DONALD TRUMP AND THE ART OF AUTHORITARIAN POPULISM

Master's Thesis
Saara Lampinen

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty	Laitos – Department
Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos

Tekijä – Author
Saara Lampinen

Työn nimi – Title
Donald Trump and the Art of Authoritarian Populism

Oppiaine – Subject	Työn laji – Level
Englannin kieli	Maisterin tutkielma

Aika – Month and year	Sivumäärä – Number of pages
Huhtikuu 2020	155

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Populistiset ja autoritaariset johtajat hyödyntävät samankaltaisia teemoja, joilla he pyrkivät vaikuttamaan kuulijoihinsa. Keskeisiä teemoja ovat esimerkiksi johtajan itsensä korostaminen, todellisen kansan kapea määritelmä ja niiden esittäminen uhkana, jotka eivät tähän kansaan kuulu. Lisäksi oikeistopopulistiset johtajat painottavat diskurssissaan konservatiivisia arvoja.

Tämän tutkimuksen tavoitteena oli selvittää, mitä sisältyy presidentti Donald Trumpin oikeistopopulistiseen ideologiaan ja millaisia poliittisia suuntalinjoja hänen kampanjapuheistaan voidaan löytää. Tutkimus toteutettiin kahdessa osassa. Ensiksi suoritettiin kvantitatiivinen sisällönanalyysi populistisia teemojen ja autoritaarisen diskurssin esiintymisestä Trumpin puheissa. Näiden tulosten perusteella suoritettiin kriittinen diskurssianalyysi tiheimmin toistuvista teemoista. Diskurssianalyysi pohjautui presentaatiostrategioihin, joiden avulla ideologisessa diskurssissa sisäryhmä esitetään positiivisesti ja ulkoryhmä negatiivisesti.

Kvantitatiivisen analyysin tulokset osoittavat, että Trump puheissa 1) korostaa itseään karismaattisena johtajana, joka toimii eliittien unohtaminen kansalaisten äänitorvena, 2) yksinkertaistaa monimutkaiset kokonaisuudet 3) painottaa konservatiivisia arvoja ja 4) demonisoi ja epäinhimillistää muita, joiden hän ei katso kuuluvan kansaan. Autoritaariset piirteet Trumpin diskurssissa näkyvät ensiksi siinä, miten hän yrittää horjuttaa kuulijoidensa uskoa mediaan, jotta he eivät uskoisi mitään negatiivista, mitä hänestä tai hänen hallinnostaan kirjoitetaan. Toiseksi Trump epäinhimillistää maahanmuuttajia ja häntä kritisoivia kansalaisia. Kolmanneksi Trump yrittää salaliittoteorioiden avulla horjuttaa uskoa Yhdysvaltojen oikeusjärjestelmään ja instituutioihin.

Kriittisessä diskurssinanalyysissä nousi esiin Trumpin pyrkimys vahvistaa kansan tunnetta siitä, että he ovat sekä kotimaisten että ulkomaisten vastustajien hyväksikäyttämä tai sortama todellinen kansa, ja Trump heidän johtajanaan on ainoa, joka voi puolustaa heidän etujaan. Trump esittää muun maailman hyväksikäyttäjinä, ja täten oikeuttaa pyrkimyksensä eristää Yhdysvallat kansainvälisestä yhteisöstä. Lisäksi Trump ei edellisistä presidenteistä poiketen yritä yhdistää Yhdysvaltojen kansaa vaan, päinvastoin, hallitakseen ydinkannattajajoukkoaan hän pyrkii syventämään kuiluja, jotka jakavat kansaa.

Asiasanat – Keywords authoritarianism, content analysis, critical discourse analysis, Donald Trump, populism

Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX

Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1 INTRODUCTION

Right-wing populism has been a growing phenomenon in European politics since the 1970s and more recently in the United States in the form of the ultra-conservative Tea Party movement and the emergence of the nationalist alt-right. In the 2016 Republican National convention Donald Trump was nominated as the Republican candidate for the 2016 presidential election. In his acceptance speech he declared, "I alone can fix it", taking on the mantle of the charismatic leader of the new Trumpian right-wing populist movement that was engulfing the Republican Party.

Pelinka (2013: 3) defines populism as a "protest against the checks and balances introduced to prevent 'the people's direct rule". It springs from Abraham Lincoln's definition of democracy as "government of the people for the people and by the people", meaning that as an extreme interpretation, the government and political parties could be seen as obstacles for true power of the people (Pelinka 2013: 3, 5). According to Pelinka (2013: 4-5), in Madisonian Democracy, which has significantly influenced the constitution of the United States, an *enlightened elite* is set to represent the people to limit the people's power over minorities, constrain the impulsiveness of the people and prevent rule by tyranny.

In right-wing populism, the central question is who belongs to the people (Betz and Johnson 2004: 316). For example, racial and ethnic minorities can begin to represent the dangerous *others*, who from the point of view of the legitimate people have disproportionate power (ibid.). The right-wing populist experience is that the voice of the legitimate people is not heard by the governing political elites. In the United States, when Barack Obama was elected as the first black president of the United States in 2008, the allegedly forgotten conservative American started to rebel against the changing times, which led to the birth of the populist, ultra-conservative Tea Party movement (Wodak 2015: 136). Donald Trump identified this feeling of neglect bubbling within the conservative America and used it to his advantage in his 2016 campaign for presidency. Indeed, Oliver and Rahn (2016: 202) argue that the party politics in the United States failed to represent the interests of a large proportion of the constituents, leading them to vote for Donald Trump who vowed to be the voice of the people.

The objective of this study was to examine what kind of populist ideology Mr. Trump propagates to his core base and evaluate what that might indicate about the future of US politics. In addition, as Donald Trump has already demonstrated affinity to authoritarian tactics (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 64-66, 177-203), this study also attempted to expose the extent of authoritarian traits in his political speeches. The speeches that were analysed included the first ten speeches Trump gave in campaign rallies after his inauguration. More specifically, the aim of the study was to find answers to the following research questions:

1. What kinds of populist themes does President Trump use in his speeches?

    1.1. Which themes are the most prominent ones?

    1.2 Does this emphasis evolve during his first year in office?

2. How does President Trump use strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation?

3. What kinds of features associated with authoritarianism can be found in President Trump's speeches?

The first research question was approached through quantitative content analysis to identify which populist themes are most prominent in Mr. Trump's speeches. The analysis relied on Wodak's (2015) definition on common themes in populist discourses and it was extended by identifying sub-categories within these themes. In this process, authoritarian themes were also identified. Second, to provide a deeper understanding of Mr. Trump's ideology, a qualitative critical discourse analysis of the populist themes was conducted. This part of the analysis relied on critical discourse analysis and the theories of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation that can be used to study ideologically loaded discourse.

This thesis consists of nine chapters. Chapter 2 focuses on the definitions of populism and authoritarianism and the authoritarian traits already observed in Donald Trump's behaviour. Chapter 3 provides examples of previous studies of populist and authoritarian discourses around the world and in the United states. Chapter 4 focuses on the theoretical framework of the study. First, the principles of content analysis and critical discourse analysis are discussed, followed by the theoretical foundation of how ideological discourse can be analysed by focusing on strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Chapter 5 introduces the aims and research questions of this study and defines the parameters for conducting the analysis, including data selection and collection, and the methods of analysis. Also, the reliability of the analysis and ethical questions are discussed. A detailed analysis of the data is

presented in Chapters 6 and 7, followed by a discussion in Chapter 8. Finally, I will close with a few concluding remarks in Chapter 9.

2   DEFINING POPULISM AND AUTHORITARIANISM

This chapter provides background information about populism, conservatism, democracy and authoritarianism to help the reader understand the right-wing populist movement and the connection between authoritarianism and conservatism in the United States. First, I will provide a definition of right-wing populism. Second, I will discuss populism and conservatism in the United States. Finally, I will close this chapter with a discussion on democracy and authoritarianism and the connection between authoritarianism and conservatism, and how these issues relate to Donald Trump.

2.1 Populism: Definitions and Key Concepts

Populism is not an easy concept to define and scholars approach it from various perspectives. Pelinka (2013: 3) defines populism as a "protest against the checks and balances introduced to prevent 'the people's direct rule". By this definition, populism is a movement that emerges when a faction of the people feels unrepresented and begins to rebel against the elites that they view as an obstacle to the direct rule of the people (Pelinka 2013: 4). Similarly, Laclau (2005: 177) argues, that populism cannot take hold unless there is something profoundly broken within institutions of the old system: when the unfilled demands of the people reach a crisis point, the fringe ideologies find room to grow. He also suggests that, for example, without the economic recession in the 1930s', Hitler would never have been able to gain power, but would have stayed in the margins of society with his fascist ideology.

Populism can also be viewed as a strategy to mobilize the masses against the elites in order to achieve the opportunistic leader's ultimate goal to win and exercise power (Roberts 2006: 144, Weyland 2001: 11). However, others consider populism as a discourse that incorporates Manichean ideas of struggle between good and evil, labelling the will of the people as good and the others as evil (Hawkins 2009: 1042, Wodak 2015: 67). Also, Mudde (2004: 562) approaches populism from this perspective, defining it as

> "… an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, 'the pure people' versus 'the corrupt elite', and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people."

In addition, Mudde (2004: 544) argues that populism is a "thin-centered ideology", in that it has no intellectual refinement or consistency, but it can be combined with very different

ideologies such as communism and nationalism. Therefore, populism can be viewed as a scaffold for effective propagation of various ideologies.

The people or *the demos* is the core concept of any populist ideology and discourse (Wodak 2015: 25). According to Oliver and Rahn (2016: 191), the broadest definition of the people is that anyone who does not belong to *the elite*, is a part of *the people*. But what ties the people together as a populist movement? According to Laclau (2005: 73 - 74), *the demos* is a social construct of unity that arises from the common demands that stem from everyday problems that the citizens face, for example, unemployment, lack of healthcare or sense of security. Beauzamy (2013: 179-180) calls this the demand-side model that aims to explain the popularity of the far-right with socioeconomic factors, such as unemployment and marginalization of the working class. As more and more working-class people face unemployment due to modernization, they tend to develop polarized ways of thinking about themselves and the others, which may lead to endorsement of xenophobic ideologies (Beauzamy 2013: 179-180).

The formation of a populist movement can also be described using the supply-side model, which explains the rise of the far-right by the ability of the party to offer the constituents more than the moderate right can provide (Beauzamy 2013: 187). One way to do this is to use existing media discourse, for example, regarding immigration issues to normalize extreme ideologies (Beauzamy 2013: 183-184).

Rydgren (2007: 242) suggests that the far right attracts the constituents by providing them an ethno-nationalistic ideology rooted in myths of the past. He states that in the ideology of far-right populist parties the good of the nation supersedes the rights of the individual and accuse the elites of putting internationalism ahead of the demos.

According to Wodak (2015: 25), populist movements often define *the demos* as a racially pure community that creates "the true nation". This homogenous view of *the demos* ignores the diversity of modern societies and often, especially in right-wing populist ideologies, the diversity is denied (Pelinka 2013:5, Wodak 2013: 29). The minority fragments within the society become the scapegoats, *the others*, who threaten *the people* (Wodak 2013: 29). According to Wodak (2013: 29), this type of construction of a common enemy is the distinguishing characteristic of right-wing populist parties. As these threat scenarios are constructed, the construct of the people is further tied together as the people rally together against these real or perceived threats from inside the society of from outside (Laclau 2005: 73-74, Wodak 2015: 66)

Another form of *the others* are *the elites*. The elites are the existing power structure against which populists revolt (Canovan 1999: 3). In the populist scene in the US, the political elites are often referred to as the establishment. The established governing parties, according to the populists, do not adequately represent the needs and values of the people (Oliver and Rahn 2016: 194). Oliver and Rahn (2016: 194-196) call this the representation gap. In addition to the political elites, populists may also rebel against the so-called intellectual elites, as they yearn for simple explanations and solutions to their problems (Wodak 2015: 67). For right-wing populist rhetoric, it is typical to adopt and propagate conspiracy theories of the elites conspiring against the people (Wodak 2015: 67). The narrative often is often that the elitist opposition party, together with the elitist media and traitors to the fatherland are all against "the true nation" (Wodak 2015: 67).

In right-wing populist discourse, the *homeland* or *fatherland* must be protected from these dangerous and threatening *others* who keep conspiring against the people. According to Wodak (2015: 66- 67), the notion of homeland implies that there is a belief in common ancestry and history. *The people* have either been valiant heroes or victims of *the others,* fighting against the above-mentioned conspiratorial enemies and traitors (Wodak 2015: 66-67). This type of narrative may result in *revisionist history* that conflates all the troubles that *the people* has ever faced resulting from the actions of the threatening others (Wodak 2015: 67).

Right-wing populists promote conservative values and morals, such as family values, religion, traditional gender roles (Farmer 2005:49-50; Wodak 2015 67). This emphasis on conservative values is often complemented by anti-intellectualism, rejecting science and instead relying on tradition and religion (Wodak 2013: 28).

The supporters of a populist movement are in need of a charismatic, Robin Hood –like saviour, who will protect the forgotten man (Wodak 2015: 67). The modern celebrity culture has seeped into populist politics, with the populist leaders performing the role of the rock-star like saviour using the media and the social media in increasingly inventive ways to influence their constituents (Wodak 2015: 12, 134-138).

According to Rydgren (2007: 242), current radical right-wing parties promote xenophobia, ethnonationalism, sociocultural authoritarianism and anti-system populism. According to Betz and Johnson (2004: 323), the right wing populism at its core is based on the idea of "ethno-dominance" that used to be the basis of nation states, thus it can be viewed as a response to the multicultural, diverse societies of today. Modern extreme right-wing parties often do not oppose democracy but disagree with the way the current form of government works and claim that they

represent the true form of democracy (Rydgren 2007: 243). During his 2016 presidential campaign, Donald Trump played into these nativist, authoritarian and anti-system ideas, calling for a Muslim ban, labelling Mexicans rapists, and talking about taking "our country" back and draining the swamp of Washington D.C. How these themes manifested in his discourse will be further discussed in Chapter 3.

In this section different definitions of populism were discussed and elaborated on. Now, it is time to turn our attention to illustrations of how these discourses manifest in the United States.

2.2 Populism and Conservatism in the United States

Populism in the United States is not a new phenomenon. It stems from the 19th century nativist and agrarian movements (Betz 2013). The first emergence of populism was triggered by the increasing immigration of Catholic migrants from Ireland that started in the 1930's (Betz 2013: 202). By the1840's, the Evangelical Protestants began viewing the immigrants as a threat to their values and way of life, sparking the formation of two populist parties: The Nativist Party and the Know Nothings (Betz 2013: 203-204). The Know Nothing's produced the first populist presidential Candidate, Millard Fillmore, who managed to win 20 % of the popular vote (Betz 2013: 202) However, the party was already falling apart due to the members' differing stances on slavery (Betz 2013: 202) The second populist wave came after the Civil War, when the farmers of the South and Midwest struggled economically (Betz 2013: 207). The frustration the farmers felt toward e.g. banks and the railroad system boiled over in the form of the agrarian revolt, which inspired the formation of the People's party (ibid.).

