in. And believe me, all you have to do is look at world events. All you have to do is look at the $1.7 billion that we sent to Iran in cash – in cash. All you have to do is see the way ISIS was created in the vacuum left by Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama out of Iraq. All you have to do, all you have to do, is look at the 800 people that were very, very not good for our nation. They were going to be deported. Lo and behold, instead of being deported, they were made citizens of the United States just recently. And lo and behold, sadly, the 800 people is wrong. It turned out to be close to 1,800 people. Our president is incompetent."

Example 57 (speech 3. PC):

"The rigging of the system is designed for one reason: to keep the corrupt establishment and special interests in power at your expense - and everybody's expense. I have no special interest but you, the American voter. I didn't have to do this, believe me. There's nothing easy about it, but I had to do it. I love our country. I love the people of our country and I felt I had to do it. Thank you."

In TABLE 8 on the next page, I present the quantity of sentences in all of Trump's speeches that contain victimage.

TABLE 8. Quantity of victimage used in sentences.

Speech	Quantity of victimage in sentences
1. (PC) Phoenix, Arizona	237
2. (PC) West Palm Beach, Florida	188
3. (PC) Gettysburg, Pennsylvania	203
4. (PE) NYC, New York	4
5. (PUS) Washington D.C.	21
6. (PUS) Washington D.C.	93

As can be seen from Table 7 the quantity of sentences that contain victimage are many per every speech delivered by Donald Trump. It is also evident that the quantity of victimage containing sentences decrease greatly after speech 3. For this there are two main reasons: 1 From speech number 4 onwards Donald Trump is no longer campaigning and 2 Speeches 4 and 5 are greatly shorter in length than the previous campaign speeches and speech number 6: the first speech to joint session of US Congress.

Even as it is more common in a campaign speech to blame other parties rather than in constitutional presidential speeches, based on the analysis, Donald Trump's rhetoric contains constantly large quantities of victimage – whether he is a campaigning presidential candidate or the president of the United States of America. Out of all the analyzed speeches only speech number 4 stood out as the one with clearly less sentences containing victimage. The reason for this is the fact that in a victory speech as a presidential elect it is the custom to thank the opponents (not blame them) and the whole campaign team. In this regard even Donald Trump's victory speech as presidential elect did not miss its own share of blaming even though it was significantly less than in the previous speeches and the ones which were to follow.

Donald Trump's speeches as president contain victimage as well as has been stated before. As president his rhetoric is a little more subtle than it was on the campaign road and he does not blame any particular people in his presidential speeches. However, he continues with his rhetoric of blaming others for their past and current actions in order to explain the problems of the present.

Even if it is not always as evident as it was in his campaign rhetoric Donald Trump nevertheless blames previous politicians and policies in his presidential speeches.

> Example 58 (speech 5. PUS):
>
> "Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public. But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now."

> Example 59 (speech 6. PUS):
>
> "More than 1 in 5 people in their prime working years are not working. We have the worst financial recovery in 65 years. In the last 8 years, the past Administration has put on more new debt than nearly all other Presidents combined. We've lost more than one-fourth of our manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was approved, and we've lost 60,000 factories since China joined the World Trade Organization in 2001."

To summarize the amount of victimage containing sentences in the speeches of Donald Trump as a running candidate for the presidency and as the president of the United States of America is one of the key findings in this study. His rhetoric is greatly composed by blaming others regardless of the official agenda or the issues he is putting forward. I will discuss these findings of victimage further in chapter 5. a

4.3.2 Mortification

In Burke's dramatism mortification means self-sacrifice or self-inflected punishment as a rhetorical method. This means that a speaker who bears responsibility by blaming themselves or by enduring a self-inflected punishment attempts to purify themselves. In other words: the speaker attempts to receive forgiveness and acceptance from the audience. As has been stated: in a rhetorical method in Burke's dramatism this means that the speaker admits her/his guilt or part in a wrongdoing to her/his audience.

Based on my analysis, mortification does not appear at all in the analyzed speeches by Donald Trump as presidential candidate and as president of the United States of America. This means that Donald Trump does not use language where he executes self-sacrificing expressions or in any other way admits to any wrongdoings or mistakes by his side or the side of his campaign.

However, in the speeches which were delivered as the president, there emerged a few sentences that seemed to qualify as mortification. But after examining them within the whole context of the speech, they were in fact indirect forms of victimage. In these sentences president Trump refers to past mistakes and people who have been forgotten. In the context though it is clear that Donald Trump as president does not share the blame, but he refers to past policies and politicians. Therefore, in this analysis these particular sentences are actually considered to be victimage and not mortification.

> Example 60 (speech 5. PUS):
> "For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military; we've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own; and spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon. One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the entire world."

> Example 61 (speech 6. PUS):
> "We must learn from the mistakes of the past - we have seen the war and destruction that have raged across our world."

In these two examples when president Trump says *we*, he is talking in a context as one of the Americans in terms of recognizing the mistakes that have been made. President Trump does not however mean that this blame affiliates to him at all, since he makes it always clear in the whole context that the mistakes that have been made are the fault of others: previous politicians, their policies etc. He does this by representing him as the change for all that has been going wrong. This

is an interesting relation between the two elements of victimage and mortification in Trump's rhetoric.

To summarize mortification does not emerge from any of the 6 analyzed speeches delivered by Donald Trump as a presidential candidate, president elect or president of the United States of America. This lack of mortification in Donald Trump's rhetoric is also considered as an important finding in the analysis, which shall be discussed further in chapter 5.

5 Discussion

The objective of this study is to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The selected data for this study consists of six different speeches given by Donald Trump during 31.8.2016 – 28.2.2017. In this study the rhetoric of Donald Trump is researched through Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism. In this chapter I will discuss the obtained results through the three posed research questions each in their separate subchapters after which I will briefly summarise the key findings.

5.1 Image of America: A turmoil without Trump

Research question 1: "What image of the United States of America arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric?", is based on all the obtained results through the made analysis in which all the key concepts of Kenneth Burke's dramatism: the dramatistic pentad, identification and the quilt and redemption cycle were used. However, the two concepts: dramatistic pentad and identification are more essential to research question 1 than the concept of the guilt and redemption cycle is. As the guilt and redemption cycle only focuses on blaming either oneself or others, the elements that are offered by the dramatistic pentad and identification provide more sufficient tools in order to analyze the speeches and thus to answer research question 1.

From all of the analyzed speeches made by Donald Trump as a presidential candidate, president elect and president of the United States of America, the same essential image arose: through his rhetoric Trump expresses that the United States of America and Americans are on the verge of division, fundamental ruin and destruction. According to Trump, the American people have lost their freedom and are about lose all that is left from the country's democracy and hope for a better future, unless he himself gets elected president. In the argumentation of Trump's rhetoric, he proposes that the current wretched state of America and its citizens are due to a handful of corrupt and global special interest people who have a total control of all the politicians, Washington D.C. and additionally have the absolutely corrupt media establishment working for their benefit.

Trump explains that the bad policies by a very corrupt and sick political establishment holds responsibility for every misgiving that has occurred in the US for a long time now. This corrupt political establishment according to Trump's rhetoric puts their own interests first and hereby abandons the forgotten American people who now have a country with a rotten infrastructure, a crumbling economy and a deteriorating military with its forgotten veterans. Trump also describes how all the jobs of the honest American workers are leaving the US shores overseas while the country's borders are leaking and allowing Mexicans and other illegal immigrants to pour straight into the US in order to commit crime and murder in addition of stealing the remaining jobs of the struggling American people. On top all of this Trump explains that the current political establishment is so weak and incompetent in terms of immigration policies that it allows elements of radical Islamic terror/ISIS to simply walk in to the country while at the same time the corrupt media establishment is choosing not to write about this, but in fact is discrediting his political movement and highlighting his main opponent Hillary Clinton to her benefit.

Throughout his campaign rhetoric Donald Trump attacks Hillary Clinton for either being the puppet or the main controller of the corrupt establishment he is running against. Additionally, Trump describes Clinton as being extremely incompetent, weak and highly dishonest. In the image that arises from Trump's rhetoric, Hillary Clinton personifies all that is wrong with the corrupt political system with its "rigged" rules and he emphasizes even further to describe that for his opponents the situation is a war and November the 8th will be the last chance to save America. The president in office (at the time of Trump's campaign speeches), Barack Obama is portrayed – just as Clinton – as an extremely incompetent and corrupt individual. The fact that a presidential candidate is so openly accusing a president in office who is not re-running is without precedent in the political history of America, and therefore underlines the unconventional rhetoric of Donald Trump. It also naturally makes the image of America described in the rhetoric of Trump even more fierce and apocalyptic.

As the only solution to the ruin Donald Trump is explicating, he urges all Americans to vote for him in the coming election on November the 8th 2016, which he frequently describes to be a crossroads moment in the history of all Americans. In the scenery of America that Donald Trump echoes throughout his rhetoric, he presents himself as being the only one who can change things

and make a concrete difference to the issues he puts forward. Trump does this by emphasizing his position as unique, but at the same time as being just one of the American people – a man who loves his country and who felt he had to act. Trump frequently underlines his fundamental understanding of the current corrupt state of the USA, since he himself is a former insider and not at all a politician who he as a group of professionals despises for their corrupt actions and weakness to put America first.

In his rhetoric he also emphasizes the personal sacrifice he has had to take upon him, since the corrupt establishment is willing to do anything in order to stop him and all the Americans who want a change. He often stresses the fact that he has become a victim for his cause and therefore the cause of all American's he is defending. In Trump's own words, all that is being said against him and his campaign, is proof of the importance of his and America's mission in order to bring the power back to the ordinary Americans from the corrupt Washington establishments. Donald Trump underlines how Hillary Clinton is not in fact running against him, but all Americans as she is running against change.