An important source on populism in the United States are Bonikowski and Gidron (2016) who have studied populist discourse in modern presidential campaign discourse over twelve US presidential campaigns from 1952 to 1996. They conducted an automated textual analysis of 2406 presidential campaign speeches to identify populist trends occurring over time and over party lines (Bonikowski and Gidron 2016). They found that candidates from both parties used populist strategies in their speeches, the average percentage for republican candidates at 20.4 & and 11.5 for democrats (Bonikowski and Gidron 2016: 1604). Republican populism peaked in 1952, 1996 and 1968 in Eisenhower, Dole and Nixon campaigns respectively. Democratic populism peaked in 1988, 1972 and 1992 in Dukakis', McGovern's and Clinton's campaigns respectively (Bonikowski and Gidron 2016: 1605). Bonikowski and Gidron's (2016: 1605) data also shows that a candidate's populism may vary significantly in different campaigns, therefore

populism is not necessarily an attribute of a particular ideology but a framing strategy that conforms to the circumstances. Furthermore, the party-line differences in how populist discourse is used are quite notable. According to Bonikowski and Gidron (2016: 1607-1608), Democrats lean heavily on economic populism criticizing business elites, whereas the Republicans use anti-statist strategies that criticize political elites. In addition, Bonikowski and Gidron (2016: 1608) found that there is a marked difference in the level of populism in a candidate's rhetoric, depending on whether they come from an incumbent party or the challenger party, with the challenger party's candidate begin significantly more populist than the incumbent party's candidate.

Even though Donald Trump ran for president as the candidate of the Republican Party, he was considered to be an outsider, who promised that he alone can fix the system that was rigged against the people (Politico 2016), thus performing the role of the Christ-like saviour who understands *the forgotten American*. Because in right-wing populism the forgotten American is a conservative, I will now briefly describe the major trends in American conservatism.

The values of the Republican base have become more and more conservative, thus making the constituents more opposed to the policies implemented by the Democratic Party, creating an opportunity for a populist candidate to succeed (Oliver and Rahn 2016: 194-196). This shift to the right has its roots in the 1970s civil rights movement, when the politics of the two parties became polarized along racial lines (Mickey et al. 2017: 24). After the Voting Rights Act was passed in the 1960s, the Democratic Party, which had been previously the party of white supremacists, attracted ethnically diverse constituents, while the Republican Party became more white (Mickey et al. 2017: 24). While some white Southern people were attracted by the economic policies of the Republican Party, many chose the affiliation because of its conservative racial views and its reputation as the party of "law and order" (ibid.).

Currently, there are two major trends in American conservatism: Classic Liberalism and Traditional Conservatism (Farmer 2005: 35, 47). Classic Liberalism refers to the liberalism of The American Revolution that consists of ideas of limited representative government, free market capitalism and equality under law, although women and minorities did not enjoy this equality and at the time the representative government represented only the white men (Farmer 2005: 35). The ideology leans, for example, on ideas that Adam Smith presented in *Wealth of Nations* in 1776: the maximization of personal freedom, that lets individuals pursue their own interests in capitalist free markets results in economic growth (Farmer 2005: 35-36). The current Republican Party has also adopted Smith's idea that all social classes benefit from the

consumption and investments made by the wealthy capitalists (Farmer 2005: 35). The government's role is limited to providing security and stability that allows the markets to function efficiently (Farmer 2005: 36).

In contrast to Classic Liberalism, Farmer (2005: 47) suggests, the Traditional Conservative ideology derives from the Christian Pilgrims and Puritans of the 17th century. He states that the Christian Pilgrims and Puritans view people as unintelligent and untrustworthy, even inherently evil and easily corrupted by power. They revere history and institutions and hope that the decaying society could be restored to the way it was in the mythical past, which manifests as a call to change society to "what the founding fathers intended" or among the Fundamentalist Protestants the ways of the church of the first century (Farmer 2005: 49-50). Dean (2006: 108) summarizes the Conservative Christians' agenda as follows:

> "… they want to control the right of women to have abortions; to ban all forms of gay marriage; to prevent the teaching of safe sex in schools; to encourage home schooling; to ban the use of contraceptives; to halt stem cell research with human embryos; to stop the teaching of evolution and/or to start the teaching of intelligent design; to bring God into the public square and eliminate the separation of church and state […] and to eliminate an "activist" judiciary that limits or impinges on their agenda by placing God-fearing Judges on the bench who will promote their sincerely held beliefs."

The populist offspring of these two conservative trends was the ultra-conservative Tea Party Movement, which by now has been replaced largely by the Freedom Caucus in Congress. According to Wodak (2015: 136), the formation Tea Party movement was triggered by the election of the democratic Senator Barack Obama as the 44th President of the United States: A black man in the White House with liberal immigration, healthcare and economic policies prompted a backlash from the conservative side of the aisle. The movement was not a traditional political party, but a loose coalition of politicians and grass roots activists that focused on conservative issues such as reducing the power of the federal government, increasing border security and the opposition abortion and gun control (Wodak 2015: 209).

The neo-conservative Tea Partiers emphasize a literal interpretation of the constitution in order to justify their claims for a limited government control over the life of citizens and, by extension, a limited form of welfare system (Schmidt 2011, Thompson 2007: 11). According to their ideology, it is not the responsibility of the federal government to help the less fortunate, rather the Tea Party engages in 'every man for themselves' –mentality and attempts to dismantle the welfare state (ibid.)

Since the neo-conservatives and right-wing populists view the world as a threatening place, filled with *others*, who threaten the existence of *the people*, they tend to emphasize the importance of the military (Davidson 2007: 251, Wodak 2015: 67) Interestingly, according to Paxton (2004: 157), the glorification of the military is a common trait in authoritarian and fascist regimes, though the former tend to be more interested in fawning over military pomp and are much less inclined to make actual war than the latter.

According to Elliot (2017: 8) the rise of the Tea Party movement has dramatically changed the rhetoric of the conservative right. Hirano et al. (2010: 188-189) have argued, that to appeal to a wide range of constituents, a candidate's political positions should lean rather toward the moderate than the polarizing extremes. However, when Elliot (2017: 8-9) compared John McCain's (a conservative republican) rhetoric during his run for president in 2008 to the post-2010 Tea Partiers' speeches, he found that fear-inducing rhetoric, political myths, racial appeals, conspiratorial accusations and personal insults had each increased in the Tea Party candidates' rhetoric. Furthermore, when comparing McCain's 2008 rhetoric to that of the 2016 presidential candidate Donald Trump's, Elliot (2017: 8-9) found that Mr. Trump followed the rhetorical style of the Tea Partiers and used harmful rhetoric much more frequently than McCain: the number of instances of fear-inducing rhetoric in the speeches included in the study had increased from 22 to 66, the number of political myths increased from 20 to 97, racial appeals increased from zero to 22, conspiratorial accusations increased from 0 t0 14 and finally personal insults increased from 13 to 71 (Elliott 2017: 8-9).

The Tea Party movement also attracted people, who supported birtherism, an unfounded conspiracy theory that claimed that Barack Obama was not born in the United States, and thus was an illegitimate president (Burghart and Zeskind 2010: 68). The acceptance and proliferation of this racist conspiracy theory crosses over to a fringe trend in the conservative landscape of the United States – Conservative extremism. Conservative extremism blends racism, nationalism and authoritarianism and feeds on fear of imagined threat that immigrants and foreigners pose on the people (Farmer 2005: 84). In the past, Conservative Extremism has manifested e.g. in the rise of the Nazi party in Germany and the KKK in the United States.

It is worth noting that Donald Trump has in the past been openly supportive of the birther-conspiracy (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 159). Before his presidential campaign the then-citizen Donald Trump promoted this conspiracy theory on his Twitter-feed in several Tweets, for example:

> Let's take a closer look at that birth certificate. @BarackObama was described in 2003 as being "born in Kenya." (Trump, 2012a).

> An 'extremely credible source' has called my office and told me that @BarackObama's birth certificate is a fraud (Trump, 2012b).

> Attention all hackers: You are hacking everything else so please hack Obama's college records (destroyed?) and check "place of birth" (Trump, 2014).

It was only late during the 2016 campaign when Mr. Trump reluctantly denounced the conspiracy theory (Johnson 2016). However, as President, Trump has not denounced or condemned individuals who still disseminate the conspiracy theory. In contrast, Trump has demonstrated support for individuals who have spread birtherism. For example, a prominent advocate of the conspiracy theory is Sheriff Joe Arpaio who was convicted of racial profiling in 2017 (CNN 2017). Just a month after the court's decision, despite dissenting voices from within his own party, Trump pardoned him (CNN 2017).

In this section I have discussed how populism and conservatism have evolved in the United States. It can be argued that traditional conservatism and classic liberalism are losing their importance within the Republican party and the populist, Trumpian wing is taking over. To better understand all the aspects of Trump's populism, the next section discusses democracy and authoritarianism and Trump's interest in authoritarian ideas.

2.3 Democracy, Authoritarianism and Trump

The focus of this section is the relationship between democracy, authoritarianism and Trump. First, the key features of democracy and authoritarianism are defined. Second, the process of how democratic systems of government may fall into the hands of authoritarians is discussed. Finally, Donald Trump's personal fascination with authoritarianism and its possible implications to the United States are described.

Levitsky and Way (2002: 53) set four minimum criteria to democratic regimes. First, the executives and legislatures must be elected through a free and fair election process. Second, virtually every adult is allowed to vote. Third, political rights and civil liberties including freedom of speech and a free media are protected. Fourth, the elected authorities must be independent from military or religious leaders' influence. Levitsky and Way argue, that in competitive authoritarian regimes, these criteria are not met, which results in imbalance of power between the government and the opposition.

The usual impression of how a democratic society falls in the hands of an authoritarian is that it happens through a violent coup. For example, in Chile in the 1970's, when General August Pinochet violently unseated President Allende, he did it with the help of the country's armed forces (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 1-2). However, the collapse from democracy may also happen through a perfectly legitimate electoral process, but the elected leaders use institutions in a partisan way to prevent the opposition from gaining power (Esen and Gumuscu 2016: 1582, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 2). Huq and Ginsburg (2017: 94) call this process in which constitutional liberal democracy degrades without collapsing *constitutional retrogression*. In this process, the changes happen in small, incremental steps and often seem innocuous, but if enough of these changes happen simultaneously, they eat away the supporting pillars of democracy, resulting in disrupted electoral process, limited free speech and association rights and deteriorating rule of law (Huq and Ginsburg 2017: 96). Constitutional retrogression has occurred for example in Venezuela, when Hugo Chávez, a populist in his discourse, was democratically elected by the ordinary people who felt abandoned by the political elites (Hawkins 2009, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 3). In addition, the democratically elected governments in Hungary and Poland have recently made changes in laws and institutions that limit fair competition in elections and made legal systems less stable (Huq and Ginsburg 2017: 94). Indeed, according to Huq and Ginsburg (2017: 95), in recent years, there has been a world-wide decrease in democratic systems of government and a slight increase of hybrid- and authoritarian regimes.

In accordance with Huq and Ginsburg's (2017: 94) conclusions, Mickey et al. (2017: 21) argue that the descent into competitive authoritarianism, in countries that have strong institutions and democratic tradition, such as the United States, would happen in small, completely legal steps. Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 77-91) and Mickey et al. (2017: 21-22) define three steps that help the would-be autocrat to consolidate power. Firstly, the leader would proceed to politicizing the institutions by appointing loyalists (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 77-81, Mickey et al. 2017: 21). By appointing partisans and loyalist in positions of power, for example as judges, and as members of legislative over-sight committees, law-enforcement and intelligence agencies as well as agencies that implement tax and regulatory policies, the leader shifts the balance of power enough to be able to, for instance, cover up any wrongdoing, or to go after their political opponents, businesses and media organizations (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 77-78, Mickey et al. 2017: 21). This can be done legally by, for example, firing non-partisan civil servants and replacing them with individuals, who are loyal to the leader (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 78)

This happened for example in Hungary in 2010, where Viktor Orban, after his party-coalition won the election, virtually eliminated the separation of the executive and legislative branches (Kornai 2015: 35). With the support of his party, he has, for example, been able to appoint a head of the Prosecution, who is willing to use his power to go after Orban's political opponents using unfounded accusations in order to damage them politically (Kornai 2015: 35-36, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 79-80). Furthermore, Orban has effectively eliminated the separation of powers of the executive and judicial branches by changing the rules in a way that with the support of his parliamentary majority he can appoint enough judges and Justices who agree with his policies to push through any legislation he wants without opposition from the judiciary (Bugaric 2016: 73, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 80). The result is that the checks and balances of democracy in Hungary have been severely eroded (Bugaric 2016: 73, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 80).

The second step for an authoritarian leader is to silence the opposition (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 80-87, Mickey et al. 2017: 21). Mickey et al. (2017: 22) argue that an authoritarian leader moves to weaken the opposition parties' voices by, firstly, supporting favourable media outlets, business leaders and religious organisations. Secondly, at the same time the authoritarian leader uses the politicized authorities to go after the organisations and individuals that affiliate themselves with the opposition (Mickey et al. 2017: 22). According to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 81-82), this can be done by giving favours, such as giving sympathetic media outlets exclusive access to the leader or giving government contracts for businesses in exchange for their support. However, when these instances cannot be bought-off, the autocratic leader may resort, with the help of the politicized courts, to jail the opponents or more subtly by going after the media through libel or defamation suits or other crimes (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 83). For example, in Russia, Vladimir Putin had the tax authorities arrest the owner of an independent television network, NTV, which was critical of the government (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 83-84). In exchange for his freedom, NTV was given over to a government owned energy-company Gazprom, effectively turning it into an arm of the government's propaganda machinery (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 84).

Thirdly, the autocratic leader attempts to limit the possibilities of political rivals to affect policies or get elected by changing rules, laws and even the constitution or modifying the electoral system to their benefit (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 87, Mickey et al 2017: 21). These types of changes are justified by completely innocuous reasons, such as weeding out election fraud and securing democracy (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 87). A common way to do this is

gerrymandering, the redrawing of electoral districts in a way that when people go to the polls, the results do not represent the electorate. For instance, according to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 88), Victor Orban did this in Hungary to ensure that members of his party would keep their majority. Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 88) also state that Orban banned political advertising campaigns from airing on non-government-controlled media, which, they argue, enabled Orban to keep his party's two-thirds majority in the parliament, even though the their share of the overall votes fell nearly nine percent.

Levitsky an Ziblatt (2018: 176) argue, that during the first year of his presidency, Donald Trump has already attempted all these three strategies that authoritarians use to consolidate their power. They argue that, firstly, he has attacked the institutions that exist to function as the checks and balances to power, both by his actions and by his discourse. As an example, they point to Trump using his legal authority to fire the Former FBI director James Comey after he refused to pledge loyalty to President Trump personally and refused to end and investigation into Trump's former national security advisor (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 176-177). Furthermore, Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 178) assert that with his discourse, Trump has attacked the judiciary by mitigating the authority of a Ninth Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals judge who struck down his administrations controversial travel ban, by referring to his ruling as "the opinion of this so-called judge". Later, when the Ninth Circuit blocked the administration's policy to withdraw federal funding from so called sanctuary cities, Trump, in an interview with the *Washington Examiner* said that he would "absolutely" consider breaking up the Ninth Circuit (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 178, Westwood 2017). In addition, Trump has repeatedly called for the Justice Deparment and the FBI to investigate his political opponents, the Democrats in general and specifically Hillary Clinton (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 180)

According to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 180), Trump has also engaged in the second strategy that authoritarians use to strengthen their position: suppressing opposition by silencing or delegitimizing those who function as the watchdogs of government activities. They argue that Mr. Trump has done this by frequently and repeatedly attempting to discredit any dissenting media outlets by labelling them "fake news" and accusing them of conspiring against him. On Twitter, Trump even went as far as calling the media "the enemy of American people", terminology that according to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 180) resembles that of Stalin and Mao. Since that particular remark on Twitter, Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 180) state that Trump proceeded to use more threatening rhetoric, for instance, suggesting at a convention for conservative political activists and politicians that the media "does not represent the people,

and we're going to do something about it". The next month in a tweet, Trump brought up changing the libel laws (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 180-181). In addition to attempts to discredit the media, according to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 181), Trump has also threatened to go after critical news organizations by using regulatory agencies, for example by threatening to prevent the merger of AT&T and CNN's parent company Time Warner and by threatening to take away the licences of television networks. Inarguably, President Trump's relationship with the press does echo the relationship between autocrats and the press.

According to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 182), Trump has also expressed interest in the third strategy that authoritarian leaders use to strengthen their position: weakening the opposition by changing the rules. In several instances both on Twitter and in a Fox News interview (a friendly media outlet), Trump has expressed a desire to change the rules of the senate in a way that laws could be passed with a simple majority instead of the 60 vote threshold that is currently required (Blake 2017, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 182). In addition, in the early days of his presidency, Trump assembled the Presidential Advisory Commission on Election integrity (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 182, 184-186). The benign sounding commission, however, had a more sinister purpose: finding ways to suppress minorities in the electorate, which consist largely of voters of the Democratic Party (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 184-186). The commission itself was formed under the false premise that wide-spread voter fraud exists in the United States, even though there is no evidence to support it (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 184-185). However, as many of the states opposed to giving voter registration information to the commission, it was disbanded in January 2018 (The White House 2018a).

Authoritarian leaders, however, cannot realise their agendas unless they have followers with authoritarian personalities. In terms of the political landscape in the United States, the Republican Party has had a longstanding fascination with conservative authoritarianism. (Dean 2006: xiii). According to Altemeyer (1996: 6), the people with authoritarian personalities have three consistent traits. Firstly, those who are willing to follow authoritarian leaders not only tend to accept their statements and actions without question but also execute their orders without hesitation (Altemeyer 1996: 9). They reject any criticism toward their chosen authority figure, because they feel that the authority cannot be wrong and criticism, in their opinion only increases division and discord (Altemeyer 1996: 9). This blind acceptance, he argues, may lead the followers of authoritarian leaders to accept even criminal behaviour from the leader, because they believe that the leader has "an inherent right to decide for themselves" (Altemeyer 1996: 9).

Secondly, people with authoritarian personalities tend to support the leader aggressively (Altemeyer 1996: 10 – 11). This manifests, for example, as support of policies that attempt to correct criminal behaviour through punishment rather than lenient forms of rehabilitation back into society (Altemeyer 1996: 10). The supporters of authoritarians justify their aggressive actions and opinions by relying on the belief that their leader condones and supports it (Altemeyer 1996: 10). Altemeyer continues to argue that the people who have authoritarian personalities direct their aggression mostly toward those who they deem unconventional. Often, these people are, according to Altemeyer (1996: 10), minorities.

Thirdly, those with right-wing authoritarian personalities adhere to the norms and conventions of society, which are dictated by Judeo-Christian religions (Altemeyer 1996: 11). The followers of authoritarian leaders are often religious fundamentalists who believe in "God's law", and in their view all conflicts in society are caused by the lack of obedience of that law (Altemeyer 1996: 11). According to Altemeyer (1996: 11), their attitudes of sex and marriage are determined by how their religion defines them, leading to long lists of sinful acts and a family structure in which the woman is in a subservient role to her husband, and the behavioural norms they impose upon women tend to be much stricter that those imposed upon men. Indeed, a significant portion of Donald Trump's support comes from the highly religious people (Gallup 2019). Furthermore, those with right-wing authoritarian personalities have a strong affinity to patriotic values, such as respect for the flag and the national anthem (Altemeyer 1996: 11).

Even though the United States of America has been perceived as the leader of the free world, the beacon of democratic values, free speech and equal opportunity, the Republican Party has had a longstanding fascination with conservative authoritarianism. (Dean 2006: xiii). Furthermore, according to Feldman (2003: 41-44), there is a correlation between conservativism and the susceptibility to right-wing authoritarian policies. This is why Trump's authoritarian populism may have a greater effect on the country than one might assume. Indeed, according to Mickey et al. (2017: 20), Donald Trump, has the potential to propel the United States into a mild form of competitive authoritarianism. They argue that institutional checks and balances that have guarded democracy in the United States have been weakened by the deepening partisan divide and the radicalization of the Republican Party. In addition, when the longstanding fascination that the Republican Party has had with authoritarianism is combined with a leader with such traits, the possibility of a perfect storm seems that much closer.

The aim of this study is to examine what kind of populist ideology Donald. Trump propagates to his core base and evaluate what that might indicate about the future of politics in the United

States. Therefore, the information provided in this chapter forms a roadmap for my analysis in terms of identifying the populist themes, conservative ideas and authoritarian traits in Trump's speeches. The next chapter further elaborates the intricacies of right-wing populist and authoritarian discourses.

3 POPULIST AND AUTHORITARIAN DISCOURSES

This section focuses on previous research on right-wing populist discourse in modern Europe and the United States. Firstly, the studies elaborate how populist themes are represented both in the discourse of individual party leaders and in political texts and party programs in Europe. Secondly, it is discussed how populist discourse dominated the 2016 presidential election in the US and how populism is integral to Trump's discourse. Finally, examples of how authoritarian discourse resembles populist discourse are provided.

Rooyackers and Verkuyten (2012: 130) have studied how the far-right party leader Geert Wilders constructed relationships between himself, the general population and mainstream politicians in parliamentary debate, and what kinds of discourses he used to convey his extremist ideas. According to their findings, Wilders, first, establishes the tripolar relationship between the mainstream politicians, himself and the people by aligning himself with *the people* by using expressions that depict homogeneity, such as using a singular form 'the Dutch public' and painting the 'political elites' in an unfavourable light, by aligning *them* with 'Islamic Dictatorships' (Rooyackers and Verkuyten 2012: 135-136). Second, Wilders presents himself as a prototypical member of the community, by e.g. using colloquial language to convey that he is one *of the people* and not afraid to speak up (Rooyackers and Verkuyten 2012: 136-137). He also supports his alignment with *the people* by offering opinion polls as evidence while denouncing the government that he presents as out of touch by contrasting the 'decent and civilized' Dutch with the 'politically correct elites' (Rooyackers and Verkuyten 2012: 137). Third, Rooyackers and Verkyten find, that by taking a seemingly pragmatic approach, presenting extremist views as objectively real and imminent threats that need to be addressed, he is able to project 'an impression of rationality' that masks his racism. (Rooyackers and Verkuyten 2012: 145).

Richardson and Wodak (2009: 251 - 18) have studied how right-wing populist discourse implicitly and in some cases very explicitly draws on pre-World War II colonialism and antisemitism in the United Kingdom and in Austria. In Britain, the British Nationalist Party (BNP) and, in Austria, Freedom of Austria (FPÖ) and The Union for Austria's Future (BZÖ) have based their policies around racist, nativist, anti-immigrant ideologies (Richardson and Wodak 2009: 251-253). They found that all these parties used a discursive strategy known as 'calculated ambivalence' to mask the racist undercurrents in their discourse when addressing diverse audiences (Richardson and Wodak 2009: 264). For example, Richardson and Wodak (2009: 261-262) state that a BNP document outlining language discipline, which was not meant

for the eyes of the general public, denies the existence of 'black Britons' and 'Asian Britons'. Therefore, Richardson and Wodak (2009: 262) argue, that whenever members of the party use terms such as 'British' or 'Britons', they refer only to white, Christian citizens, excluding all other ethnic or religious groups. Similarly, they found that BNP relies on *Heimat* rhetoric in expressions such as 'charity begins at home', which is derived from German right-wing discourse that is designed to elicit emotional connotations (Richardson and Wodak 2009: 254, 262).

Sakki and Petterson (2016: 160) have identified three different types of constructions of otherness in right-wing populist discourses in Finland and Sweden. Firstly, the others, in this study, Muslims and Africans, are in online discourses represented as a "deviant group of people": they are outsiders who are described as different, strange and therefore threatening (Sakki and Petterson 2016: 160-161). More specifically, this construct of deviancy was found to entail two separate discourses: representing *the others* as norm breakers, i.e. characterizing an entire racial community as criminals and representing immigrants as welfare abusers. (Sakki and Petterson 2016: 161). Secondly, they found that instead of the others themselves, the ideology that those others harboured was represented as the threat (Sakki and Petterson 2016: 162). Specifically, Islam was portrayed as an oppressive ideology that threatens the Western culture, its society and values (Sakki and Petterson 2016: 162). This threatening imagery was further advanced by discourse of "Izlamization in the making", i.e. right-wing extremists described Islam as a conquering force that was already polluting the Western society (Sakki and Petterson 2016: 162). Thirdly, Sakki and Petterson (2016: 162-163) found discourses about internal enemies, typically female left-wing activists, who were depicted as the intolerant ones, creating a narrative that the leftists are racists and therefore pose a danger for the supporters of right-wing ideologies. The right-wing discourse on internal enemies also included a narrative of supporters of immigration as unpatriotic traitors, whereas the narrators considered themselves as "the saviours of the nation" (Sakki and Petterson 2016: 165).

Populist movements tend to organize around a charismatic leader who is represented as a Robin Hood –like figure who comes to the rescue of the common people. The right-wing populist parties use traditional media and social media expertly to create the image of the saviour (e.g. Wodak 2013: 32, Wodak 2015: 134-138.) This aspect of populism has been identified in studies on several populist leaders' discourse. For example, Rooyackers and Wekuyten (2012: 137-138) found, that Wilkers depicts himself as a group oriented leader, by talking about urgent threats from which he is there to save *the people*, while representing the elites in a negative

light emphasizing their inaction by repetition. Similarly, Wodak (2015: 134-138) has found that the Austrian politician HC Strache, presented himself as a saviour, who *knew* what the people wanted. His argument was that he would succeed in protecting *the people* because of his similarity to a former chancellor Bruno Kreisky, almost depicting himself as the rightful heir to the throne. Strache used social media, branding, and strategically placed coded messages to appeal to the people. Similarly, Donald Trump, who entered the political sphere from the actual world of celebrities and reality television, knew how to play the traditional media and the social media to his advantage to perform the role of Robin Hood.

Oliver and Rahn (2016) have used content analysis to study how populist the candidates of the 2016 US Presidential Election were. The research was conducted using dictionaries that include words and phrases typical of anti-establishment rhetoric. They concluded that Trump's rhetoric was distinctively more populist than the other candidates' rhetoric. They found that of the candidates, Mr. Trump's syntax was the most consistently populist (Oliver and Rahn 2016: 193). They state that he scored high in bashing the political elites, using blame language, describing foreign threats and utilizing polarizing 'us vs. them' -rhetoric. They also found his language to be simple and repetitive.

Mr. Trump's speeches and tweets have been recently researched using Critical Discourse Analysis (Kreis 2017, Mohammadi and Javadi 2017). With the help of discourse analysis, Kreiss (2017) has studied how Mr. Trump uses Twitter to spread his populist ideology. As a framework for coding the tweets, she used Wodak's (2015) definition of common populist themes: homogenous nation, heartland threatened by others, protecting the fatherland, conservative values, simple explanations and solutions and a charismatic leader depicted as a saviour. Kreiss' findings show that Trump presents the American people as a homogenous entity, which must be protected against "evil" from outside. She also suggests that as Mr. Trump tweets about the homeland ("our country") being invaded by the "people pouring in", he is evoking the need to protect the fatherland. Kreiss illustrates how as a simplified explanation to the problems of the people, Trump blames the previous administration making a mess. In contrast, his simple solution is to create more jobs, but not explaining how he achieves this. According to Kreiss (2017), Trump also presents himself as the person who brought more democracy to the American people, thus saving them from the elites, performing the role of the saviour.

3.1 Populism and Authoritarianism Intertwine

It is possible to identify similar traits between populist and authoritarian discourse, since populism and authoritarianism have similar features. Populist discourse present the demos as a homogenous community, and the minorities become the scapegoats that are blamed for societal problems and a threat to the people (Wodak 2013: 29; Wodak 2015: 25). According to Kteily et al. (2015: 901), dehumanization is a way to signal this otherness. Kteily et al. (2015) studied how blatant dehumanisation affects intergroup relations and conflicts. They found that those with right-wing authoritarian personalities, as defined by Altemeyer (1996), engage in blatant dehumanisation (Kteily et al. 2015: 915). Their study also suggested that those who engage in blatant dehumanization do not support immigration and do not have sympathetic emotional responses to social injustices that the members of the dehumanized minorities face (Kteily et al. 2015: 913).

By analysing dictators' speeches, Khany and Hamzelou (2014: 919) have developed a model of the moves that dictators use; these can be divided into three main move sets, with a number of subcategories. The first move-set is highlighting commonality, with the sub-moves of 1) emphasizing religious values, 2) narrating history in a subjective manner and 3) emphasizing patriotic values. These moves resemble populist discourses that are meant to convey the homogeneity of the people by emphasising conservative values, such as religious values and patriotism (Wodak 2015: 66). In addition, according to Wodak (2015: 66), discourses on protecting the fatherland have the premise of a common narrative of the past which represents *us* as either the heroes or as the victims of *the others*, thus generating revisionist history.

The second move-set that Khany and Hamzelou (2014: 919) suggest is justifying current policy by 1) depicting an evil picture of foreign or internal enemies 2) presenting the current policy as the best and 3) offering solutions for current problems. This move-set corresponds to populist discourses on dangerous others threatening the heartland and to discourses on simplistic explanations and solutions. The third move-set that dictators' use, is representing state orders by 1) euphemizing and 2) wishing further success (Khany and Hamzelou 2014: 919). As an example of a euphemism, Khany and Hamzelou (2014: 922) present Stalin's insistence on "danger over our country" when the danger was actually to his government posed by dissidents. In this example, the euphemism would rely on the populist discourse on dangerous others. In addition, as an example of wishing for further success, Khany and Hamzelou present Mussolini's call to arms*:* "People of Italy! Rush to arms and show your tenacity, your courage,

your valour!". In this example, the corresponding populist discourse would be protecting the fatherland.