As the image of the USA that arises from the rhetoric of Donald Trump is that of an apocalyptical ruin where only he stands against it, the key finding based on my analysis was the medium how he presents his point: through blaming. In his "America in ruins"-rhetoric Donald Trump continuously blames the guilty parties in all of his speeches. His rhetoric is coherently constructed by blaming and regardless of the official agenda of the speech that is being delivered (immigration policy, inauguration, first speech to joint session of US Congress etc.), his medium of delivering a speech is through cyclical blaming. The main parties to be held responsible for the ruin of America according to Trump's rhetoric are: *immigrants or illegal immigrants, Hillary Clinton, President Obama, Mexico and Mexicans, Isis or Radical Islamic terror and Media/Journalists.* It is notable to mention that in several cases it seems that all these mentioned people, nationalities, institutions and organizations are inseparably connected with each other in the America which Donald Trump describes in his rhetoric. It is also interesting to observe that according to Trump's rhetoric, the media is an active political operator as it is according to him fundamentally biased and destined to campaign against him. In other words: Trump does not only strongly criticize the media for its "picking sides"-policy that he continuously refers to during his campaign, but in the

fashion Trump cyclically associates the media with all of his political opponents, he simultaneously paints a picture in which the US media is not an institutional representative of a worldwide free press, but in fact a member of the same corrupt political establishment he is running against – a political agent themselves.

It is also interesting to note that when delivering speeches as president, Donald Trump does not mention the media by name or blame them anymore as he did on the campaign road. This also is due to the differences of the nature of a campaign speech and a presidential speech. The narrative of America, which Trump prompted throughout his rhetoric and became famous for during his campaigning, is still the same in his presidential rhetoric and the media does have its part in it, even when it is not exclusively mentioned.

As has been discussed in chapter 4, the tone of Donald Trump's speeches became slightly less vindictive after he won the election and when he delivers speeches as the president. To a large extent the reason is simply the fact that campaign speeches tend to be more fierce in general and as president elect or especially president in office, Donald Trump was bounded by certain ceremonial requirements for his speeches and was not as free to improvise as on the campaign road.

For example, in speech 4 (9.11.2016: NYC, New York) president elect Trump addressed his supporters after winning the election. This was a victory speech in which it is a custom to thank the campaign team, the opponent and speak about moving forward. In speech 5 (20.1.2017: Washington D.C.) president Trump delivered his inauguration speech, which traditionally in the ceremonial context is directed to all Americans. In speech 6 (28.2.2017: Washington D.C.) president Trump delivered his first speech to joint session of US Congress –only semantically different from the official *State of the Union Address* - which in the ceremonial context of the American political tradition is primarily directed to the senators, congressmen, the representatives of the high courts and the military.

As has been examined and explained before in the theoretical background of this study in chapter 2.2.2, the inauguration speech and the *State of the Union Address* hold certain ceremonial,

institutional and historical requirements. Both of these official speeches are regarded as the most significant political addresses that the president of the United States of America regularly delivers. In the inauguration speech it is a custom that the new president in office presents his views and objectives on policy and where her/his focus will lie during their presidency. In a *State of the Union Address* it is instead a tradition to present the means on how to concretely achieve the set goals. (Nelson & Riley 2010, 123, 133). In addition, as it has been stated before: the presidency is more than just the individual (and her/his characteristics) who holds the office: the presidency is an institutional, cultural and symbolic role, which to a large degree limits the behavior of whoever is in office, due to the institutional requirements (Smith & Smith 1990, 237; Denton & Hahn 1986, 9-10; Denton & Woodward 1990, 215). These factors themselves suggested that they would have an impact on the speeches due to their contextual requirements which the campaign speeches were absolutely free of.

However regardless of the official status in which Donald Trump delivers his speeches and the historical contextual requirements they contain, it is essential to observe that the image that arises from his rhetoric is practically the same as in his campaign speeches. The "America first" policy that Trump prompt's in his presidential speeches echoes the same rhetoric as his campaign speeches did. As a presidential candidate Trump describes the disastrous state of the American country and its inhabitants – factors that can all be blamed on others. When Trump becomes president the main image of the state of America in his rhetoric does not change even if his hardest rhetoric mellows down slightly as he introduces the terms of unity, bipartisan politics and the end of division. In the post campaigning speeches Donald Trump does not accuse any people or institutions by name anymore, even though he maintains his old rhetoric which is greatly composed by blaming others regardless of the official agenda or the issues he is putting forward. So it can be argued that Trump's presidential rhetoric is somewhat more controversial than the campaign one, since after winning the presidential election he does propose a future of political unity and togetherness among all American's only to continue further with rhetoric that strongly suggests the obvious since, the vindictive tone of his speeches remains very much the same.

In addition, in his presidential speeches Donald Trump is not as much in the spotlight of his own rhetoric as he was during his campaign speeches. This does not nevertheless mean that he and his

political movement with the American people (as he describes it) are not an active counterpart in his rhetoric delivered as president. It is only slightly more subtle and as president he does not refer to himself in third person anymore.

In the image of the USA that is composed through his rhetoric, Donald Trump does not see and does not admit to any wrongdoings from his own side or the side of his campaign team or later his newly formed government. This means that in his rhetoric in terms of the element of mortification (self-sacrifice) Trump does not use language where he executes self-sacrificing expressions or in any other way admits to any faults or mistakes. As has been stated in chapter 4, in the two speeches delivered as president, there emerge a number of sentences which contain admitting to past mistakes. However, after examining these sentences within the actual context, it became clear that these sentences were indirect forms of blaming, which Donald Trump as president uses to pass on responsibility to former governments and policy makers. In other words: in these sentences in which president Trump refers to past mistakes and people who have been forgotten due to failed past policies, he actually does not share the blame as president, but by referring to past policies and politicians is able to rhetorically wash his hands and yet again put on forward the blame on the shoulders of others than himself. All this adds to the conclusion that throughout his rhetoric Donald Trump presents himself at the same time as the savior and victim for the cause of saving America and its people. In a country where a lot has been going wrong and is yet going worse, he himself is without fault.

As the substance of the general rhetoric of Trump is the same in all of his speeches whether he is a presidential candidate, president elect or president of the US, also his position and mission remains the same. As a presidential candidate Trump wants that all Americans vote for him and as president elect and later president in office, he wishes that Americans join him in his policy. Trump's main purpose in his own words is to consider "America first" and thus make America great again, since in the image rising from his rhetoric suggests very strongly that at the moment America is all but great. This observation was interesting since Müller (2016, 4) discusses the fact that populism is not limited to the harmless campaign rhetoric, since the transformation from a campaigning populist to a ruling and governing one is possible: populists can in fact govern as populists.

When discussing the results obtained from the analysis in regarding research question 1 "What image of the United States of America arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric?", it is interesting to mirror the results of the analysis through the individual concepts and elements of the dramatistic pentad and identification. As I now have discussed research question 1 in general, it will be fundamental to discuss how the concepts of the dramatistic pentad and identification in general support the image that arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric.

The fact that Donald Trump cyclically refers to himself throughout his speeches using the following expressions: *I*, *me*, *presidential candidate,* or *Trump administration* is on one hand to be considered a normal custom for a person running for president who builds up a certain image. On the other hand, in the case of Donald Trump's rhetoric in particular it must be stated that this is also a very concrete way for him to draw as much focus on himself as possible – whatever the subject matter of the speech may be. To Trump's self-referring there does not seem to emerge a clear pattern as he changes the way of referring to himself regardless of the context.

The finding that Trump also refers to himself through the American people, associating himself and the US citizens into one single entity in terms of the "agent" of the rhetoric, was one of the most interesting findings of my analysis, since it allowed Trump to merge his own persona into the more complex context of "the American people". The fashion in which Trump merged the American people with himself, allowed him to vocalize this story of them being together as one in their political cause. In other words: the main agent, thus character in the narrative Trump prompts in his rhetoric, is himself and he himself is as much as the American people. Whenever Trump was using words such as: *our country, us, we, American workers, American lives, American voters, our administration, our people, our jobs, our streets, our laws, our nation* he was factually using rather general words in order to convert them into the idea of "us Americans" in a way to create a sense of togetherness in his rhetorical narrative: him and the American people together against everyone who ill wishes them and their beloved country. This was an interesting finding especially when mirrored with the theoretical background of this study.

Through identification the speaker thrives to convince her/his audience and to create a particular

community and a communal feeling of unity, which she/he is part of herself/himself. When the speaker and the audience are made to appear as the same then also the interests of the speaker and audience start to appear as the same. (Burke 1962, 544-545.) This merging of common interests into one as a rhetorical method is exactly what Donald Trump executes in his "us American's"-rhetoric.

Also the finding of how Trump used the mentioning of physical locations in order to highlight their unifying qualities with him and the American people, were a frequently emerging factor in Trump's rhetoric especially in the case of speech 3 where Trump was in Gettysburg Pennsylvania referring to the famous battle of Gettysburg (1863) and the speech made by a former republican president Abraham Lincoln. In themselves the locations did not play a big part in his rhetoric, but were nevertheless a method of underlining Trump's "us Americans"-rhetoric.