In this chapter, I have provided examples of right-wing populist discourse both in Europe and the US and an overview of the common traits that populist and authoritarian discourses share. The studies show, that populist discourses are constructed so as to present the leader as the saviour who aligns themself with the people to give them a voice against the establishment and at the same time demonizing the others based on e.g. race, ideology or whatever else makes *them* different from *us.* According to Elliot (2017) Trump used this type of populist discourse in his 2016 presidential campaign more than other presidential candidates included in the study. Finally, research shows that authoritarians use similar themes in their discourse. The studies presented in this chapter form the basis of discursive aspects that I will be paying attention to in analysing Trump's speeches. In the next chapter I will discuss the theoretical framework of this study.

4   THEORETHICAL FRAMEWORK

This section focuses on the theoretical framework of this study. The thesis falls within the field of political discourse studies and it approaches political discourse with two analytic methods. First, a qualitative content analysis that functions as a diagnostic tool to find the relevant populist themes in Trump's speeches is conducted. Second, the most relevant themes will be further analysed qualitatively with methods of critical discourse analysis. Therefore, in this section I will first provide an overview of the history of quantitative content analysis and the theories it is based on. Secondly, I will discuss critical discourse analysis, focusing on the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA). Finally, strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, which are a key tool in analysing populist discourses are presented.

4.1 Content Analysis

Content Analysis is a method of analysing texts to extract information about the sender of the message, the message itself or the target audience (Weber 1990: 2). Its origins can be traced all the way back to the 17th century, when the church attempted to identify texts that did not agree with its doctrine in the newly founded print press (Krippendorff 2013: 10). Later, in the beginning of the 20th century, quantitative analysis was first used in evaluating the quality of news and followed by the rise of the social sciences it became a tool for identifying trends in public opinion and attitudes (Krippendorff 2013: 11-14). But it was only in the 1940's that Berelson and Larazfeld introduced the term content analysis and with it a systematically codified, concise conceptual and methodological framework (Krippendorff 2013: 14).

During World War II, content analysis was used in analysing Nazi propaganda (Krippendorff 2013: 15). The analysts were able to effectively infer changes in political power within the Axis countries, assess the Nazi leaders' perception of the situation and even predict future military operations of the German army from the speeches of Nazi propagandist Joseph Goebbels (Krippendorff 2013: 16). In addition, the Nazis used propaganda in a preparatory fashion to ensure that the public supported the planned operations. (Krippendorff 2013: 16-17). In terms of this study, the concept of *preparatory propaganda* is central, because one of the aims is to identify what kinds of policies Mr. Trump is preparing his base for.

Holsti (1969: 3, 5) defines three requirements for conducting a reliable content analysis: it must be objective, systematic, and theoretically relevant. Firstly, he states that in order to conduct the study objectively, there must be explicitly stated rules and procedures set in place to guide

the research process to eliminate the analyst's subjective influence on the results. Second, the data selection process must be made according to consistent rules in order to prevent the researcher from selecting only the type of data that supports the researcher's hypothesis (Holsti 1969:4). Thirdly, Holsti (1969: 5) emphasizes that a purely descriptive account of a document does not provide any scientific value, and therefore it must be connected to other discourse through theory.

According to Potter and Levine-Donnerstein (1999: 266), using an existing theory to establish a coding scheme makes the process more reliable, as it gives a clear direction to what to look for in the text. For this study, six key populist themes identified by Wodak (2015) are used as a preliminary framework for the coding categories of this study. These themes were discussed in detail in section 2.1.

The simplest form of quantitative content analysis consists of counting the number or occurrences of interest in the data and comparing their frequencies in the text (Titscher et al. 2000: 60), which is the chosen method for the quantitative portion of the analysis in this thesis. In addition to the quantitative content analysis, the analysis is extended qualitatively. Therefore, in the next section, the chosen qualitative method, Critical Discourse Analysis, is discussed.

4.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

This section is focused on defining discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis, with an emphasis on analysing ideologically loaded discourse using the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) and the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

Discourse can be defined as a complex network of interrelated linguistic acts that occur both simultaneously and sequentially within and across social fields of action (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 36). These linguistic acts are thematically interrelated oral or written 'texts' that belong to a specific genre (ibid.). Therefore, discourses are both influenced by their situational, institutional and social contexts and but they also shape the social and political actions and processes (ibid.) For example, in the area of political action, Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 36-40) distinguish six fields of action: law-making procedure, formation of public opinion and self-presentation, party-internal development of an informed opinion, political advertising or propaganda, political executive or administration and political control. Furthermore, they assert that discourses from each of these fields can overlap through explicit references, formal or

structural similarities and allusions or quotations and discourses may spill to other areas in society.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) studies the relationship between language, power, ideologies, institutions and social identities (Fairclough 2012: 9, Wodak and Meyer 2001: 2). Critical Discourse analysts study the language of those who are in power, because they are not only the ones that create inequality but also the ones that have the opportunity to change the world for the better (Wodak and Meyer 2001: 2, 10). The difference between CDA and a purely descriptive discourse analysis is that it is a political form of social critique (Reisgl 2017: 50). CDA is based on critical social analysis that not only describes the existing conditions but also evaluates how they fit into the core values of societies that are considered civilized and fair (Fairclough 2012: 9).

The Discourse Historical Approach, like other approaches in the field of CDA, is focused on examining abuse of power created through discourse, inequality and social injustice (Reisigl 2017: 49). It was developed originally in 1987-1993 to study the anti-semitic discourses of an Austrian presidential candidate, Kurt Waldheim (Reisigl 2017: 44-45). Since then, it has been used to study, for example, discourses relating to discrimination, such as racism, xenophobia and sexism; language barriers in social institutions; discourse and politics, e.g. studies in nation building, language policy and populism; how identities are constructed through discourse; and discourses in both classical media and social media (Reisigl 2017: 48).

The Discourse Historical approach recognizes three distinct forms of critique: discourse immanent critique, socio-diagnostic critique and prospective critique (Reisigl 2017: 50). Firstly, the discourse immanent critique is aimed at the inconsistencies and contradictions within the structures of the discourse (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 32). Features of interest include cohesion, presuppositions, and argumentation structures (ibid.). Secondly, the socio-diagnostic critique relies on the researcher's social, historical and political background knowledge in exposing how discourse is used, for example, in manipulation and how aspects of discourse practices may be ethically dubious (Reisigl 2017: 51; Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 53-54). Through socio-diagnostic critique "persuasive, propagandist, populist 'manipulative' character of discursive practices" can be exposed (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 53). In this dimension of critique, the aim is to expose discrepancies between discourse and related social practices (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 54). Thirdly, prospective critique aims at practical solutions to improving communication in all areas of society, from reducing racist or sexist communication to developing new guidelines to improve communication within organizations and institutions (Reisigl 2017: 51).

The Discourse Historical Approach is specifically focused on the socio-political and historical context of a particular discourse (Resigl 2017: 53). For example, reconstructing the origins of seemingly innocuous fragments of discourses by referencing to instances and ways it has been used in the past, can expose what they truly signal to those who know the historical context. (Reisigl 2017: 53). In addition, it is possible to compare how social actors, such as politicians, talk about the past to how historians represent it, in order to expose revisionist history (Reisigl 2017: 53).

Because critical discourse analysis is always political in the sense that it is done conducted from a critical perspective and with an intention to expose distorted and abusive uses of power, it is pertinent to follow some ethical guidelines in it. For example, according to van Dijk (1993: 252), because of the political nature of CDA, the analyst's point of view, perspective, principles and aims should be explicitly stated. In addition, van Dijk (1993: 253) argues, critique should never be targeted towards a specific individual or situation, but it should focus on the structural imbalance of power between groups. Ultimately, as the analyst tackles the injustice and inequality that those in power condone and ignore, the aim is to facilitate change through understanding (van Dijk 1993: 252). Therefore, van Dijk (1993:252) emphasizes that the relevance of CDA is measured in its contribution to social change over time.

4.3 Ideologies and Strategies of Positive Self-Presentation and Negative Other-Presentation

Van Dijk (2006) explores the relationship between ideology and discourse with a focus on positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Van Dijk (2006: 116) defines ideology as a belief system that is socially shared by members of a social *collectivity*, meaning that ideologies are construed of "social representations that define the social identity of a group", mainly as opposed to other groups. These social representations are the foundation for discourse, which in turn is the primary vehicle for the dissemination of ideologies (van Dijk 2006: 120-121). Van Dijk (2006: 124-126) identifies discursive structures and strategies for expressing enacting and reproducing ideologies. Overall, in ideologies there is a polarized presentation of *us vs. them*, with the emphasis being on the positive aspects of us and the negative aspects of them while simultaneously de-emphasizing the negative in us and positive in them (Van Dijk 2006: 126). Positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation encompasses both form and meaning, thus, for example, a topic may be selected to accentuate

the bad qualities of others (meaning) and this may be done repeatedly (form) (Van Dijk 2006: 126-127). However, van Dijk (2006: 124) states that people may hide their ideologies on some occasions, for instance, if they feel they might be rejected because of them. Therefore, discourse analysis cannot always tell what a certain person's ideology is.

The Discourse Historical Approach has adopted the concepts of 'positive self-presentation' and 'negative other-presentation' (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 31). Next, I will discuss three discursive strategies that can be used to produce these presentations in ideological discourse: referential strategies that include strategies of nomination and predication, argumentation strategies and involvement strategies. (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44-45, Reisigl 2017: 52).

Firstly, *referential strategies* include *strategies of nomination* and *strategies of predication* (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 45, Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). Predication means linguistically attributing qualities to for example persons, actions and social phenomena (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 54). Referential strategies rely on synedochization, which means cultivating a distinct feature, trait or characteristic as representative of a whole (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 45). Because of the evaluative nature of these types of categorisations, nominational and predicational strategies are not always distinguishable (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 45) Linguistic devices used in nominational strategies include membership categorization, metonymies and metaphors, whereas predicational strategies utilize "stereotypical attributions of positive or negative traits and implicit or explicit predicates" (Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). There are several categories of referential strategies: collectivisation, spatialization, de-spatialization, explicit dissimilation, originalisation, actionalisation or professionalisation, somatisation, economisation, politicisation, militarisation, social problematisation and realisationalisation or sociativisaion (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 47-52). For example, collectivisation is realised by the linguistic means of deictics (us, them) or collectives (family, nation, majority). Somatisation on the other hand can include strategies such as racialisation by the use of racionyms (blacks, red-skins) and specific body fragmentation by using body meronyms to stand for the whole person (blonde, asshole [metaphor]). Strategies of social problematisation include for example negation by the use of negative qualionyms and negationyms (illegals, unskilled). (For a more detailed discussion see Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44-69.)

Argumentation can be used as a discursive strategy to "justify political inclusion or exclusion, discrimination or preferential treatment" (Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). There are several *topoi* (*topos*: a traditional or conventional literary or rhetorical theme or topic) that are commonly used to argue both for and against discrimination (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 74-80). For

instance, *the topos of definition* can be employed to imply that the carrier of a name also carries the qualities contained in the literal meaning of the name (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 76.). Therefore, Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 76) suggest that, when referring to immigrant workers as guest-workers, the implication is that because they are guests, at some point they must leave. In another example, Reisigl and Wodak (2001:77) illustrate the *the topos of danger and threat*. They suggest that this *topos* can be used to argue for or against actions, policies or groups of people on the premise that the end result is somehow dangerous. Consequently, they suggest that the restriction of immigration can be justified by the premise that if there are too many immigrants, the native population will turn hostile towards them. In addition, Reisigl and Wodak (2001:77) further assert that this argumentation strategy reverses the concepts of victim and victimiser. (For an extensive discussion on *topoi* that are employed to argue for or against racism and discrimination see Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 75-80).

Involvement strategies include *perspectivation, framing and discourse presentation strategies* (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 81). These strategies are used to position the speaker's or writer's point of view and to express either involvement or distance (Reisigl 2017: 52, Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). This positioning is achieved by reporting, narrating or quoting events and utterances in a manner that either positively reflects on the in-group or negatively to the out-group (Wodak 2001: 27). For example, detachment can be signalled through the use of relative and complement clauses and prepositional phrases (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 135). In addition, by using the passive voice, nominalisations and metonymisations instead of employing vivid metaphors, the producer of the discourse can be detached from the subject (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 135, Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 82). In contrast, involvement can be produced by repetitions, emphasising and amplifying particles and morphemes (Reisgl and Wodak 2001:83). In addition, involvement can be expressed by utilizing exaggerating quantifiers and intensifying verbs and verb phrases, adjectives and adverbs that relay the speaker's emotive involvement and frame of mind (ibid.).

The way in which discourses are represented can provide essential information on the detachment or involvement of the producer of the discourse (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 135, Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 83). For instance, indirect speech signals distance, whereas direct speech expresses and evokes involvement (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 83). Notably, extremely animated storytelling in the form of constructed dialogue engages the attention of the audience in a unique way with the characters of the story and the storyteller him or herself (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 135).

In this section, I have discussed the definition of discourse, the concepts of critique that critical discourse analysis relies on, and theories of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. The three key discursive strategies presented above – referential strategies, argumentation strategies and involvement strategies – are important for the purposes of this study: they are used to form polarizations between *us* and *them*, which is the foundation of populism.

Based on the definitions of authoritarianism and populism presented in Chapter 2, the studies on populist and authoritarian discourse in Chapter 3 and the theoretical framework presented in this chapter, I will now move to lay out the guidelines that I will follow in conducting the present study.

5 SET-UP OF THE PRESENT STUDY

5.1 Aims and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to examine what kind of populist ideology Mr. Trump propagates to his core base in his campaign speeches and to what ends is he trying either to mould or to reinforce his constituents' views, beliefs and values. In addition, since Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018) have argued that Mr. Trump has already displayed the four key indicators of authoritarian discourse. The second key aim of this thesis is to examine how this trait manifests in his speeches.

Therefore, my research questions are:
1. What kinds of populist themes does President Trump use in his speeches?
   1.1 Which themes are the most prominent ones?
   1.2 Does this emphasis evolve during his first year in office?
2. How does President Trump use strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation?
3. What kinds of features associated with authoritarianism can be found in President Trump's speeches?

5.2 Data Selection and Collection

As the head of the GOP and the cabinet, the President greatly influences and is responsible for the implementation of the policies legislated by the Congress, and he may also implement policies unilaterally by executive orders. Therefore, as Mr. Trump speaks to receptive crowds in political campaign rallies, he is not only trying to sustain the support of his voters for the next presidential election, but also marketing the policies he has either already implemented or is about to engage in. Therefore, Mr. Trump's speeches in campaign rallies provide information not only on which populist themes Mr. Trump uses to appeal to his base but also information on the direction Mr. Trump is leading the country in terms of policy decisions.

The speeches analysed in this thesis include all the speeches Mr. Trump has made in political campaign rallies after his inauguration during his first year in office. By including all the campaign rallies in the data, it is possible to study if Mr. Trumps discourse evolves during his first year in office. In addition, as campaign rallies are in essence an arena of political advertising and propaganda (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 38), analysing the all the speeches given

at the rallies provides information on how Mr. Trump explains and spins the events occurring around each rally in order to convince his supporters that his approach is the right one.

Mr. Trump attended ten campaign rallies, nine of which were organised by Donald Trump Presidential Campaign, 2020 and one was a campaign rally for Luther Strange, a candidate in the republican primaries in the Alabama special election for the United States Senate. All the speeches to be analysed are directed to a similar audience which consists of distinctly pro-Trump, conservative republicans. Since the message in all the speeches is directed to this distinct portion of the electorate, the data is consistent in terms of content. The rallies included in my analysis are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. List of Campaign Rallies.

	Date	Location
Speech 1	February 18, 2017	Melbourne, FL
Speech 2	March 15, 2017	Nashville, TN
Speech 3	March 20, 2017	Louisville, KY
Speech 4	April 29, 2017	Harrisburg, PA
Speech 5	June 21, 2017	Cedar Rapids, IA
Speech 6	July 25, 2017	Youngstown, OH
Speech 7	August 3, 2017	Huntington, WV
Speech 8	August 22, 2017	Phoenix, AZ
Speech 9	September 22, 2017	Huntsville, AL
Speech 10	December 8, 2017	Pensacola, FL

The rallies were broadcast on multiple cable news channels, such as Fox News and CNN. The speeches are available in video format on www.c-span.org, which is where I accessed them using online streaming. In creating the transcripts used for this study, I mostly used crude transcripts that were publicly available online on the C-SPAN website and in one instance on Factba.se, as guidelines. I compared them to the videos to verify the accuracy and corrected inaccuracies. The transcripts are not very detailed as far as pauses, intonation or emphasis are concerned; this is because the focus of my analysis is on the textual content of the speeches.

5.3 Methods of Analysis

This study is a combination of two methods of analysis: a quantitative content analysis and a qualitative a critical discourse analysis. The quantitative analysis is conducted in order to detect

which populist themes are the most frequently used by Mr. Trump in his speeches and also to identify any evolution in the emphasis of the themes during the course of his first year in office. In addition, in the quantitative analysis, discourse that includes authoritarian features is identified. Furthermore, the quantitative analysis serves as a diagnostic tool for the qualitative analysis that focuses on the most frequent themes arising from the quantitative analysis. The qualitative analysis, in turn, provides a deeper insight into how Mr. Trump presents these themes to his audience and what meanings he generates via them.

According to Holsti (1969: 15), using content analysis is appropriate when the researcher does not have a direct channel of communication to the research subject to conduct e.g. questionnaires or interviews. In content analysis, the text is analysed using recording units that are coded into different categories (Weber 1990: 22-24). Weber (1990: 23-24) defines six types recording units: word sense, sentence, theme, paragraph, and the whole text. Strijbos et al. (2006), have developed a unitizing method for analysing electronic communication, in which the unit of analysis is defined as "a sentence or part of a compound sentence that can be regarded as 'meaningful in itself, regardless of the meaning of the coding categories". For the purposes of this study, I slightly modified their unitizing rules in a way that that they better serve the purpose of analysing spoken language. Therefore, the unitizing process is conducted with the following set of rules.

1. A sentence is a "word, clause, or phrase or a group of clauses or phrases forming a syntactic unit which expresses an assertion, a question, a command, a wish, an exclamation, or the performance of an action" (Merriam-Webster).

2. An independent clause is a single unit of analysis.

3. Complex sentence is a single unit of analysis

4. Compound sentences are segmented into separate units on the condition that each part of that compound sentence can be regarded as meaningful in itself.

5. When determining whether a part of a compound sentence can be regarded as a 'meaningful' unit in itself, the following rules apply

   a. It is allowed to ignore the conjunctions that form the collocation

   b. It is not allowed to add mentally a 'finite form' or 'verbs'

   c. It is not allowed to leave out words

5. Hesitations in the beginning of a sentence, (e.g. repeated words) will be regarded as a part of the following sentence, whereas fragments of discourse that have no connection to the following sentence will be considered separate units of analysis.

6. If a sentence is interrupted by meaningful units of analysis as previously defined, those interrupting units will be put into brackets and regarded as separate units of analysis while the surrounding sentence will be regarded as one unit. Other fragments of discourse within a sentence will not be considered as separate segments.

After the unitizing process I proceed to coding the units of analysis. A single unit of analysis may be included in multiple coding categories, as it may serve multiple functions in Mr. Trumps discourse. My framework for the coding categories is derived from Wodak's (2015) research. According to her theory, right-wing populist discourse includes the following themes

1. Discourse relating to a homogenous demos.

    a. Common values and wants, common origin.

2. Discourse relating to the dangerous others.

    a. The opposition /elites /judges are against the common people.

    b. Foreign countries that take advantage of the United States.

    c. Migrants, immigrants or others who not included in the other categories that threaten the common people.

    d. Representing the media as unreliable or against the people or otherwise demeaning or discrediting news organizations.

3. Discourse relating to protecting the fatherland.

    a. Law enforcement, military and borders as protection of the fatherland.

    b. The people depicted as heroes or as victims of the others.

4. Discourse on conservative values.

    a. Family values.

    b. Religion.

    c. Reducing government overreach (taxes, regulation, healthcare system and other republican policies).

    d. Supporting law enforcement, constitution, conservative judges, also opposing liberal interpretations of the constitution.

    e. Patriotism and military.

    f. Other conservative discourse, e.g. longing for the golden age.

5. Discourse relating to simple explanations and solutions.

    a. Simplistic descriptions of problems (e.g. Obamacare is a disaster), blaming past administrations (e.g. "The democrats need to take responsibility for Obamacare").

   b. Distorting the facts or providing selective examples that do not reflect the big picture.

   c. Simplistic solutions to problems that suggest a concrete action (e.g. "We will build a wall").

  6. Discourse on the charismatic leader depicted as a saviour.

   a. Materialised success, real or perceived, that is created by the Trump administration.

   b. Promises of future success under the Trump administration.

   c. Depictions of Trump as the leader that solves everything, and Trump as one of the people or their messenger.

Within these categories, themes that include key features of authoritarianism, i.e. dehumanizing minorities, undermining the free press, or undermining the importance of the judicial and legislative branches of the government, are identified for further analysis.

Other factors to be considered in the coding process include the coding of sentences with pronouns, metaphors and fragmented discourse. Sentences with pronouns are coded according to the person, entity or concept the pronoun refers to. If the reference is ambiguous or an affirmation of the previous sentence or sentences (e.g. "I can tell you that."), the sentence is not categorized into any coding category. In the case of metaphors, I have chosen to use a similar approach as Holsti (1963: 136) used with idiomatic expressions. He suggests that the idiomatic expression is clarified to reflect its meaning. Therefore, I have chosen to code metaphors according to the intended meaning. Fragmented discourse is not categorized, if the intended meaning cannot be reliably deduced.

Next, after the coding units are categorized, the occurrences in each category in each speech are calculated. This quantitative data provides concrete evidence on the themes Mr. Trump emphasizes to his base and demonstrates if his discourse evolves during the first year of his presidency.

Finally, the most prominent populist themes and authoritarian discourse are analysed qualitatively in more detail through Critical Discourse Analysis, using the discursive strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation that van Dijk (2006: 124-126) identified in ideologically loaded discourse, and which are also used in DHA (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44-45, Reisigl 2017: 52).

First, I identify and select examples of recurring or otherwise distinctive topics within the themes for analysis. The topics that the speaker chooses to highlight can be in itself a form of either positive self-presentation or negative other-presentation van Dijk (2006: 125).

In analysing the selected examples, I focus specifically on identifying referential strategies, involvement and detachment strategies and argumentation strategies. Firstly, I study how Trump uses referential strategies. These strategies include strategies of nomination and strategies of predication (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 45, Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). Referential strategies are used to represent a distinct feature, characteristic or trait as representative of the whole (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 45). Linguistic devices used in nomination strategies include membership categorization, metonymies and metaphors (Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). Predication means linguistically attributing qualities to for example persons, actions and social phenomena (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 54). Predicational strategies resemble referential strategies but they include the use of stereotypes about positive or negative traits and implicit or explicit predicates (Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). Both strategies of nomination and predication can be realized through several discursive strategies, such as collectivisation, somatisation, and social problematisation (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 47-52). For example, collectivisation is realised by the linguistic means of deictics (us, them) or collectives (family, nation, majority). Somatisation on the other hand can include strategies such as racialisation by the use of racionyms and specific body fragmentation by using body meronyms to stand for the whole person. Strategies of social problematisation include, for example, negation by the use of negative qualionyms and negationyms.

Secondly, I study how Trump uses strategies on involvement and detachment in his speeches. These strategies include perspectivation, framing and discourse presentation strategies that are used to position the speaker's or writer's point of view to express either involvement or distance (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 81; Reisigl 2017: 52; Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). This positioning is achieved by reporting, narrating or quoting events and utterances in a manner that either positively reflects on the in-group or negatively to the out-group (Wodak 2001: 27). The signals of involvement that I attempt to identify in my analysis include repetitions, emphasising and amplifying particles and morphemes, utilizing exaggerating quantifiers and intensifying verbs and verb phrases, adjectives and adverbs that reflect the speaker's emotive involvement and frame of mind (Reisgl and Wodak 2001:83). On the other hand, I also include in my analysis the signals that suggest detachment, for example using the passive voice, nominalisations and metonymisations (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 135, Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 82).

Furthermore, I study how Trump uses discourse representation to signal either involvement or detachment. For instance, indirect speech signals distance, whereas direct speech expresses and evokes involvement (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 83). Furthermore, I include in my analysis sequences of extremely animated storytelling in the form of constructed dialogue which, according to Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (2004: 135) effectively engages the attention of the audience.

Thirdly, I include argumentation strategies in my analysis. Argumentation can be used as a discursive strategy to "justify political inclusion or exclusion, discrimination or preferential treatment" (Wodak and Meyer 2001: 27). In my analysis I identify different *topoi* (*topos*: a traditional or conventional literary or rhetorical theme or topic) that Trump uses to justify his positions and policies to his supporters.

The presentation of the critical discourse analysis is structured to follow the results of the quantitative content analysis. Each one of the most frequently occurring populist themes is qualitatively analysed mainly in its own section, although there is some overlap of the themes which is noted in the analysis. In addition, the analysis of authoritarian discourse will be integrated in the analysis of the populist themes, since the two tend to intertwine.

5.4 Reliability of the Analysis and Ethical Questions

The aim of any research is to produce objective data. In order to achieve objectivity, the research methods must be reliable enough to produce replicable results (Holsti 1969: 135). In content analysis, the reliability of the analysis depends on the coder's skill, clarity of categories and coding rules and the degree of ambiguity in the data. In order to produce accurate and reliable results, according to Holsti (1969:135), the analysis should ideally rely on results produced by a pool of coders, because there is always variation in the judgement of individual coders. This study relies only on the judgement of a single coder. Therefore, the results of the quantitative analysis should be considered to be only approximations and serve only as a diagnostic tool for selecting the most prominent populist and authoritarian themes for the discourse analysis.

All the data used in this research is publicly available on www.c-span.org, except for the transcript for Speech 5. C-SPAN allows the data to be used as long as the source is credited, and the material is not used for profit (Terms & Conditions 2014). The rough transcript that was used as a template for creating the transcript for Speech 5 can be found on Factbase, which is a database of information relating to the executive branch. Factbase is public and free to use

(FactSquared). In addition, Donald Trump is a public figure and the speeches used in this study are meant for public dissemination. For these reasons this data can be used in scientific research.

6   QUANTITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS

In this chapter I will present the findings of the quantitative content study of the ten speeches included in this study. This chapter provides answers to my first research question which includes getting information on which of populist themes President Trump uses in his speeches, which themes are the most prominent and if the emphasis of the themes evolves during Trump's first year in office. Furthermore, the quantitative analysis will provide information on how frequently and in which populist themes and their sub-themes authoritarian discourse can be identified.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section focuses on the analysis data obtained about the occurrences of different populist themes and their sub-categories. The quantitative findings related to authoritarian discourse are presented in the second section.

6.1 Populist Themes in Trump's Discourse

After his inauguration in 2017, Donald Trump attended ten campaign rallies, nine of which were organized by his own Trump 2020 campaign and one was a campaign rally for Luther Strange in the Republican Senate primaries in Alabama.

The populist themes that Trump employs in his speeches are presented in Table 2. It should be noted that the coding units could be categorized under multiple themes, which is why the total number of coding units for each speech does not equal the number of populist themes combined. There were four populist themes that stood out in Trump's speeches: Firstly, when the occurrences from all the speeches were summed up, Trump scored highest in presenting himself to his audience as The Charismatic Leader, scoring highest on the theme in four of the speeches with 1208 occurrences in all the speeches combined, which adds up to a total of 17 % of all the coding units analysed. The second highest scoring populist theme was Conservative Values with 1103 occurrences, adding up to a total of 16 %. The populist theme of Simplistic Explanations and Solutions was the third highest scoring one with 1060 occurrences and 15 % of the total number of coding units. The populist theme The Dangerous Others came in a close fourth with 1027 occurrences, making up to a total of 15 % of all the coding units analysed.

Table 2. Populist Discourse in Trump's speeches.

	The Charismatic Leader		Conservative Values		Simplistic Explanations and Solutions		The Dangerous Others		Homogenous Demos		Protecting the Fatherland		Not Categorized as Populist		Total Number of Coding Units	
Speech 1	113	22 %	76	15 %	112	22 %	79	15 %	48	9 %	39	8 %	186	36 %	518	100 %
Speech 2	69	17 %	77	19 %	91	23 %	53	13 %	39	10 %	41	10 %	127	32 %	403	100 %
Speech 3	115	22 %	73	14 %	108	21 %	56	11 %	34	7 %	36	7 %	189	36 %	522	100 %
Speech 4	139	24 %	68	12 %	126	22 %	135	24 %	20	4 %	57	10 %	186	33 %	570	100 %
Speech 5	173	19 %	124	14 %	108	12 %	124	14 %	51	6 %	41	5 %	398	44 %	906	100 %
Speech 6	80	19 %	97	23 %	71	17 %	70	17 %	51	12 %	37	9 %	136	32 %	423	100 %
Speech 7	67	22 %	76	25 %	43	14 %	39	13 %	59	20 %	19	6 %	92	31 %	299	100 %
Speech 8	137	15 %	129	14 %	86	9 %	217	24 %	97	11 %	50	5 %	372	41 %	915	100 %
Speech 9	164	13 %	205	16 %	116	9 %	103	8 %	43	3 %	69	5 %	762	59 %	1299	100 %
Speech 10	151	14 %	178	17 %	199	19 %	151	14 %	51	5 %	40	4 %	461	43 %	1066	100 %
Total	1208	17 %	1103	16 %	1060	15 %	1027	15 %	493	7 %	429	6 %	2909	42 %	6921	100 %

The two other populist themes, Homogenous Demos and Family Values scored only 493 (7 %) and 429 (6 %) respectively of the total coding units analysed. Since Trump employed these themes less than a half as much as the other populist themes, I have chosen to exclude these themes from the qualitative discourse analysis.