As Trump makes attempts to identify with his audience through the mentioning of specific locations (and being there himself), mentioning stories of victims of crimes committed by illegal immigrants (and sharing the podium with them) or referring to special quests in the audience in order to share their story as well, Donald Trump attempts as a presidential candidate and later as president to bring more substance to his rhetoric by introducing flesh and blood examples with experiences to the issues he is discussing. This rather obvious way of creating an atmosphere of identifying with the audience - as he was the spokesperson for these issues - was not a frequent one, but nevertheless a used one in Trump's rhetoric. It all added up to the narrative of his rhetoric which itself boasted the certain image he was prompting about the United States of America.

This way of making oneself as if "one of the people" or "only one for the people" and drawing lines such as "us against them", is a classical populist rhetorical method which Trump does not fail to use in order to paint his image of the current state of the USA (Müller 2016), (Taquieff 2015) and (Rosanvallon 2008) The intriguing fact how Donald Trump rather egocentrically emerges the American people with himself constantly in his rhetoric might in addition to a potential rhetoric method, merely be an indication of Trump's personality and as such it is impossible for me to comment any further.

The element of formal patterns from the concept of identification emerged strongly in Trump's rhetoric in the way he used repetition in order to highlight what has been said. As much as Trump's rhetoric can be described as a composition of blaming it is as such as much a composition of no more than two word repetitive filler words such as: *beautiful* and *believe me* or simply repeating again what has just been said. All though this finding did not bring any depth to the substance of his rhetoric context wise, it was nevertheless strongly present both on the campaign road and after the election as president of the United States of America. Whether or not we can presume to the impact of the use of repetition to the delivered message, it is at least notable that it continuously highlighted the message Donald Trump himself wanted to emphasize and is such an important finding when discussing the image of America that arises from Donald Trump's rhetoric.

The fact that Trump's rhetoric lacked any signs of the use of ambiguous symbols or mystification can only lead to the conclusion that Donald Trump's both pre-presidential and presidential rhetoric are not complex or abstract to any degree. He does not conceal his personal or political opinions behind intricate words, expressions or sentences. Even as Trump used some obvious metaphors such as the *Trojan horse* or *dark clouds* in both his campaigning and presidential rhetoric it must be stated that as a speaker he only uses straightforward sentences which are transparent in terms of their intended meaning. These findings all together suggest that the image of America in ruin by the corrupt political establishment and the biased media in Trump's rhetoric are being presented with the up most unambiguousness – for anyone listening to comprehend with as little trouble as possible.

5.2 Threats to America: Only the illusion of democracy

Research question 2: "What are the threats in the United States of America that arise from Donald Trump's rhetoric?", is also constructed by the presented key concepts of dramatism: the dramatistic pentad and identification. In addition, the third key concept of dramatism: the guilt and redemption cycle is an essential part in forming this particular research question.

From all of the analyzed speeches made by Donald Trump as a presidential candidate, president elect and president of the United States of America, it became evident based on the obtained results

that the same threats arose from his rhetoric. The threats in America according to Trump were: *immigrants or illegal immigrants, Hillary Clinton, President Obama, Mexico and Mexicans, Isis or Radical Islamic terror and Media/Journalists*. In his campaign speeches they were presented directly through blaming and vindication without any soothing choice of vocabulary. As president, Donald Trump voiced continuously the same threats as he did on the campaign road, with the distinct exception of not naming any political opponents personally by name or mentioning any foreign nationalities. In these cases, he referred to *previous bad policies* and to *forgotten American's* in a way of blaming previous politicians and administrations for their lack of caring and actions. As Trump mentioned Mexico and Mexican's in his campaign rhetoric, as president when referring to foreign countries he did so by using words such *other countries*, *overseas* and *foreign countries*.

These mentioned threats according to Trump's rhetoric are the single most essential cause to the turmoil of America which has been described in the previous subchapter through research question 1. According to Trump the major threats in America at the moment are these mentioned elements which will unfold into something even worse unless he gets elected president. During his campaign speeches Donald Trump continuously refers to the current president in office, Barack Obama in order to point out the negative outcomes of his administration's policies. Trump mentions that the last thing the USA needs is another four years of president Obama, which in itself can be seen as an argument lacking substance, since president Obama was already on the end of his second term and was therefore not constitutionally applicable for another term – nor had anyone anywhere to the knowledge of me voiced out any potential realistic prospects of president Obama re-running. It can be assumed that Donald Trump merely wanted to emphasize the difference what his policies would bring to the country's political scene in comparison with the current state. As a concrete example of bad policies he refers to is the healthcare plan also known as Obamacare, which he promises to get rid of. Trump also often referred to his political opponent Hillary Clinton as the natural follower to president Obama's policies and makes it clear that everything that is wrong and what constitute as concrete threats against the ordinary American's are manifested in the personas of Hillary Clinton and president Obama.

As has been discussed earlier in this study; Trump suggests in his rhetoric that the mentioned threats to America are somewhat linked together. Bad and corrupt politician's equals bad policy. Bad policy means bad immigration policy which leads to more illegal immigration (from Mexico) and crime committed by illegal immigrants. Bad policy on immigration policy will lead into more threats by ISIS or any elements of radical Islamic terror. Bad policy will also lead to the loss of American jobs and the ruin of the country's infrastructure. All these backed up by a biased and corrupt media, which is actually controlled by Trump's opponents, make the situation in America worse and the threats themselves even greater and concrete. On the campaign road in speech 2, Trump sums up the stakes of this particular election by stating that the result will determine whether or not America has true democracy or only the illusion of it.

The arising threats facing America in Donald Trump's rhetoric are a continuous theme and they appear cyclically again and again in his speeches. Two notable factors when discussing the mentioned threats, are the fashion in which they are pointed out: 1. By continuous blaming and 2. Without offering a great amount of substance in form of facts in order to support the made claims and accusations.

As has been discussed earlier in many points of this study: Donald Trump's rhetoric is greatly composed by blaming others regardless of the official agenda or the issues he is putting forward in his speech. Therefore, also when discussing the threats America is facing, Trump presents them without an exception by putting blame of the problem to someone else. He emphasizes how any problem he is pointing out – immigration for example – is an ongoing problem at the moment, and only he will have the capacity and strength to do something about it, unlike the ones who are now in control, thus allowing it and so making America all but great. This rhetorical style of putting blame at the same time on outside parties such as other nationalities or ethnic minorities as well as on bad, corrupt or estranged politicians who allow the current status quo with disregard to the country's population, is casebook populistic rhetoric. (Müller 2016), (Taquieff 2015) & (Rosanvallon 2006)

The fact that Donald Trump does not offer a great deal of facts in order to support his accusations and so forth the vocalization of the threats that face America, is an interesting one. In his campaign

speeches he does offer amounts and numbers on illegal immigrants or the number of Syrian refugees that are apparently to be allowed to enter the US soil if Hillary Clinton gets elected. However, Trump but does not elaborate any further with concrete details on where these numbers are based on. Trump does refer to a 2011 Government Accountability office record in terms of homicide crimes committed by illegal immigrants without specifying what the current situation is or if there are other sources that back his views. He merely emphasizes minor details for example how thousands of members or the border patrol are endorsing him and how this is an unprecedented occurrence in any American election. In this case Trump only offers his word to the audience, but does not actually go into details on the fact what it means if official members of the United States Border Patrol have given his campaign their endorsement. In this example as well it is a very typical way for Trump to make any policy matter – in this case immigration – just as much about him as anything else and leave it at that.

As Trump presents these threats that face America in detail, it is the so called bigger picture that arises from his rhetoric as the single major threat: his view that all of the mentioned threats are somewhat linked together under the common concept of however is against Donald Trump, and therefore unless he gets elected as president, these mentioned threats will evolve into even far greater problems.

Trump voices several times in his campaign rhetoric that the situation is as bad as following: this election will determine whether the United States of America actually has democracy or only the illusion of it. This illusion is in other words is being created by the mentioned threats: *immigrants or illegal immigrants, Hillary Clinton, President Obama, Mexico and Mexicans, Isis or Radical Islamic terror and Media/Journalists*, which all with their own part will donate to the destruction of America.

It must be mentioned that in speech 6, his first speech to joint session of US Congress, President Trump mentions *"Recent threats targeting Jewish Community Centers and vandalism of Jewish cemeteries, as well as last week's shooting in Kansas City…"* as individual threats that have occurred in the US, but based on my analysis they are not a part of the rhetoric which has been vocalized throughout his campaign and presidential speeches on the whole. In other words: even

though as president, he mentions these happenings quite distinctively as threats, in this context they are merely a point the president in office makes due to his ceremonial duty and they are not a part of any arguable campaign or political theme that would have emerged at any point during Trump's campaigning or presidency during the timeframe of the chosen speeches of this study.

Based on my analysis it can be said that as Trump's voicing of the threats facing America are being manifested through his vindictive rhetoric, the audience can only take his word for it. He does not provide any substantial factual elements to support his views. This can be seeing as a way of choosing a less detailed campaign policy in regards to political rhetoric, but the fact however remains unchanged: on several topics Donald Trump is voicing out opinions which he states as facts. It is thus interesting to wonder what kind of an effect candidate and especially president Trump's rhetoric might have on policy and public opinions regardless of their factuality. It is as Torkki (2006, 30) explains: the US president has the concrete ability to use his rhetoric in order to achieve her/his political goals and even more importantly: the most essential thing about political rhetoric is to break the former convictions, perceptions, or decisions of the audience and in addition to provide them with a new perspective.