As presented in Table 3, the populist theme of The Charismatic Leader could be divided into three distinct sub-themes: 1. emphasizing his positive Personal Attributes and Connection to the People, 2. Materialized Success during his presidency and 3. promising Future Success. In all the speeches combined, Trump scored highest in emphasizing his Personal Attributes and Connection to the People, with 513 (42 %) occurrences in the sub-theme. Next, he talked about already Materialized Success with 370 (31 %) occurrences. The final sub-theme, promising Future Success, occurred nearly as frequently with a total of 325 occurrences (27). It is not surprising, that Trump scored highest on the theme of The Charismatic Leader, because, as Wodak (2015: 67) suggests, the supporters of a populist movement are in need of a charismatic, Robin Hood –like saviour, who will protect them. Therefore, the data obtained from these campaign speeches supports the fact that Trump used this populist theme to assure his audience that his unique personal attributes can deliver results for the people, and that the connection he shares with them is still strong. In addition, he reminded the audience of all the achievements his administration had already delivered and promised more to come. It should be noted that toward the end of his first year in office, Trump shifted his emphasis slightly towards the sub-thme of Materialized Success, thus attempting to reassure his voters that they had made the right choice in voting for him.

Table 3. The Charismatic Leader

	Personal Attributes and Connection to the People		Materialised Success		Future Success		Total	
Speech 1	65	58 %	29	26 %	19	17 %	113	100 %
Speech 2	23	33 %	19	28 %	27	39 %	69	100 %
Speech 3	34	30 %	28	24 %	53	46 %	115	100 %
Speech 4	56	40 %	45	32 %	38	27 %	139	100 %
Speech 5	98	57 %	46	27 %	29	17 %	173	100 %
Speech 6	31	39 %	19	24 %	30	38 %	80	100 %
Speech 7	16	24 %	32	48 %	19	28 %	67	100 %
Speech 8	64	47 %	42	31 %	31	23 %	137	100 %
Speech 9	77	47 %	53	32 %	34	21 %	164	100 %
Speech 10	49	32 %	57	38 %	45	30 %	151	100 %
Total	513	42 %	370	31 %	325	27 %	1208	100 %

Interestingly, as shown in Table 3, Trump focused heavily on his Personal Attributes and Connection to the People in Speeches 1 and 5 when compared to the other two sub-categories. The high number of occurrences in Speech 1 may be attributed to the fact that Trump had been in office for only about a month and he did not have any major achievements to tout, therefore choosing to advertise his personal abilities and characteristics instead. However, in Speech 5, the high number of occurrences could be related to the events that had unfolded between Speeches 4 and 5, which took place on April 29th, 2017 and June 21st respectively. During this period, the investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 elections escalated, Trump fired the then FBI director James Comey, which in turn prompted the appointment of Special Counsel Robert Mueller to form a team to investigate the election interference and all things that might directly stem from that investigation (Kiely 2018). This resulted in an increased media coverage of the investigation and different news organizations released article after article that represented Trump and his campaign in a negative light. Therefore, it can be inferred that Trump chose to emphasize his unique attributes to his base in order to counter the negative media coverage. This interpretation is further supported by the fact that this speech was the first and only one of the speeches included in this study in which Trump used the term *witch hunt* to describe the investigation and the resulting media coverage.

The second most prominent populist theme that Trump utilized in his speeches was the theme of Conservative Values with 1103 occurrences (16 %) in all the speeches combined, as shown in Table 2. This theme was divided into six sub-themes which are presented in Table 4. First, the sub-theme of Patriotism and Military included references to the military, veterans, the flag, national pride, and references that emphasized *American* citizens. Second, the sub-theme of Limited Government included references to conservative policies on taxes, healthcare and social security and to reducing the government overreach in the form of deregulation and, on the other hand, bashing democratic policies that support regulation. The third sub-theme, Law and Order included references to law-enforcement officials, in other words, the police, ICE and Border Patrol Agents. The fourth sub-theme, Religion, included references to the Christian faith. Fifth, the sub-theme of Family Values included references to family, and finally the Sixth sub-theme, Other, included other ideas related to conservativism, such as yearning back to the elusive golden age and general references to *our values* which, among Trump's supporters, are conservative values.

Table 4. Conservative Values.

	Patriotism and Military		Limited Government		Law and Order		Religion		Other		Family Values		Total	
Speech 1	23	30 %	18	24 %	26	34 %	7	9 %	1	1 %	1	1 %	76	100 %
Speech 2	28	36 %	34	44 %	12	16 %	2	3 %	0	0 %	1	1 %	77	100 %
Speech 3	28	38 %	30	41 %	9	12 %	3	4 %	2	3 %	1	1 %	73	100 %
Speech 4	35	51 %	19	28 %	12	18 %	2	3 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	68	100 %
Speech 5	25	20 %	40	32 %	47	38 %	5	4 %	6	5 %	1	1 %	124	100 %
Speech 6	40	41 %	24	25 %	22	23 %	6	6 %	4	4 %	1	1 %	97	100 %
Speech 7	41	54 %	22	29 %	6	8 %	3	4 %	3	4 %	1	1 %	76	100 %
Speech 8	64	50 %	29	22 %	20	16 %	8	6 %	7	5 %	1	1 %	129	100 %
Speech 9	93	45 %	62	30 %	23	11 %	8	4 %	15	7 %	4	2 %	205	100 %
Speech 10	88	49 %	50	28 %	15	8 %	20	11 %	3	2 %	2	1 %	178	100 %
Total	465	42 %	328	30 %	192	17 %	64	6 %	41	4 %	13	1 %	1103	100 %

In all the speeches combined, Trump brought up the sub-theme of Patriotism and Military the most with 465 occurrences in total (42 %). It can also be observed that the number of occurrences increases from 23 in the Speech 1, to 88 in Speech, peaking at 93 in Speech 9. The next frequently referenced sub-theme was Limited Government with 328 occurrences (30 %) in total, with a similar upward trend of increasing occurrences toward the end of the year, starting from 18 mentions in the Speech 10 to 50 in Speech 10, peaking at 62 occurrences in Speech 9. The increase toward the end of the year, could be explained by the push to get a tax reform bill passed through congress by the end of the year, which indeed happened on December 19th, 2017 (Committee on Ways and Means 2017).

The third most prominent sub-theme of Conservative Values was Law and Order with 192 occurrences in total (17 %). The number of mentions fluctuated throughout the year from six to 47. The peak of 47 occurrences in Speech 5 can be considered as an anomaly, since the second highest score was only 26 in Speech 1. This anomaly appears to be caused by the fact that Speech 5 occurred soon after a shooting in which several Congressional Republicans were targeted. The Capitol Police managed to detain the shooter, and therefore, Trump's remarks included a section in which he addressed the event and praised the officers for their actions.

Interestingly, the three sub-themes of Conservative Values, Patriotism and Military, Limited Government and Law and Order completely overshadowed discourse on Religion and Family Values. Religion was mentioned 64 times and family values only 13 times in total. Other references to conservative ideals got 41 mentions in Trump's speeches. This indicates that Trump's policy platform focuses on the military and veterans, reforming the tax-code to reflect the conservative ideology and policies that strengthen the role of law enforcement and mould the judiciary to a more conservative direction. Although a large portion of Trump's base identifies as Evangelical Christians, religion and religious liberty is only mentioned in passing, which might reflect Trump's personal religious convictions – or lack thereof. Similarly, the almost non-existent discourse on Family Values, with only 13 occurrences in total, might be intentionally designed in order to avoid drawing attention to Trump's two divorces, extramarital-affairs and allegations of sexual harassment.

The third most frequently occurring populist theme in Trump's speeches was Simplistic Explanations and Solutions with 1060 occurrences in all the speeches combined (15 %). There was great variation in the number of occurrences among the speeches, ranging from 43 occurrences in the Speech 7 to 199 in Speech 10 with no observable upward or downward trend.

The theme was divided into two sub-themes as presented in table 5. First, the sub-theme of Simplistic Solutions included sentences like, *We will build the wall* and *We're putting the miners back to work*, and second, the sub-theme of Simplistic Explanations that included utterances, such as *Obamacare is a disaster* or explaining the Diversity Immigrant Visa Program as countries taking *their worst and they put them in the bin* and sending them to the United States. All but one of the speeches had more occurrences of Simplistic Solutions than Explanations.

Table 5. Simplistic Explanations and Solutions

	Simplistic Solutions		Simplistic Explanations		Total	
Speech 1	70	63 %	42	38 %	112	100 %
Speech 2	60	66 %	31	34 %	91	100 %
Speech 3	59	55 %	49	45 %	108	100 %
Speech 4	85	67 %	41	33 %	126	100 %
Speech 5	67	62 %	41	38 %	108	100 %
Speech 6	50	70 %	21	30 %	71	100 %
Speech 7	32	74 %	11	26 %	43	100 %
Speech 8	59	69 %	27	31 %	86	100 %
Speech 9	68	59 %	48	41 %	116	100 %
Speech 10	88	44 %	111	56 %	199	100 %
Total	638	60 %	422	40 %	1060	100 %

In Speech 10, the occurrences of Simplistic Explanations peaked at 111 occurrences, while the occurrences of Simplistic Solutions remained at 88. Speech 10 was the second longest included in this study, which contributes to the large number of occurrences. However, it does not explain why number of occurrences of the sub-theme Simplistic Explanations exceeded Simplistic Solutions, when in all other speeches its occurrences remained fewer. In closer examination of the speech, the only topic that did not usually appear in the speeches was the hurricanes that had hit Texas and Florida shortly before the speech, which Trump presented as a Simplistic Explanation to GDP growth not achieving the level he had promised. This, however, accounted for only one occurrence in the sub-theme. However, further examination revealed that even though the topics did not differ from other speeches, Trump managed to fit healthcare, TPP, NAFTA, the Paris Climate Accord, immigration, regulation and tax policies endorsed by the

Democrats, blaming previous administrations for challenges he is facing in foreign policy, NATO and explaining the financial gains in the stock markets as direct result of his election victory into this speech. Furthermore, he explored most of these topics in great detail with several examples to illustrate how his political opponents had failed. Since this speech was given at a rally that closed his first year in office, it appears that Trump was attempting to recap everything that had happened that year and place a lot of blame for his shortcomings on others by employing the sub-theme of Simplistic Explanations.

The fourth highest scoring populist theme that Trump used in his speeches was the populist theme The Dangerous Others. In total, the theme occurred in the speeches 1027 times (15 %), ranging from 39 occurrences in speech 7 to 217 in Speech 8. However, the number of occurrences in Speech 8 was markedly higher than in the other speeches, as shown in Table 2. The theme of The Dangerous Others could be divided into four distinct sub-themes as shown in Table 6. Firstly, Trump represented the media as a threat 359 times in total (41 %). This included phrases such as *Fake news* and conspiratorial statements, such as *Their agenda is not your agenda*. The number of occurrences ranged from zero to a peak of 123 in Speech 8. This peak in criticizing the media was the aberration that caused the peak in the entire theme, The Dangerous Others, in Speech 8. This anomaly will be further analysed in section 7.4.1.

Table 6. The Dangerous Others

	The Media		Dangerous Individuals and Groups		The Elites		Foreign Countries		Total	
Speech 1	31	39 %	19	24 %	19	24 %	10	13 %	79	100 %
Speech 2	18	34 %	13	25 %	21	40 %	1	2 %	53	100 %
Speech 3	9	16 %	17	30 %	23	41 %	7	13 %	56	100 %
Speech 4	28	21 %	60	44 %	32	24 %	15	11 %	135	100 %
Speech 5	44	35 %	22	18 %	25	20 %	33	27 %	124	100 %
Speech 6	19	27 %	33	47 %	8	11 %	10	14 %	70	100 %
Speech 7	0	0 %	12	31 %	23	59 %	4	10 %	39	100 %
Speech 8	123	57 %	38	18 %	41	19 %	15	7 %	217	100 %
Speech 9	42	41 %	23	22 %	19	18 %	19	18 %	103	100 %
Speech 10	45	30 %	34	23 %	58	38 %	14	9 %	151	100 %
Total	359	35 %	271	26 %	269	26 %	128	12 %	1027	100 %

Second, in the sub-theme Dangerous Individuals and Groups Trump focused on representing, immigrants or others not included in the other sub-themes as a threat to the people and its values, mostly by conflating criminality and terrorism with a non-white ethnic background. The total

number of occurrences in all the speeches was 271 (26 %), with the number of occurrences varying from 12 in Speech 7 to 60 in Speech 4, as shown in Table 6.

The third most frequently occurring sub-theme of The Dangerous Others in Trump's speeches was The Elites with a total number of occurrences at 269 (26%). This sub-theme included discourse that presented political elites, special interests and the judiciary as a threat to the people. The number of occurrences fluctuated from 8 to 58. Similar fluctuation was observed in the fourth and final sub-theme, Foreign Countries, in which Trump presented foreign countries as a threat. The occurrences ranged from one occurrence in Speech 2 to 33 occurrences in Speech 5, with a total of 128 occurrences (12 %) in all the speeches combined. Trump represented the threat from foreign countries mainly as an economic one, but there were some instances in which he referenced other countries as a threat to national security.

The last two populist themes presented in Table 2, Homogenous Demos and Protecting the Fatherland occurred much more rarely than the other themes with of total only 493 (7 %) and 429 (6 %) occurrences respectively, with no marked variation in the speeches. The populist theme of Homogenous Demos often occurred in connection to Conservative Values, for example, in connection to the sub-theme Patriotism and Military in the form of phrases, such as *We love our flag* or *we love our veterans*. Similarly, Trump connected the populist theme of Protecting the Fatherland to the theme of The Dangerous Others, for example, with sentences like *We are watching every single one,* when referring to terrorist suspects.

In summary, the results of the content analysis show that Trump scored highest in the populist theme of The Charismatic leader. Within this theme Trump scored highest in the sub-theme of Personal Attributes and Connection to the People. This suggests that Trump is attempting to highlight his own role as the charismatic leader, which is typical for populist leaders. The second most prominent populist theme was Conservative Values. Within this theme, Trump focused on the sub-themes of Patriotism and Military, Law and Order, and Limited Government. These three sub-themes narrow down the focus of Trump's policies, which appear to align with conservative priorities. The third most prominent populist theme was Simplistic Explanations and Solutions, in which Trump offered explanations and solutions that oversimplified issues and often mischaracterized facts. Finally, The Dangerous Others emerged as the fourth most prominent populist theme with the sub-theme The Media scoring the highest of the sub-themes. This suggests that Trump attempts to delegitimize the media and intimidate journalists and news organizations. This tactic is employed by authoritarian leaders, which leads us to the topic of the next section, Authoritarian Traits in Trump's Discourse.

6.2 Authoritarian Traits in Trump's Discourse

The theme populist theme The Dangerous Others was the one specific theme in which Trump's authoritarian discourse was particularly observable. The theme of authoritarian discourse was divided into three sub-categories as shown in Table 7. These categories were (1) Discrediting the Free Press, (2) Undermining Institutions and (3) Dehumanizing Minorities and Immigrants.

The highest scoring category of authoritarian discourse was Discrediting the Free Press. Trump attempted to silence dissenting voices by discrediting the media, insisting it cannot be trusted and suggesting conspiratorially that *their agenda is not your agenda*. Indeed, all the occurrences categorized under the sub-theme The Media, in which Trump represented the media as threat or otherwise attempted to discredit journalists or media organizations were also categorized as authoritarian discourse. Therefore, of the three categories of authoritarian discourse identified, this was the most prominent with 360 occurrences in total adding up to 87 % of all authoritarian discourse identified in this study.

Table 7. Authoritarian Discourse

	Discrediting the Free Press		Undermining Institutions		Dehumanizing minorities and immigrants		Total	
Speech 1	31	94 %	2	6 %	0	0 %	33	100 %
Speech 2	18	67 %	9	33 %	0	0 %	27	100 %
Speech 3	9	100 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	9	100 %
Speech 4	28	62 %	0	0 %	17	38 %	45	100 %
Speech 5	44	98 %	0	0 %	1	2 %	45	100 %
Speech 6	19	90 %	0	0 %	2	10 %	21	100 %
Speech 7	0	0 %	6	100 %	0	0 %	6	100 %
Speech 8	124	98 %	1	1 %	2	2 %	127	100 %
Speech 9	42	100 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	42	100 %
Speech 10	45	74 %	12	20 %	4	7 %	61	100 %
Total	360	87 %	30	7 %	26	6 %	416	100 %

The second highest scoring sub-category of authoritarian discourse was Undermining Institutions, which included undermining members of co-equal branches of government (i.e. the Congress and the judicial branch) and the intelligence community, was identified in 30

occurrences (7 %) in total. Trump used this sub-category in only five speeches, ranging from one occurrence in Speech 8 to twelve occurrences in Speech 10. In this sub-category Trump, for example, undermined the judicial branch by referring to one of the courts as the *much overturned ninth circuit* and conspiratorially referred to the intelligence community as the *corrupt system.*

Even though Trump scored second highest in the sub-theme Dangerous Individuals or Groups, a sub-theme of The Dangerous Others, which included representing immigrants, terrorists, criminals and minorities as threat to the people, of these instances only 26 could be considered strictly authoritarian. In these instances, Trump dehumanized minorities and immigrants, most commonly by calling them *animals*. However, there is a spike in this sub-category in Speech 4 as can be observed in Table 7. This spike can be explained by the fact that Trump recited a poem called *The Snake* in which he dehumanized illegal immigrants by comparing them to snakes that are bound to bite and kill innocent citizens that only want to help them.

To summarize, the category of Undermining the Free Press emerged as the most prominent sub-category of authoritarian discourse, but some discourse relating to Undermining institutions and Dehumanizing Minorities was also found. This suggests that Trump's priority is to convince his supporters that what they see, hear and read in the media is not the truth, and that the only information they can trust comes from Trump himself. These findings are in line with what Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 81-87) have pointed out: according to them, an authoritarian leader attempts to silence the opposition. Since in the United States the institutions are strong and the First Amendment guarantees free speech, extreme steps such as jailing journalists are unlikely to happen. Therefore, Trump resorts to delegitimizing the media every opportunity he gets.

Based on findings of the quantitative content analysis, the qualitative analysis presented in the next chapter will focus on the four most prominent populist themes identified in Trump's speeches: 1) The Charismatic Leader, 2) Conservative Values, 3) Simplistic Explanations and Solutions and 4) The Dangerous Others. The authoritarian themes identified in the speeches will be analysed alongside the populist discourse.

7   QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I present the findings of the qualitative portion of this study. This chapter aims to answer research questions 2 and 3:

2. How does President Trump use strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation?

3. What kinds of features associated with authoritarianism can be found in President Trump's speeches?

For the analysis, I identified recurring topics in Trump's speeches and selected examples that demonstrate the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation or features of authoritarianism most comprehensively. The analysis begins from the populist theme of The Charismatic Leader, followed by the analysis of how Trump employs the theme of Conservative Values. Next, some topics that fall under the populist theme of Simplistic Explanations and Solutions are analysed. However, since this theme tends to overlap with other populist themes, some of its analysis is conducted alongside the analysis of the other populist themes. The chapter ends with the theme of The Dangerous Others, which according to the quantitative content analysis, includes many features of authoritarian discourse.

7.1 The Charismatic Leader

Populist movements are organized around a charismatic leader who presents themself as a saviour of the people, who as a member of the people shares a deep understanding of their plight and promises to serve as their voice (Rooyackers 2012: 136-137). The quantitative analysis demonstrated that Trump has three distinct sub-themes of presenting himself as the charismatic leader. Firstly, he employs the sub-theme of Personal Attributes and Connection to the People. Secondly, he keeps reminding his audience of the achievements that he has been able to deliver to the people: Materialized Success. Thirdly, he promises to deliver even more prosperity and success to the people when nobody else before him could: Future Success. In this section, I will present examples of recurring topics in the speeches and examine the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative-other presentation that Trump utilizes.

7.1.1 Trump – The Unique Leader, the Voice of the People

The results of the quantitative analysis show that within the theme of The Charismatic Leader, Trump scored highest in Personal Attributes and Connection to the People. Trump paints a picture of himself as the messenger of the people who fights for the forgotten men and women in Washington D.C., a leader who protects the people from both domestic and foreign adversaries. In addition, he emphasizes his unique ability to form relationships with influential people and his knack for finding ways to benefit his constituents.

7.1.1.1 The Messenger and the Saviour

Firstly, similar to how Geert Wilders operated in Austria (Rooyackers and Verkyten 2012: 135-137), Trump aligns himself with the people and presents himself as the brave messenger who is not afraid to speak up and fight for the people. Indeed, in Speech 1, Trump declares, *I'm the messenger.* He carries this topic of being the messenger of the people throughout the year. He frequently evokes the theme of the saviour, by using phrases such as *I hear your demands, I hear your voices, and I promise you I will deliver* in Speech 1 or *I came to Washington for you. Your dreams are my dreams. Your hopes are my hopes. And your future is what I'm fighting for each and every day* in Speech 8. In both instances, Trump employs collectivization to create the in-group by using the possessive pronoun *your* to imply that the people are united, they have common demands, voices, hopes, dreams and even a common future, at the same time excluding those Americans who did not vote for him, making them the out-group. He effectively aligns himself with the people by equating the people's hopes and dreams with his own. In addition, Trump uses a verb associated with war when he describes how he is *fighting* in Washington for the people, suggesting that there is an enemy, an out-group, who is resisting the will of the people.

Interestingly, in Speech 9, Trump makes a point of sharing the values of the people, while acknowledging that he is different from his prototypical supporters as shown in example (1).

> (1) I understand the people of Alabama. I feel like I'm from Alabama, frankly. Isn't it a little weird when a guy who lives on 5th Avenue in the most beautiful apartment you've ever seen comes to Alabama and Alabama loves that guy. I mean, it's crazy. It's crazy. But I do, I understand your values, I love your values and those are the values that I believe in.

Trump describes himself as *a guy who lives in 5ᵗʰ Avenue*, one of the world's most expensive locations – very different from Alabama. Yet he *feels* like he's from Alabama and he *loves* the values of Alabama. By choosing to use verbs that convey his emotional state, Trump is suggesting a deep emotional connection with the people and their values. In addition, Trump

employs the discursive strategy of spatialization by using the toponym *Alabama* as a personification, implying that all the people in Alabama support him and his policies, downplaying the possibility of dissenting voices. Finally, Trump uses repetition to demonstrate his involvement in Alabama values by repeating the words *Alabama* and *values* several times.

In speech 10, Trump creates polarization by highlighting his political opponents' negative qualities while contrasting them with his own positive qualities.

> (2) I took this job on behalf of the forgotten men and women of our country. But guess what? They are forgotten no more. No more. People came out of areas -- you know, they didn't think you existed. You know that, right? Remember? And do you remember the word deplorable? How brilliant was that? I was watching her with that speech. And she was reading a teleprompter, yet. And she said "deplorables.' And I said: Huh. That's not nice. She is talking about a lot of people. Little did I know, I was right. That thing blew up. That was one of the reasons she lost. And now we are all proud deplorables. We're proud deplorables. Very proud. Your voice will never ever be ignored again.

In example (2) Trump is using the involvement strategy of perspectivation by narrating the events from the first-person perspective and adding constructed dialogue to increase the effect. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (2004:135) state, that constructed dialogue as a form of discourse representation engages the attention of the audience, and he utilizes this strategy frequently and effectively. In the example, Trump evokes the populist trope *forgotten men and women*, and turns it upside down, since he is now representing them in the White House – *They are forgotten no more*. He declares that they, the political elites, possibly even more specifically the Democrats *didn't think you existed*, suggesting that the ruling class is completely out of touch with the reality of ordinary Americans. Trump then engages the audience with questions, *You know that, right?* and *Remember?*. He turns his original declaration about the elites not thinking the forgotten men and women even existed into a common narrative by engaging the audience in the cognitive exercises of knowing and remembering. Next, he turns to his former opponent Hillary Clinton and her use of the word *deplorables* to describe Trump supporters. He accentuates the importance of that event by vividly narrating the event in the past progressive tense (*I was watching* and *she was reading*). Trump describes how he said: *"Huh. That is not nice"* when Clinton used the word deplorables. With this small bit of constructed dialogue, or monologue to be exact, Trump highlights his alignment with the people Furthermore, by adding the little huffing sound in the beginning of the statement, he creates a sense of authenticity. Then Trump recounts how right he was to reject Clinton's description of his base, when *That thing blew up* – a vivid metaphor to describe the backlash Clinton experienced. Next, he declares, *Now we are all proud deplorables*, repeating the phrase *proud deplorables* twice and adding *Very proud* as an involvement strategy in order to create a sense of unity within the in-

group and turning the derogatory term into a rallying cry against the out-group, the political elites.

Trump frequently presents himself as the protector of the American people. He depicts the forces that he protects them from as either domestic in the form of political elites, special interest groups and the media, or foreign in the form of other countries or illegal immigration. For instance, in Speech 1, he declares,

> (3) I was elected to change our broken and dangerous system and thinking in government that has weakened and endangered our country and left our people defenceless. And I will not stop fighting for the safety of you and your family's, believe me. Not today, not ever.

In example (3) Trump describes the political system in America with the adjectives *broken* and *dangerous* and claims that the United States has been *weakened* and *endangered* and *our people have been left defenceless.* With this type of fear language Trump evokes an image of a faceless enemy that is threatening the in-group, his supporters who he deictically collectivizes as *our people*. Indeed, Trump promises that he will never *stop fighting* for his supporters' safety, evoking the imagery of a charismatic saviour.

Similarly, in Speech 5, Trump depicts himself as the saviour who will represent the people despite opposition.

> (4) We are not going to let the same failed and tired voices in Washington keep us from delivering the change you voted for and the change that you deserve, that you deserve. I do not answer to any donors or financial contributors. I don't care about them. I am not beholden to any consultants or any of the very powerful special interests. I don't care about them. I have to do what's right. And if they're right, that's good. We will never be intimidated by the dishonest media corporations who will say anything and do anything to get people to watch their screens or to get people to buy their failing papers. They are failing.

As a predicational strategy Trump describes a faceless enemy with vivid attributive adjectives – *failed and tired voices in Washington*. He claims this enemy is attempting to impede the change that Trump's supporters had *voted for* and that they *deserve*, setting emphasis on the word *deserve* by repeating it. Furthermore, Trump uses repetition when he attempts to convince the audience that he does not represent financial contributors, consultants and special interests, by repeating the phrase *I don't care about them* twice. Trump continues to claim that he does what is right, but interestingly adds, *And if they are right, that's good*, the pronoun *they* referencing to special interest groups. This small off-script concession implies that despite his assurances, he is open to listening to the contributors, special interests and the consultants who he just denounced. Finally, using a predicational strategy Trump depicts the media as an unreliable source by using the attributive adjective *dishonest.* He states that *we will never be intimidated* by them, referring either to himself alone in the first-person plural, or him and his supporters as a collective. If the first interpretation is presumed to be correct, the phrase evokes

an image of a brave leader, who stands up to smear campaigns by the media. In addition, Trump implies that the media is lying about him only for profit when he states that they *will say anything and do anything to get people to watch their screens or to get people to buy their failing papers* He enhances this imagery with a referential strategy, i.e. using the noun *corporations* that has more financial connotations instead of a more neutral word like *organizations*.

Trump expands on this topic in Speech 6, by again reassuring that he is not beholden to anyone and claiming that the media is attempting to silence either him or conservatives in general.

> (5) We will never be beholden to the lobbyists or the special interests. We will never be silenced by the media. I want to protect America, and I want to protect the citizens of America. Your hopes are my hopes. Your dreams are my dreams. I've had a great successful career. I've built a great, great business. This is the only thing that matters. This is the only thing that matters.

Since example (5) begins by Trump referring to himself in the first-person plural in *We will never be beholden to the lobbyists*, it is safe to assume that he is referring to himself, when he states, *We will never be silenced by the media*, the verb selection alludes that the media is actively trying to silence him, even though in reality the media constantly covers everything the president says and does. When he immediately moves on to say, *I want to protect America and I want to protect the citizens of America*, he is implying by proximity of the sentences that the lobbyists and special interests are the ones he is protecting the people from. Next, Trump repeats the phrases that he frequently uses in his speeches, *Your hopes are my hopes. Your dreams are my dreams*, aligning himself with the people. Then he goes on to state that he has had *a great successful career* and he has built *a great, great business*, implying that since he is rich, he has no need to listen to anyone but the people, emphasizing the message by repeating twice, *This is the only thing that matters*.

Trump also presents himself protecting the United States from other countries. In speech 9, he approaches the topic as follows:

> (6) As I said during my address to the United Nations, "I will always defend America's interests above all else". I'm here for you. I'm not here for global interests. […] For years they've said America first, although I'm the one that really means it.

In this extract, Trump refers to his address to the United Nations, in which he said, *"I will always defend America's interests above all else"*. Trump is again using discourse representation to signal involvement by narrating the even from the first-person perspective. In addition, by stating the fact that he said the phrase in front of the delegates of the member nations of the UN, Trump again presents himself as a brave leader, who is not afraid to speak up against the rest of the world. He also implies a contrast between the interests of his supporters

and other countries by stating, *I'm here for you. I'm not here for global interests*. Finally, Trump presents himself as a unique leader by stating, *For years they've said America first*, *although I'm the one that really means it*, thus differentiating himself from all the other Presidents before him, portraying himself as the ultimate protector of the nation.

In speech 4, Trump presents himself as a protector of *American lives*, which are in danger from illegal immigrants as follows:

> (7) As I campaigned across the nation, I met with the grieving mothers and fathers of children who had been killed, viciously killed, violently killed, by illegal immigrants. And I made them a promise, "We will protect American lives. Your family member will not have died in vain."

In this extract, Trump is again using perspectivation by narrating events from the first-person perspective, signalling involvement. He weaves the point he is trying to make into a story of himself meeting voters on a campaign trail. As a predicational strategy he describes the in-group, Americans who had lost loved ones, with the attributive adjective *grieving* and nouns that evoke emotions – *mothers and fathers*. In contrast, he describes the out-group as *illegal immigrants*, the attributive adjective functioning as a predicational strategy emphasize their criminality. Furthermore, Trump signals his own emotional involvement and engages the audience emotionally by describing the act of killing with graphic adjectives *viciously* and *violently*. He makes his point in the most engaging form of discourse representation, constructed dialogue; he had made a promise to the parents to protect American lives, so that the death of their child would have meaning.