In addition, the theme of the single most great threat towards America and the American people, which according to Trump is to not elect him and so forth allowing the corrupt people in power to hold on to their positions, is manifested interestingly also in speech 2 where Trump is on the campaign road. During the time Donald Trump gave this speech at a campaign rally in West Palm Beach Florida (13.10.2016), many sexual harassment charges had publicly surfaced against him. In the midst of his speech Trump takes a great deal of time to comment on these accusations which he regards as absolutely false. He concludes the whole matter by stating the following:

> Example 62 (speech 2. PC):
>
> "I will not lie to you. These false attacks are absolutely hurtful. To be lied about, to be slandered, to be smeared so publicly, and before your family that you love, is very painful. What is going on is egregious beyond any words. People that know the story, people that see the story, people that know the facts, they can't even believe it. It's reprehensible beyond description, it's totally corrupt. But, I also know that it's not about me. It's about all of you and it's about our country. I know that. I fully understand that. That's why I got involved. It's about all of us together as a country. It's a movement the likes of which we have never in

history in this country seen before, never in history. Even the pundits, even the media — that truly dislikes Donald Trump for their own reasons — will admit this is a movement the likes of which people have never seen before."

As can be seen from example 62, not only does Donald Trump affectively deny the accusations that have been brought against him – as could be expected from any presidential candidate-, but he actively turns it around as a way to counterattack his political opponents and even more so: to indirectly emphasize once again the great threats that America and American's are facing. It also is important to note how Trump in a plain, but rhetorically effective way outsources himself and his responsibility of the whole issue of his sexual harassment charges. Whether or not Trump regards these accusations as serious or not – even though he calls them hurtful - he simply claims them to be false and at the same time emphasizes how the actual issue is not even remotely connected to him in reality, since it is actually about the political campaign he is leading. In other words: Trump effectively drags the American people with him to share the responsibility of these risen charges as they are as much about them as about him and simultaneously he washes his hands of the whole issue, by rising effectively above it.

This particular example is an interesting one since it 1. shows how Trump turns attacks against him into counter attacks, with his vindictive rhetoric, 2. how he merges himself even with an issue like this with the American people he represents, into one single entity and 3. most importantly in regard to research question one: to underline the importance of his persona as the leader of this political movement, which is in itself on a mission against all the threats that he is vocalizing in his rhetoric.

5.3 Solutions for America: Make America Great Again

Research question 3: "What solutions are offered to the issues presented in Donald Trump's rhetoric?", is constructed on the arguable assumption that a person involved in a presidential campaign and the president of the USA refers to political issues, current situations and offers solutions in forms of promises and policies in order to justify her/his candidacy or presidency.

From all of the analyzed speeches made by Donald Trump as a presidential candidate, president elect and president of the United States of America, it became evident based on the obtained results that as Trump does present some solutions to the issues and threats he voices in his rhetoric, he does not however specify how to execute these solutions. After looking closer at the voiced solutions in Trump's rhetoric, one can draw the conclusion that in terms of substance he does not offer any solution's at all, since he is not specifying to any degree how he will put into effect his proposed plans of action. This is the case with both his campaign and presidential rhetoric.

As was discussed in research question 1, Donald Trump emphasizes his role as crucial in order to change things above anything else. In terms of him offering solutions to the threats and issues he voices throughout his campaign and presidential rhetoric it appears that it all begins and ends with him and it all can be summarized in his world known campaign slogan, which he still used as president: make America great again.

As in Donald Trump's rhetoric the named slogan in itself represents the change he will bring to the US, it often seems that he does not care elaborate any further than to make his claim about a certain issue, threat or subject. For example: when Trump discusses the issue of immigration and the threats that illegal immigration generate in America, he settles for the statement that the only way for American's to change the whole immigration system is to change the corrupt leadership in Washington. This of course refers directly to himself being elected president. The other concrete measure Trump proposes in order to face the issue of immigration is to hire 5000 additional border patrol agents. As to why 5000 is a sufficient number in order to change matters for the better, Donald Trump does not comment on.

The single most distinguishable measure in regard to illegal immigration in Trump's campaigning – a promise he held on to also when elected president - was to build a wall on the US-Mexican border. This border according to Trump would be a crucial improvement in terms of managing illegal immigration and even more so, he makes it abundantly clear that the government of Mexico will in fact pay for the construction of the wall. As to the questions of how the border wall would factually be beneficial in terms of preventing illegal immigration and how Trump or the US can make the Mexican government single handedly finance the construction of the border wall, Trump

does not offer any explanations for. Instead of proceeding deeper into the details and realities concerning such propositions, Trump keeps on repeating his vindictive rhetoric and how things are getting from bad to worse, unless he will be the one in charge. Trump settles for blaming his usual scapegoats for the current situation in America, underlining the various problems the voiced issues are creating and prompting his own position without actually concealing any tangible procedure which he might execute when given the chance to govern.

This example of the substance lacking rhetoric in terms of concrete measures by Donald Trump is the most evident when observing his views on illegal immigration. In speech 1 for example: as Trump does offer in his own words a "detailed policy address on illegal immigration", he actually proposes 10 different measures which he will put in effect immediately when becoming president of the US. Some of these measures contain either eliminating or creating new legislation in order to strengthen the US against illegal immigration or simply sending back all illegal immigrants who have committed illegal actions. Instead of detailing each of the 10 measures Trump is proposing I can simply state that not for one measure does he offer any concrete plans of procedure as how to affectively put them into action. It is in the rhetorical pattern of Trump to present a measure as such and then go on into blaming his political opponents as to why the situation at the moment is as bad as he presents them. After which Trump yet again promises to change everything simply by becoming president and as such effectively making America great again.

Also in the case of speech 3, which Donald Trump gave in Gettysburg, he proposed his "100 day action plan" and six particular measures, which his new administration will pursue to put into action in order to clean up the corruption in Washington. In the case of these six presented measures, as with all the other offered solutions in his campaign speeches, Donald Trump does not rationalize or in any way state concrete believable reasons as to how he can obtain these solutions as presented in the fashion he presents them. Trump rather sums up his vision of the current state of America and its citizens into his promise of solving all the issues if being elected, thus making America great again. Also in the case of enabling the healthcare plan known as Obamacare, Trump clearly voices his disapproval towards it as he swears to get rid of it. In regard to how and what would he offer in return, he does not make any concrete statements on.

In addition, in speech 6 - president Trump's first speech to joint session of Congress- his announcement for the creation of the Office of Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement (VOICE) in the United States Department of Homeland Security as a means of progress, is left arguably hollow in its reasoning. Trump emphasizes in one sentence how he is creating this office to serve the American victims who the media has long ignored with the immediate support of the special interest groups. After this Trump shares some selected stories of certain victims of crime committed by illegal immigrants and proceeds on about his plans for sending a new budget to the Congress for the rebuilding of the American military without specifying how the creation of the Office of Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement will function and what it concretely stands for.

It is interesting to pay attention to the fact that Trump does not abandon his world famous campaign slogan even when he takes office as the president of the United States of America. Where, as a candidate running for office, he urged all Americans to vote for him under the purpose and pretext of making America great again, as president, he does very much the same, only this time he proposes support for his policies as it can be argued that he seeks justification. Only in speech 4 (the victory speech as president elect) of all the analyzed speeches, Donald Trump does not mention his campaign slogan.

In terms of the theoretical background of this thesis it is interesting to mirror the use of Trump's slogan with what Kenneth Burke had to say about presidential rhetoric, identification and composition of a slogan which would present an enemy. Burke (1969a) noticed the special role of the president as the unifier of a nation. According to Burke the president faces the paradox of togetherness-difference, according to which he should make attempts in order to unify the nation, but not too well. A unity that would be too strong does not leave space to identification and therefore no space to influence. As an example of effective means of identification Burke presents the all-encompassing motive or creating of a situation. With this identification method the president can compose a common goal or a slogan which presents an enemy. (Burke 1969a, 392). Based on the obtained results it can be stated that Donald Trump's famous campaign slogan "Make America Great Again" –which he does not abandon in his presidential rhetoric is also an indirective way of blaming those who he famously alleges of making America "ungreat". As has been stated

before: Donald Trump borrowed and popularized his campaign theme from the "Let's make America Great Again"-slogan - which was used by president Ronald Reagan in his 1980 presidential campaign. This is interesting to observe in terms of detecting some sort of deeper substance in Trump's slogan, since during his campaign Trump often publicly endorsed Reagan as one of his favorite US presidents.

The fact that Trump still endorses his campaign slogan during his presidency can also been seeing as a way of holding on to a strong image he managed to create of himself during his campaigning. As Larson (2013, 334, 311) says: the re-emerging characteristics of a political campaign are its attempts to influence and persuade, agenda setting, to execute strategic and tactical aspects as well as the aim to conduct a certain image of a specific issue among the people. According to Larson, campaigning is a chain of various different communicational acts during a certain period of time: the campaigns often proceed by a planned fashion firstly by catching the people's attention, then preparing them to decide and finally to propose them to act. It can be argued that Trump and his campaign-team were very successful with the implementation of the "Make America Great Again"-campaign slogan into the minds of people all over the globe. Therefore, it can be possible that Trump as president is not willing to give up on his slogan in order to transfer his campaign successes to his presidency.

In terms of the solutions offered to the same problems in his post campaign speeches as president elect and president, the previously stated fact remains: Donald Trump offers similar one liner/listed solutions without backing them up with any concrete plans of action. As has been stated based on my results and the discussion before: Trump's rhetoric on the whole does not significantly change between his candidacy and presidency. The one major rhetorical difference in the presidential speeches in comparison to the ones made on the campaign road, is Trump's volition of welcoming bipartisan unity and working as "American's together", regardless of party or ethnicity. In his presidential rhetoric Trump proposes a true American unity as a fundamental solution in order for America to overcome its issues and threats. However, the rhetoric that follows these unifying openings, continues the previous path of directly or indirectly blaming others. From this fact it can be concluded that Donald Trump's presidential rhetoric does not believably contain any of the seeds of unification he pleads to.

To conclude: based on the results, Donald Trump does not offer any concrete solutions to the issues and threats he voices in his campaign and presidential rhetoric. As he does voice rather general solutions to the threats and issues facing America and the American people throughout his campaign and presidential rhetoric, he does not offer any sustainable propositions in order how to achieve them.

As I can not speculate any further to the reasoning behind this un-argumentative rhetoric, I can at least suggest based on the results, that in certain cases Donald Trump seems to very openly endorse the fact that there is no actual need for him to offer any concrete solutions to the issues he is voicing. Based on his rhetoric the fact that he will be president is sufficient enough in many regards. In speech 2, for example where Trump directly poses his message to the African-American community who's situation he paints as desperate, in order to get their vote he pleads: "*what the hell do you have to lose?*". In this fashion Trump rather directly offers no solutions or promises to any issues. He simply voices that he will do a better job than anyone else before him. Additionally, it can indirectly be interpreted that for him as a presidential candidate there is no need to offer any veritable solutions to the issues he puts forward. This also suggests that in Trump's rhetoric and reasoning, the words "make America great again", in themselves hold all the specifics and details of solving the problems he is voicing.

It must also be noted that Donald Trump's rhetoric, which strongly victimizes others –especially the establishment - by blaming them effectively for all the problems that are being presented, and yet is lacking in any believable concrete ways of presenting alternative options to these issues that can arguably be considered as wide and complex, echoes very much to the typical rhetoric used by populistic politicians (Müller 2016), (Taquieff 2015) & (Rosanvallon 2006)

5.4 Summary of the key findings

As all the three posed research questions have been discussed it is appropriate to draw six short conclusions from all of them together:

1. The discussion of the three posed research questions confirm the obtained results, which

indicate that Donald Trump's campaign and presidential rhetoric does not change in any essential fashion. As minor changes on the surface do emerge in comparison with the pre-presidential and presidential rhetoric, the "narrative" in the speeches of Trump – the actual image which rises from his rhetoric – is essentially similar in all of the analyzed speeches. In addition, as president Donald Trump does not abandon his world famous campaign slogan "Make America Great Again", instead he continues to use it in his presidential rhetoric.

2. Donald Trump merges his own persona into the more complex context of "the American people". This creates a sense of togetherness and unity and allows him to identify with his audience also on complex and more abstract issues such as unemployment, security, corruption, biased media etc.

3. Trump's campaign and presidential rhetoric is constructed with strong cyclical blaming of others. Donald Trump does not admit to any wrongdoings on his own behalf or that of his campaign machine or government. The continuing blaming of others follows a pattern in which anyone, but Donald Trump himself can be held responsible for any discussed issue at hand (immigration, corruption, radical Islamic terror, sexual harassment charges, unemployment, crime etc.)

4. Based on the presented definitions of populistic rhetoric, Donald Trump's speeches fall into this category indicating strongly that his campaign and presidential rhetoric is that of a populist.

5. Donald Trump uses continuously his "Make America Great Again"-campaign slogan as an umbrella term which contains the solution to every problem he voices as well as the assurance of his ability to be the president of the United States of America.

6. Donald Trump does not offer any concrete solutions to the issues, threats and problems he continuously presents in his campaign and political rhetoric.

6 Evaluation of the study

The objective of this study was to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The selected data for this study consisted of six different speeches given by Donald Trump during 31.8.2016 – 28.2.2017. The rhetoric of Donald Trump was researched through Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism and in order to achieve the objective of this study three research questions were posed. All the posed research questions were formed based on the theory of dramatism as has been explained previously in chapter 3, Design of the study. In this study I used the qualitative research design which means that the data was being constructed with a focus on the big picture, on the whole. It is said that qualitative research is used to uncover trends in thought and opinions and to dig deeper into the problem (Korrapati, 2015). Its aim is not to make generalizations since the data are always unique, which also has to be taken into account when analyzing the data. (Hirsjärvi & Remes & Sajavaara 2009, 164.)

In all academic research the credibility of each individual study has to be taken into consideration in order for it to be scientifically justifiable and in other words: credible. The credibility of an academic study is often measured through the concepts of validity and reliability. These two concepts have originally emerged from the school of quantitative research and in qualitative research they have received various different kinds of interpretations. (Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara 2009, 232.) In qualitative research the evaluation of the data collection and the analysis as well as the evaluation of the credibility of the study cannot be concluded in a similar way as in a study that consists of a quantitative research method. (Eskola & Suoranta 2008, 208.)

The credibility of this study is being evaluated through the four criteria outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) which they created to measure the trustworthiness of qualitative research. The criteria are: 1) credibility; 2) transferability; 3) dependability and; 4) confirmability. In the next subchapters I will discuss the credibility of the conducted study through these four criteria and reflect on the potential limitations of this study.

6.1 Credibility

The credibility of the study is based on how truthfully the collected data has been analyzed and how well the researcher has been able to use the chosen method in order to obtain results which also support the reality of those who are the object of the study (Lincoln & Guba 1985, 301). As this study was a rhetorical analysis of speeches held by Donald Trump as presidential candidate, president elect and president of the United States, instead of a conducted interview, all the speeches were public material and thus no permits were needed in order for their use. This also means that as Donald Trump was not interviewed for this study and it might afterwards be challenging to receive a personal comment from him regarding the results and key findings of this study, the criteria of "obtaining results that support the reality of the object of the study", can be challenging to achieve in its original purpose. Hirsjärvi, Remes and Sajavaara (2009, 233) state that as all qualitative research is subjective by its very nature, the researcher should always present in utmost clarity how she/he arrived at the presented results and conclusions. All the discussed answers to the posed research questions and therefore the main findings of this study have been founded on the obtained results, which have been presented in chapter 4, with the most solid clarity and which are sustained by the comprehensive presentation of the theoretical background presented in chapter 2.

The results are transparently presented with addition of various tables in order to visually clarify the findings to anyone reading this study. The method of this study as well as the data collection with the criteria for the selected speeches with their sources, in addition of presenting the concrete procedure of the made analysis by an example, is made clear in chapter 3. The entire research process as well as the method has thus been openly and specifically presented to the reader as is also the case with the obtained findings. These factors are all in favor of the credibility of this study. Even as the obtained results are credible and justifiable as such, it is important to note that Lincoln and Guba (1985, 37-38) emphasize the contextual (time and place) aspects of each research.

In addition, the sufficiency of the research data is a way to evaluate the credibility of any research. The criteria for the selected speeches are being comprehensibly presented in chapter 3 as well as

the word count of each speech. As any word count in itself is not an indication whether or not data is sufficient in a rhetorical analysis, one can nevertheless claim that all the selected speeches offered a commendable amount of material which to analyze – a factor the broad results of this study also suggest. The importance of the data in regard of this study was nevertheless in the context of the speeches, not in their length even as they were not of the short type. So it can be stated that adding additional speeches to the data would not have made a difference to the results as can be deduced of the results and key findings of this study. I believe that the results would have been somewhat similar if the amount of data had been reduced, but the fact that it had not, adds to the credibility and value of the obtained results and key findings of this study.

6.2 Transferability

The criteria of transferability refers to how well the results can be transferred to another context, so in other words: how they can be applied to another other similar phenomenon (Lincoln & Guba 1985, 297). In this particular study the transferability can be discussed by considering into what other kind of political communication context this theoretical background and its key elements could be transferred. As Burke's theory of dramatism offers a sufficient tool for any sort of a textual analysis, we can assume based on the credible results that were obtained in this study, that the same theory and method can be comprehensively used in another context. The applied method used in this study could rather justifiably be executed whilst analyzing speeches made by other high profile politicians during their campaigns and after them being elected. In a similar way as has been conducted in this study, the analysis and results would provide us concrete knowledge on how and in which fashion the rhetoric in question is being constructed and whether or not is goes through any transitions. As in this study, also in another context it would be interesting to observe whether some political, institutional, historical and cultural requirements would have an impact on the made speeches or not. And if so, what may the reasons for the obtained results be?

 In addition, if one were to go further into transferring the method and the theoretical background of this study to another similar phenomena and context, one could set the starting point into the analysis of politicians that are being considered populist. This would mean that the researcher could approach the speeches of the politician – or politicians of their choosing – with the same theoretical

background as I have and then mirror the results with the basic definitions of political, campaign and presidential rhetoric in addition the concepts of populism and propaganda. Even though as has been stated: the rhetoric of Donald Trump is not that of a traditional political figure, some results especially concerning populistic rhetoric might emerge to be somewhat similar to this study if transferred into another context. However, it must be stated that Trump's rhetoric – as has been presented – is largely without a precedent in American campaign and presidential rhetoric. This is one of the reasons why the results and key findings of this particular study are unique in the context of dramatistic analysis.

Eskola and Suoranta (2008, 212) emphasize that the results of any qualitative research cannot be generalized. This means that the key findings of this study cannot be generalized in terms of Donald Trump's political rhetoric on the whole, but only inside the parameters of the data analyzed. As one can perhaps make justifiable assumptions about Trump's rhetoric in general based on the findings of this study, one must always bear in mind that the results and findings of this study can only factually describe the rhetoric of the selected data and nothing else.

6.3 Dependability

Lincoln and Guba (1985, 298-299) emphasize that when evaluating the credibility of a research, one must give notion to the possible errors that have been conducted. The researcher should always take her/his own prejudices and presumptions into account as well as any potential factors in her/his background which might affect the objective or the conduct of the research. In addition, external factors always have an effect on any made research. (Eskola & Suoranta 1998, 213).

As the method of analysis as well as the data has been comprehensibly presented with the highest transparency with examples included, in chapter 3, anyone reading this study can follow the footsteps and reasoning which have led to the presented results and findings. Because the theoretical background of dramatism consists of very particular concepts and elements, all of the sentences which included these concepts and elements were counted and then presented in order to conduct a broader understanding of all the speeches. The posed research questions of course served the purpose of using these results and transforming them into something more concrete and discussable

than only a list of numbered sentences each indicating a potentially different meaning. This means that even if after a considerably encompassing manual counting of sentences which contained the concepts and elements of the theory, I would have miscounted a few of them, this would not affect the ultimate results. For example: in chapter 4, I state that the element of *agent* in the form of Donald Trump himself appeared a number of 73 times in the first speech. If in fact I had done a miscalculation and the actual number would not be 73, but 72 or 74, this would not affect the overall entity of the results in terms of the discussion and key findings of this study. As stated earlier, the key findings of this study are based on the wholesome understanding of the theoretical background, it's concrete successful execution during the analysis and a comprehensive understanding of the context of all the analyzed speeches. Therefore, as all the analysis is being conducted with the highest possible level of transparency a calculative error would not change the definitive findings of this study. However, I want to strongly emphasize that at all times when conducting the analysis for this study, a great level of caution was maintained and this notion of potential miscalculations is not at all to suggest that in any point of this study I would have conducted an incautious attitude towards the research.

6.4 Confirmability

The confirmability of a study refers to the evaluation of the subjectivity of the done research. This means that all the obtained results derive clearly from the data and in no ways are the attitudes or earlier experiences of the researcher being posed on them. (Lincoln & Guba 1985, 298-300.) According to Eskola and Suoranta (1998, 20-22) when a research is partly or entirely based on the qualitative research method, the results are largely based on the subjective interpretation of the researcher who is conducting the study. Therefore, in order to maintain a credible level of confirmability I had to put special emphasis on the fact that all interpretation can be viewed as subjective and work in a method that was at all times conscious of this fact.

In this study I presented results and a discussion of them which led to the key findings. The key findings derived strictly from the posed research questions and the transparently presented results, which were all explained credibly and adequately. All the sections and chapters of this study are transparently free of any personal opinions which would be stated as scientific facts, this means that

in no part of this study have I concluded unfounded interpretations without the sustainable support of the obtained results or the theoretical background.

Throughout this study I have aimed to be neutral and objective to the degree that none of my potential personal political opinions, preferences or ideologies would have interfered with the posed research questions, the conduct of this study, the results, discussion or key findings. The main purpose of this study is therefor based on a scientific motive from a communicational point of view and none other. During the conduct of this study I have pursued to fulfill the requirements set by my own scientific community. The data, method and the execution of the analysis have been transparently presented and explained so that anyone reading this study can follow my argumentation, follow the reasoning behind the results, discussion and the key findings.

Eskola and Suoranta (2008, 212) state that the subjectivity of a researcher can also be observed by the fact how the obtained results go together with previously conducted research about the same phenomenon. The campaign and presidential rhetoric of Donald Trump has not been analyzed through a textual rhetorical analyzing method at this magnitude before, so the results as a whole cannot be comprehensively compared to earlier research. Earlier research that has been focusing on Donald Trump's rhetoric has been focusing on individual speeches alone and not in a selection of them, which then would have been observed as an entity or compared to each other based on the obtained results. For example: in the thesis of Widyawardani (2016) the presidential candidacy announcement speech of Donald Trump is being analyzed through a rhetorical method which is more directly linked to Aristotle's *rhetoric*. Also in a 2016 paper, Siegmund analyses the same speech in a rather brief fashion. In addition, many journalists have done rhetorical analyses of Trump's inauguration speech, but none of these mentioned or any others that I am aware of at the moment of writing this research are comparable to the conducted analysis of this study. This is mainly because of the quantity of the data and the theoretical background presented in this particular research. Donald Trump's communication on twitter has been studied for example by Liu, in his thesis (2016), but in this case as well the theoretical background and the data differ greatly from that of this study, also partly due to the different communication medium: twitter vs. live speeches.

The confirmability of a study can also be evaluated by the fact how well the chosen data and method of analysis supported the objective of the study. As it has been stated: the objective of this study was to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The selected data was in its extent greatly sufficient enough to obtain interesting and diverse results of, which then were discussed further through the posed research questions. The selected data and method of analysis distinctly provided interesting and valuable key findings which all indicate that the objective of the study has been successfully executed.

6.5 General limitations of this study

Even as the objective of this study has been commendably achieved it does not however mean that it would not be without its limitations. The results and key findings of this study provide information on how the rhetoric of Donald Trump is being constructed in the selected speeches, but it does not and cannot reveal to us the guaranteed motives behind the speaker even as this is arguably the sole purpose of the theory of dramatism. This is not an indication to a deficiency on behalf of the used theory since it did provide insightful and valuable results. This is merely a reality any scholar conducting a qualitative research has to deal with, since actual hard boiled facts can be hard to obtain or in some cases even impossible. In a qualitative research method such as this, one has to accept this limitation as a factuality.

Also the notion that the appropriate use of the theory and method can provide sufficient, interesting and valuable results can be challenged by the very strength of this theory – its complexity. The complexity in itself is due to the multiple complex and overlapping concepts and elements of dramatism, which may not come across as immediately comprehendible to everyone without them actually putting an effort in order to understand them in the meant context. This is of course the case with other scientific research as well and in no means is the purpose of a study to be "easy" or "light" for the public. The theory must however be mastered by anyone conducting the research after which the appropriate display of their understanding of it is absolutely necessary. In my opinion the great strength and the greatest weakness of the theory of dramatism lies in its ambiguous and partly rather abstract concepts. At the same time, it offers a serious and a functional tool for a thorough rhetorical analysis, but it comes with the responsibility of understanding that

the conducted analysis is as much as worthless if the presentation of the used method and results is not sufficient. Therefore, the difference between an excellent and a poor use of the theory of dramatism can come down to two things: the motivation and necessary humility of the researcher.

It is also worth mentioning that with most previous research conducted with the use of Burke's theory of dramatism, not all of the three main elements have been used, as mostly emphasis is been given to only one of them, for example the dramatistic pentad. As this means that most studies focus on rhetorical analysis using only one key concept of dramatism, it is clear that in the conducting of my analysis I could not rely on a large source of material consisting of previous work as an example. Thus, it is possible that some parts of my analysis were not conducted in the up most efficiency and I had to make a lot of autonomic decisions regarding the combination of all the three concepts of dramatism with their elements in the analyzing of the data. As this on the other hand provided arguably profound and versatile results, it also was with an even greater emphasis the unprecedented work of one person – not immune to errors as has been already discussed in the previous chapter.

In the following chapter I will discuss the conclusions of this study as well as the possible future implications.

7 Conclusion

The objective of this study was to describe and explain Donald Trump's rhetoric both in his campaign and presidential speeches. The selected data for this study consisted of six different speeches given by Donald Trump during 31.8.2016 – 28.2.2017. The rhetoric of Trump was researched through Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism and in order to achieve the objective of this study three research questions were posed. The objective of this study has been achieved commendably. The key findings of this study with the support of the additional findings provide the reader and anyone interested in political communication or the Donald Trump phenomena, insightful and valuable results and information on how the rhetoric of Trump is being constructed in detail. The discussion of the results and the key findings are at all times being mirrored to the encompassing theoretical background of this study.

In the discussion all three research questions strengthened the already obtained results and the key findings of this study, which indicated that Donald Trump's campaign and presidential rhetoric does not change forms in any essential way. Even as minor changes on the surface do emerge in comparison with the campaign and presidential rhetoric, the so called narrative in the speeches of Donald Trump - the image that rises from his rhetoric - is very much the same: the vocalizing of the fundamental destruction and ruin of America and its people, unless Trump gets elected president in order to "Make America great again". This observation rises in itself the question whether Donald Trump's presidential rhetoric is in fact just an extension to his campaign rhetoric and as such not at all presidential? As in this study I have not the means to comment on this subject any further I can only offer an interesting insight in to the thoughts of a previous controversial republican US president, George W. Bush who stated the following after hearing (at the premises) Donald Trump's inauguration speech: "That was some weird shit" (Clinton 2017, 11).

As for the other findings of this study: the way Donald Trump merged his own persona into the more complex context of "the American people" in order to create a sense of togetherness, the way Trump mentioned physical locations in order to highlight their unifying qualities with him and the American people, the use of two word repetitive filler words such as *beautiful* and *believe me,* the

continuous lack of substance in the offered solutions to the proposed threats and the straight forward unambiguous language he used, all support the key findings of this study.

It is essential to observe that the key findings of this study as explained in chapter 5, do not themselves seem remarkable without the understanding how they are being constructed and supported by the other mentioned findings. As the similarity in both campaign and presidential rhetoric can be seen as a key finding in this study, just as well as Trump's rhetoric which is conducted by continuous and strong cyclical blaming of others with a non-existing quality of self-criticism, they are not scientifically remarkable from a communication science point of view until it is explained how this rhetoric is being constructed. The same goes to the finding that based on even the most basic definitions of populistic rhetoric, Donald Trump's speeches fall into this category, indicating strongly that his campaign and presidential rhetoric is that of a populist.

This in fact is a strong indication of the overall practicability and functionality of the theory of dramatism in terms of a rhetorical analysis. The theory of dramatism is a theory with multiple and partly complex concepts which sometimes can emerge as overlapping when analyzing texts. However, with the appropriate understanding of the theory, concrete execution of the method and the successful presentation of the obtained results combined with a scientifically justifiable research subject as well as clear research objectives, it is able to offer profound and deep results about the subject matter.

Even as it can be generally argued that a rhetorical analysis is not necessary in order to claim or indicate that Donald Trump uses hard language which points strongly to populism, it can be stated with the utmost certainty that without a rhetorical analysis such as the one conducted in my study, a scholar of political communication could never arguably explain why Donald Trump's rhetoric is what it is. Therefore, in order to understand what is being said behind the actual rhetoric of a political speaker and which smaller factors have been essential in the formation of this rhetoric and the images it rises, the research of political speeches is always important – not only for our school of thought called political communication, but just as well for the informative and educational purposes of the public. Science – of any school of thought – becomes science when the presented claims, however self-evident they may seem, become verifiable through the process of a

transparently and ethically sustainable research. In my opinion the scholars of political communication who often deal with a popular phenomenon, should always bear this in mind, since their work is that of an extreme importance, but often in danger of being simplified.

In the future this subject of campaign and presidential rhetoric of Donald Trump or another politician, could be studied with the combination and support of other theories. As I see that the increasing of the data in this research would not have provided any further findings I do believe that the merging of dramatism (in its current form with all the three main concepts used) with for example the theory of Fisher's narrative paradigm or Mead and Cooley's symbolic interactionism, could provide the scientific community of political communication even more circumambient results on the studied subject. This sort of research could of course be possible to conduct in a team of communications scholar's through the medium of a series of scientific articles or another voluminous publication. As this study only concentrated on analyzing the speeches of Donald Trump in written form, it could potentially be an interesting effort to conduct a research with an emphasis on Trump's nonverbal communication.

As has been mentioned, Trump's communication via Twitter is already a widespread topic and one that has been used as a subject of research to some extent. In this technologically mediated communication perspective therein lies a great magnitude of potential research topics, which when conducted correctly, might provide us with a deeper understanding how high profile politicians communicate with their followers and with each other through social media. It is interesting to note that according to Grant (2010) people use social media during political campaigns more systematically in order to listen than to actually compose messages. Therefore, the use of Twitter could be researched for example from the point of view of attitude altering or even from a form of Agenda Setting. The fact that political debates have so far been a major field of communication research – especially the debating between political candidates – it would be interesting to research politicians use of Twitter as a forum of debate.

In order to emphasize the conceptions of a "traditional" political rhetoric, it could also be possible to compare various politicians and their rhetoric with each other. For example, the rhetoric of two presidential candidates or the rhetoric of all republican and democratic candidates of a certain

election. This is of course is an ambitious example and not necessarily one that would proof to serve any predefined purpose since as has been discussed throughout this study: qualitative research is always contextual. What might seem as a phenomenon worth researching now might be shaped into something different in a short time. This is why in my opinion future plans for potential research topics should never be carved in stone.

In addition, from a strictly technical point of view, regarding qualitative data analysis in terms of qualitative research, future researchers could explore all the possibilities that modern day technological support offers them. For example, the ATLAS.ti- program which has been developed specifically for qualitative data analysis, could prove to be an essential tool for rhetorical textual analysis. In the case of this study, I was familiar with the possibilities that the program offers, but decided not to exploit it, since the theory of dramatism applies certain complications in terms of the meanings of individual words. In short: this might have caused a prolonged usage of time during the actual analyzing process and proven to be counterproductive. This does not however mean that the exploitation of qualitative data analysis programs such as the ATLAS.ti should be overlooked in future research concerning textual rhetorical analysis.

Finally, it is interesting to observe that since this conducted study interacts and overlaps with the concept of populism, there is also a great deal to be researched in this field - even more so from a communication science point of view. Populism seems very much to be a phenomenon of today - here in Europe as well as in the Unites States and even partly in South-America. As many scholars and academic papers I came across with, when conducting my study, are astutely navigating through the concept of populism in terms of communication, for example: Bracciale and Martella (2017) in their paper: Define the populist political communication style: the case of Italian political leaders on Twitter", in addition with Aalber, Esser, Reinemann, Stromback and Vreese (2016) in their work: Populist Political Communication in Europe and finally: Wirth and Esser (2016) in their paper: The appeal of populist ideas, strategies and styles: A theoretical model and research design for analyzing populist political communication, none of them actually offer a definition of populism from a purely communicational point of view. As a great deal of them are endorsing various definitions of the arguably challenging concept of populism - without definitively coining it - it might be interesting to pursue this challenge in future research.

As populism is quite systematically seen as a "way of communicating", there remains plenty of room for any determined communications scholar to dig even deeper into this concept and perhaps even aim to define what a populistic way of communicating concretely consists of - from a strictly communication science point of view. A credible pursue at this in terms of research might prove to be a profitable attempt in order for us to deepen our knowledge as well as understanding, on what the charm of populism is in the 21st century. In addition, it would clearly illuminate what the role of communication is in the equation. Since moralizing is never a great path to the truth, only by means of objective, transparent and credibly conducted ambitious research we can try to pursue an understanding of this topical communication phenomenon which surrounds us.

References

Aristoteles, Retoriikka. 1997. I ja II kirja. Teokset, osa IX. Suom. P. Hohti. Gaudeamus.

Aalberg, T. Esser, F. Reinemann, C. Stromback,J. & De Vreese, C. 2016. Populist Political Communication in Europe. 1 st Edition. Routledge.

Bitzer, L. F. 1981. Political rhetoric. In the work D. D. Nimmo & K. R. Sanders (toim.) 1981. Handbook of political communication. Sage Publications, Inc., 225–248.

Black, J. 2001. Semantics and Ethics of Propaganda. Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 16(2&3), 121-137. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. University of South Florida – St. Petersburg.

Blakesley, D. 2002. The Elements of Dramatism. Longman.

Bobbit, D., A. 2004. The Rhetoric of Redemption. Kenneth Burke's Redemption Drama and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" Speech. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. INC.

Brummett, B. 1981. Burkean Scapegoating, Mortification, and Transcendence in Presidential Campaign Rhetoric. Central States Speech Journal, 32, 254-64.

Burke, K. 1957. The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action. Revised edition, abridged by the author. Vintage Books.

Burke, K. 1962. A grammar of motives and A rhetoric of motives. Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company.

Burke, K. 1965. Permanence and change. University of California Press.

Burke, K. 1966. Language as a Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method. University of California Press.

Burke, K. 1968. "Dramatism". International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: Macmillan.

Burke, K. 1969a. A Grammar of Motives. University of California.

Burke, K. 1969b. A Rhetoric of Motives. University of California Press.

Burke, K. 1989. On Symbols and Society. Edited by Gusfield, J. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bygrave, S. 2003. Kenneth Burke: Rhetoric and Ideology. Published by Routledge. USA & Canada.

Cicero, M. T. (2006), *Puhujasta*, suom. A.Vuola. johdanto J. Sihvola. Helsinki: Gaudeamus

Kirja / Oy Yliopistokustannus University Press Finland.

Clinton, H. R. 2017. What Happened. Simon & Schuster, Inc. A CBS COMPANY

Crable, B. 2012. Ralph Ellison and Kenneth Burke: At the Roots of the Racial Divide. University of Virginia Press.

Day, D., G. 1960. Persuasion and the concept of identification. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 46(3), 270-273.

Denton, R. E. Jr. & Hahn, D. F. 1986. Presidential communication. Description and analysis. Praeger Publishers.

Denton, R. E. Jr. & Woodward, G. C. 1990. Political communication in America. Second edition. Praeger Series in Political Communication. Praeger Publishers.

Denton, R., E. & Kuypers, J. 2008. Politics and Communication in America: Campaigns, Media, and Governing in the 21st Century. Chigago: Waveland Press.

Denton, R. E. 2017. The US presidential campaign: political communication and practice. Springer International Publishing AG. Switzerland.

Deutch, K. W. 1963. The Nerves of Goverment: Models of Political Communication and Control. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Denver, D. 2007. Elections and Voting Behaviour in Britain. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dickinson, E. & A. 2009. The Montana Meth Project: Applying Burke's Dramatistic Pentad to a Persuasive Anti-drug Media Campaign. Communication Teacher 23, 126-131.

Ellul, J. 1965. Propaganda: The formation of men' attitudes. New York: Knopf.

Enoch, J. & Anderson, D. 2013. Burke in the Archives: Using the Past to Transform the Future of Burkean Studies. Columbia, S.C. : University of South Carolina Press.

Eskola, J. & Suoranta, J. 2008. Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Fisher, W. R. 1980. Rhetorical fiction and the presidency. The Quarterly Journal of Speech 66, 119–126.

Foss, S. K. Foss, K. A. & Trapp, R. 1985. Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Foss, S. K. Foss, K. A. & Trapp, R. 1991. Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Foss, S. K. 1996. Rhetorical criticism. Exploration and practice. Second edition. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Foss, S. K. 2004. Rhetorical Criticism. Exploration & Practice. Waveland Press.

Foulkes, A., P. 1983. Literature and Propaganda. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

Foster, S. 2010. Political Communication. Edinburgh University Press.

Fox, C. 2002. Beyond the "Tyranny of the real": Revisiting Burke's Pentad as research method for professional communication. Technical Communication Quarterly, 11(4).

Gunderson, E. 2009. The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric. Cambridge University Press

Gonzales, A. & Tanno, D. 1997. Politics, communication, and culture. International And Intercultural Communication Annual Volume XX

Grant, W. J., Moon, B. & Grant, J. B. 2010. Digital Dialogue? Australian Politicians' use of the Social Network Tool Twitter. Australian Journal of Political Science, 45 (4), 579-604.

Gronbeck, B. 2004. Rhetoric and Politics. In the book L. L. Kaid (toim.) Handbook of political communication research. New York: Lawrence, 134.

Hacker, K. L. 2004. Presidential candidate Images. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.

Hansen, G. 1996. Kenneth Burke's rhetorical theory within the construction of the ethnography of speaking. Folklore Forum 27, 50-59.

Hart, R. P. 1987. The sound of leadership. Presidential communication in the modern age. The University of Chicago Press.

Hart, R. P. 1997. Modern rhetorical criticism. Second edition. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Herrick, J. 2004. The history and theory of rhetoric. An introduction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. & Sajavaara, P. 2001. Tutki ja kirjoita. 6.-7. painos. Tammi.

Horowitz, D. 2017. Big Agenda. Humanix Books.

Jowett, G. S. & O'Donnell, V. 1986. Propaganda and persuasion. Newbury Park, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kendall, K. E. 2000. Communication in the presidential primaries: candidates and the media 1912-2000. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Publishing Group. 2000.

Kiewe, A. 1994. Introduction. Teoksessa A. Kiewe (toim.) The modern presidency and crisis rhetoric. Praeger Series in Political Communication. Westport and London: Praeger Publishers, xv–xxxvii.

Korrapati, R. 2015. Five Chapter Model for Research Thesis Writing. Diamond Pocket Books Pvt. Ltd.

Kunnas, T. 2014. Fasismin Lumous: Eurooppalainen Älymystö Mussolinin ja Hitlerin politiikan tukijana. Atena.

Laclau, E. 2005. On Populist Reason. Verso.

Lasswell, H. D. 1969. The study and practice of propaganda. Teoksessa H. D. Lasswell, R. D. Casey & B. L. Smith. Propaganda and promotional activities. An annotated bibliography. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 3–27.

Larson, C. U. 2007. Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility. 11th ed. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Larson, C. 2010. Persuasion. Reception and responsibility. 12th ed. Wadsworth.

Larson, C. 2013. Persuasion: reception and responsibility. Wadsworth Cengage

Lilleker, D. G. 2006. Key Concepts in Political Communication. Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. 1985. Naturalistic inquiry. Sage.

Maddux, K. 2006. Finding Comedy in Theology: A Hopeful Supplement to Kenneth Burke's Logology. Philosophy and Rhetoric 39, 208 - 232.

Machiavelli, N. 2009. T. Parks. London: Penguin Books. (Original work *Il Principe* 1513.)

Mazzoleni, G. & Schulz, W. 1999. "Mediatization" of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy. Political Communication, 16:3, 247-261.

Martin, J. 2014. Politics and rhetoric: a critical introduction. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York

Meadow, R. G. 1980. Politics as Communication. Norwood: Ablex.

Medhurst, M. J. & Aune, J. A. 2008. The Prospect Of Presidential Rhetoric. Texas A&M University Press.

Mudde, C. & Kaltwasser, C. R. 2012. Populism in Europe and the Americas: Threat or Corrective for Democracy? Cambridge University Press.

Müller, J-W. 2016. What Is Populism? University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nelson, Michael & Riley, Russell L. (2010) (toim.), The President's Words. Speeches

Newton, N. M. & LaMay, C. L. 2008. Inside the Presidential Debates: Their Improbable Past and Promising Future. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.

Nimmo, D. & Combs, J. E. 1983. Mediated political realities. New York: Longman Inc.

Nimmo, D. & Swanson, D. L. 1990. The field of political communication: Beyond the voter persuasion paradigm. Teoksessa D. L. Swanson & D. Nimmo (toim.) New directions in political communication. A resource book. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 7–47.

Quintilian. 2015. Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory, or, Education of the Orator. Loeb Classical Library.

Paloheimo, H. & Wiberg, M. 1997. Politiikan perusteet. WSOY

Paletz, D. L.1996. Political Communication research. Approaches, Studies and Assesments. Volume II. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Palonen, K & Summa, H. 1996. Pelkkää retoriikkaa. Tammer-Paino Oy.

Palonen, K. (1988), Tekstistä politiikkaan. Vastapaino.

Palonen, K.(1997), Kootut retoriikat. Jyväskylän yliopiston paino.

Palonen, K. 2003. Quentin Skinner: History, Politics, Rhetoric. Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Palonen, E. 2016 *Populismi on välttämätöntä*. Ulkopolitiikka 3/2016.

Palonen, E. & Saresma, T. 2017. *Jätkät ja jytkyt: perussuomalaiset ja populismin retoriikka*. Vastapaino.

Perelman, C. 1982. The Realm of Rhetoric. University Notre Dam Press. Notre Dame, Indiana 46566

Plett, H. F. 2004. Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin.

Puro, J-P. 2006. Retoriikan historia. Wsoy.

Puro, J-P. 2009. Pyhä sota kaupunkikaneja vastaan. Teoksessa A. Harju (toim.) Journalismin kritiikin vuosikirja. Tampere: Juvenes print. 96-104.

Rountree, C. 2010. Revisiting the Controversy over Dramatism as Literal. KB Journal, 6. Accessible: http://www.kbjournal.org/content/revisiting-controversy-over- dramatism-literal [Referred 31.1.2018]

Rosanvallon, P. 2006. Vastademokratia: Politiikka epäluulon aikakaudella. Vastapaino.

Samra, R. J. 1998. Guilt, Purification and Redemption. <http://ac-journal.org/journal/vol1/iss3/burke/samra.html>. Referred to 1.2.2018.

Schulz, P. & Saussure, L. D. 2005. Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Shultz, K. 2000. Every Implanted Child a Star (and Some Other Failures): Guilt and Shame in the Cochlear Implant Debate. Quarterly journal of speech 86. 251-275

Smith, C. A. & Smith, K. B. 1990. The rhetoric of political institutions. Teoksessa D. L. Swanson & D. Nimmo (toim.) New directions in political communication. A resource book. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 225–254.

Snow, N. 2014. Propaganda and American Democracy: A Novel. Lousiana State University Press.

Sproule, J. M. 1997. Propaganda and Democracy: The American Experience of Media and Mass Persuasion. Cambridge University Press.

Taguieff, P. 2015. La revanche du nationalism. Néopopulistes et xenophobes à l'assaud de l'Europe. Presses Universitaires de France.

Taveira, R. & Nyerges, A. 2016. Populism and Propaganda in the US Culture Industries. Australian Journal of American Studies. Volume 35, No. 1, July. The Australian and New Zealand American Studies Association and The United States Studies Centre

Taylor, P. M. 2003. Munitions of the mind. Manchester University Press.

Terrill, R. E. 2015. Double-Consciousness and the Rhetoric of Barack Obama : The Price and Promise of Citizenship. Published by the University of South Carolina Press.

Torkki, J. (2006), Puhevalta. Kuinka kuulijat vakuutetaan. Otava.

Trent, J. S. Friedenberg, R. V. & Denton, R. E. Political Campaign Communication Principles and Practices 7th edition. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.

Tulis, J. K. 1987. The Rhetorical Presidency. Princeton: Princeton University

Press.

Walker, R. Monin, N. 2001. The purpose of the picnic: using Burke's dramatistic pentad to analyse a company event. Journal of Organizational Change Management 14, 266-279.

Wiesner, C. Haapala, T. & Palonen, K. 2017. Debates, Rhetoric and Political Action: Practices of Textual Interpretation and Analysis. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Winslow, L. 2007. A Discourse of Redemption: The Rhetoric of Dr. Phil. Conference Papers --
National Communication Association. Washington D.C.: National Communication Association.

Internet references

Bracciale, R. & Martella, A. 2016. Define the populist political communication style: the case of
Italian political leaders on Twitter. Information, Communication & Society – Jounral.
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1328522?journalCode=rics20

Brock, B. L., Scott, R. L., Chesebro, J. W. 1990. Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-
Century Perspective. 3rd ed.
<http://books.google.fi/books?id=g9_oe6rGv9oC&pg=PA186&dq=rhetoric+reason+for+guilt&h
l=fi&sa=X&ei=lJLNUMXlA4mPswazqYH4Aw&ved=0CDEQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=fals
e>. Referred to 31.1.2018

Liu, C. 2016. Reviewing the Rhetoric of Donald Trump's Twitter of the 2016 Presidential
Election. Jönkoping University. School of Education and Communication.

http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1117157/FULLTEXT01.pdf

New York Times. 1987. By Michael Oreskes:"Trump gives a vague hint of candidacy".
http://www.nytimes.com/1987/09/02/nyregion/trump-gives-a-vague-hint-of-candidacy.html

Siegmund, V. 2016. Rhetorical Analysis of Donald Trump's Announcement to Run for
President.
https://www.scribd.com/document/334112697/Rhetorical-Analysis

Widyawardani, Y. I. 2016. Rhetorical analysis of Donald Trump's Presidential candidacy
announcment speech. Sanata Dharma University.
https://repository.usd.ac.id/4879/2/111214096_full.pdf

Wirth, W. & Esser, F. 2016. The appeal of populist ideas, strategies and styles: A theoretical model and research design for analyzing populist political communication. National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) Challenges of to Democracy in the 21st Century. Working Paper No. 88.

https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3cfc/b5b66ee482d8b577778a451f0f4fb49a7357.pdf