7.1.1.2 The Only One Who Can Fix It

In the previous examples, Trump has been shown to use discourse representation in the form of constructed dialogue to promote his role as a protector and also to highlight his alignment with the people. However, for Trump, discourse representation in the form of constructed dialogue is also a very common strategy to emphasize his personal ability to be a common-sense leader who puts the interests of the American people first. For example, in Speech 1, Trump demonstrates the audience his unique ability to spot key details that affect the American people. He re-enacts the following discussion in relation to the construction of the Key Stone Access pipeline as follows.

> (8) And very importantly, as I was about to sign it, I said, "Who makes the pipe? Who makes the pipe?" Something this audience understands very well, right? Simple question. The lawyers put this very complex document in front. I said, "Who makes the pipe?" They said, "Sir, it can be made anywhere". I said, "Not anymore". So, I put a little clause on the bottom: The pipe has to be made in the United States of America if we're going to have pipelines.

In example (8), Trump first presents himself as a sharp and attentive person by remarking that *as* he was about to sign the contract, he noted, "*Who makes the pipe*", as if this was an unique observation, made at the last minute, that only he within his administration even thought of. Next, he highlights how attuned he is with the people by adding, *Something this audience understands very well*. He then contrasts the lawyer's indifferent attitude to the American people, who Trump as president is defending, by retelling their response, "*Sir, it can be made anywhere*", implying that the lawyers' do not consider the employment of the American people to be a factor to be considered in making such deals. To this indifferent response, Trump replies sharply and decisively, "*Not anymore*", insinuating that with him in office, things are run differently. Finally, he intensifies the image by recounting how he *put a little clause on the bottom: The pipe has to be made in the United States of America if we are going to have pipelines.* This final sentence serves two purposes: Firstly, by referencing the official name of the country, United States of America, Trump evokes patriotic imagery in the audience, Trump is fighting for Americans and the United States of America. Secondly, with the unconditional declaration of *if we are going to have pipelines* Trump positively presents his unyielding character and willingness to play hard ball.

In the same speech, Trump also promotes his ability to deal with financial matters and his importance on the world stage. He recounts a conversation with the prime minister of Japan as follows:

> (9) In fact, when the Prime Minister of Japan – Prime Minister Abe, who's great; great guy – when he came over, he said, "Thank you". I said, "For what?" "You saved us many, many millions of dollars on the F-35 fighter jet." Because when I negotiated, I took our allies into the same negotiation.

Trump begins his story by stressing that he is dealing with a very high-level world leader by referencing Shinzo Abe twice with his title, *the Prime Minister of Japan – Prime Minister Abe*. He then demonstrates how at ease he is with this leader by complimenting his character, *great guy*, implying that they have a friendly relationship. Next, Trump depicts Abe almost in a subservient position as he recounts how Abe thanked him for saving Japan *many, many millions of dollars on the F-35 fighter jet*. Trump implies that without his negotiation skills even other nations will lose money, thus emphasizing the importance and benefits of his leadership not only in the US but in the international community as well.

In Speech 3, Trump again uses discourse representation to demonstrate his unique way of finding solutions to problems. He recounts a conversation with representatives of Harley Davidson as follows:

> (10) They came in. I said, "How you doing?" "Great" "How's business?" "Great" "How do you do overseas?" "Well, it's tough. We have countries that charge us a $100 [sic] import tax". I said,

"100?" Think of it, they want $100 – 100 percent. So, I said, "How do you do?" "Not so well. It's tough" They have other countries; they charge a lot. We want reciprocal. So, if they are going to charge us 100 percent, we're going to charge them 100 percent.

In example (10), Trump asks many questions from the representatives of Harley Davidson to present himself as an attentive leader who wants to know the real state of affairs in the corporation. When he finds out that import taxes are a problem for the corporation, he immediately comes up with a solution to the problem which he shares with the audience. In addition to accentuating his personal attributes as a leader, this example of discourse representation crosses over to the theme of anti-intellectual discourse and presenting simplistic solutions in particular. When Trump states, *We want reciprocal. So if they are going to charge us a 100 percent we're going to charge them 100 percent*, he is offering a simple solution to a complex problem and at the same time preparing his constituents for tariffs on foreign goods, which he later imposed on several nations as a forceful negotiation tactic in order to get better trade deals.

7.1.1.3 The Respected Leader

Trump also uses discourse representation to demonstrate how respected and influential he is among politicians. In Speech 5, Trump recounts a phone conversation with the former governor of Iowa, Terry Branstad, as follows:

(11) I remember about a year ago when Terry Branstad was saying all of these great things, your governor. So, I called him up, and I said, "Listen, you've been doing this for 24 years. You want to do something else? Like how would you like to be ambassador to China?" And I didn't think he'd really do it. It's a long trip. Twenty-one hours? That's a lot of plane time. But he wants to do what's right for the country. And I said to him tonight, I said, "I wasn't sure you were going to do it". He said, "When my president calls me to help him with our great country, I do it". That's what he said to me. I thought it was nice.

Trump begins the story by letting the audience of Iowans know that their former governor had said *all of these great things* about him, thus representing himself as a well-liked person among the political leadership in Iowa. Trump then frames his request to nominate Branstad the Ambassador to China as something so big that the then governor Branstad would not possibly be able to accept it by citing the *long trip* and *a lot of plane time*. However, Branstad had agreed and Trump recounts his surprise, *"I wasn't sure you were going to do it"*, to which Branstad replies, *"When my president calls me to help him with our great country, I do it"*. Here, Trump describes Branstad calling him *my president*, suggesting devotion and subservience.

Trump uses a similar form of discourse representation in Speech 9. Trump is in Alabama to support Senator Luther Strange in the Republican primaries and the discussion represented in

the next example is intended to demonstrate Strange's good characteristics, but instead turns into a demonstration of how liked and influential he himself is.

> (12) Now I call Luther Strange. I say, "Oh, I've got to call this guy", and he's a no, right? And I say, "Senator, I need your help." I said, "I've got to get your vote on health care". He says, "You've got it". I said, "What do you mean I have it?" Because I've just been hammered by all of these people, right? "What do you mean I have it?" He said, "Sir, I was for you right from the beginning, I knew you were going to win, I knew you were going to win the whole thing. I've always been for you, my family has always been for you. And honestly, Mr. President, if you want my vote, you have it."

In example (12), Trump describes Strange as a no-vote in terms of a healthcare bill the congress was about to take up. In the example, he requests Strange's support and immediately Strange states, *"You have it"*. Trump expresses surprise, *"What do you mean I have it?"*. Next, Trump recounts an effusive praise from Strange, in which Strange describes how he had supported Trump during his presidential run, how his whole family supported him and finally proclaiming, *if you want my vote, you have it*. Trump appears to imply that his personal leadership is the reason Senators come to support legislation that they might otherwise oppose, by framing Strange as being opposed to the bill (*he's a no right?*) and still describing him easily offering Trump his support just because Strange had known he was going to win and how he had *always been for Trump*. Thus, Trump uses constructed dialogue to present himself as an irreplaceable, unique leader that the Republican Party cannot afford to lose quite effectively and engagingly.

Interestingly, examples (9), (11) and (12) all have in common a moment in which Trump expresses surprise at his ability to deliver. In example (9), when Prime Minister Abe thanks him, Trump asks, *"For what?"*. In the story about Governor Branstad (example (11)), Trump was not sure if Branstad would comply with his request to accept an ambassadorship to China, and in example (12), Trump is surprised that he gets Strange's vote on health care quite effortlessly. His utterances of surprise can be viewed as a strategy to emphasize his instinctive ability to make a good deal and the idea that he is such a good deal maker that he can persuade people to his will without serious attempt.

In speech 8, which takes place at his first rally after the Charlottesville riots[1], Trump addresses the resignation of the members of his Economic Council in protest of his reluctance to condemn white supremacists. In example (13), he uses discourse representation to minimize the importance of those resignations.

> (13) And many of those people, you know, the Economic Council? When it got a little heat with the lies from the media, they sort of said, "Oh, we'll take a pass. […] But they'll say, " We take…

---

[1] The Unite the Right rally was organized by white supremacist groups in August 2017. The confrontations between protestors and counter-protestors turned violent, resulting in a death of one counter-protestor. (Heim 2017).

> Oh, we'll take…" But people are now calling me, people that have been like we'll take a pass. "Don, can we get together for lunch? Let's do it privately instead of through a council".

In example (13), Trump depicts *the lies from the media* as the reason why the members of the Economic Council resigned in protest and making them say publicly *we'll take a pass*, while at the same time, according to Trump, the very same people were privately reaching out to him. The use of his nick name *Don* and the request to *get together for lunch* is designed to imply casual and perhaps even cordial relationships between himself and the former members of the Economic Council – a sign of the effectiveness of his one-on-one leadership style. Furthermore, that cordial tone is meant to suggest that the people reaching out to him do not feel Trump did anything wrong and that they wish to continue working with him, just not publicly to avoid *heat*, in other words, the public scrutiny from those who do condemn white supremacy. Therefore, the discourse represented the example, is an attempt to convey that despite their resignations, the former members of the Economic Council understand Trump's aversion to the media and appreciate his leadership.

In section 7.1.1, I have investigated the strategies of positive self-presentation Trump uses to construct an image of a unique and effective leader. The most notable strategy of positive self-presentation for Trump is discourse representation. By recounting vivid stories of discussions with leaders, politicians, CEO's and average Americans, he involves the audience effectively and at the same time accentuates his involvement in the issues. Furthermore, by employing discourse representation Trump to avoids overt bragging about his characteristic and instead, is able to give the impression that all these people in the stories have either directly found him to be an effective leader and stated as much or at least have had the chance to experience his positive characteristics. Trump also uses strategies of negative other presentation, especially predicational strategies in the form of attributive adjectives to contrast his opponents with the glorified image he creates of himself.

7.1.2 Touting Achievements

As a part of constructing his image as a charismatic leader Trump likes to tout his achievements – no matter if they are real or not. Frequently, Trump points to progress being made since his inauguration, the increasing employment numbers, the booming stock market, the decrease in illegal immigration and his election victory. In this section, I will explore the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation that Trump employs when discussing these topics.

7.1.2.1 Vague Victories

Trump frequently talks about his achievements since his inauguration, but refers to them very vaguely, not going into much detail. For instance, in Speech 2, he states as follows:

(14) It has been a little over 50 days since my inauguration, and we have been putting our 'America First' -agenda very much into action. You see what is happening. We're keeping our promises. In fact, they have signs: "He's kept his promises". They're all over the place. I have. We have done far more… I think maybe more than anybody has done in this office in 50 days. That I can tell you.

Trump states that his administration has been executing *our* America First agenda. The collectivizing pronoun *our* emphasizes Trump's alignment with the people. Next, he employs the *topos of reality*, by stating, *You see what is happening*, arguing that his statement is valid, because people can see that it is. Then Trump assures that *We're keeping our promises* and supports the statement tautologically by the fact that people at the rally have signs that say, *He's kept his promises*. He finishes the statement by hyperbolically claiming that he has *done more than* any president in the same period of time but does not offer any evidence just his own assurance, *That I can tell you*.

Trump returns repeatedly to this vague notion of success that he has produced. For example, in Speech 5 Trump states, *And we are making such incredible progress. We are making progress like nobody can believe.* By using the hyperbolic expressions *such incredible progress* and *progress like nobody can believe*, Trump continues to construct the image of a charismatic leader and highlights his ability to produce what the people wanted from him when they voted for him. Furthermore, in Speech 7, Trump further aligns himself with the people while negatively presenting the others by stating

(15) We are fighting for every American who has been overlooked, pushed aside, or told to put their dreams on hold. But we will win and we're winning now.

The verbs *overlook*, *push aside* and *put* dreams *on hold* contribute to an image of an arrogant elite that does not care about *the people*. Next, Trump assures the people that *we will win and we're winning now*, but uses the verb *win* just as a buzzword without providing any definition of what winning actually means.

7.1.2.2. Economic Achievements

Trump uses the topic of jobs that he has created to present himself in a positive way to his audience. For example, in Speech 2, Trump states,

(16) "…because of this new business climate, we are creating jobs that are starting to pour back into our country like we haven't seen in many, many decades".

Trump refers to *a new business climate* as the reason why *we are creating jobs*. He is using the active present continuous tense to emphasize his administration's significance in creating jobs. As Trump continues his utterance, he employs a force of nature metaphor when he defines the jobs as *starting to pour back into our country*, as if the process is something that his administration started with the new business climate, but has turned into an inevitable process that benefits his supporters. Trump is also implicitly arguing that because this has not happened *in many, many decades*, his policies must be better than his predecessors'.

Trump frequently employs the *topos of numbers* in order to strengthen his position as a leader. For example, in Speech 9, he states,

> (17) I authorized the construction of the Keystone Pipeline and the Dakota Access Pipeline, over 50,000 jobs, 50,000 beautiful construction jobs

In example (17), Trump is the agent that sets in motion the events that caused the generation of *50 000 beautiful construction jobs*. The repetition of the number 50 000 is used to convey the notion that this achievement is formidable. In addition, by describing the construction jobs with the attributive adjective *beautiful*, Trump signals that these jobs are extremely important to him. In another instance, Trump incorporates a nationalist element to the topic of creating jobs. In Speech 1, he states as follows:

> (18) In Arizona, Intel – great company – just announced it will open a new plant that will create at least 10,000 brand-new, beautiful American jobs.

Here the jobs that Intel has announced to create are again *beautiful* and also *brand-new* and significantly *American.* Richardson and Wodak (2009: 262) argue, that when members of the British Nationalist Party use terms such as 'British' or 'Britons', they refer only to white, Christian citizens, excluding all other ethnic or religious groups. It is likely, that Trump signals a similar ideology, when he refers to *American jobs*. Therefore, the creation of those jobs makes him the defender and saviour of the white, Christian segment of the population, which is a large part of his base.

Similarly, Trump argues that he is an effective leader because he has reduced unemployment. For instance, in Speech 6, he states as follows:

> (19) But I think that with few exceptions no president has done anywhere near what we've done in his first six months. Not even close. But they don't let you know. They don't want to write about it. That unemployment last month hit a 16-year low. Since my election, we've added much more than 1 million jobs.

In example (19), Trump argues that he is better than most previous presidents because he has achieved so much his first six months. He then creates an out-group by using the pronoun they, in reference to the media, who *don't let you know*, while the pronoun *you* references the in-group, his supporters. Trump, then, goes on to recount the achievements that he vaguely

referenced to in the beginning of the quote. When Trump mentions the increasing number of jobs, he explicitly connects the number to himself by stating, *Since my election*. His choice to use the possessive pronoun *my* can be seen as a strategy of positive self-presentation, because, as noted before, Trump has a tendency to refer to his election victory as *our election* in order to align himself with his supporters. This time, however, Trump accredits the achievement all to himself.

Another accomplishment that Trump credits to himself is the booming stock market. For instance, in Speech 4, he discusses it as follows.

> (20) And, by the way, the stock market, since our election is through the roof. I believe, from the point of the election, isn't it too bad that the Obama administration gets a lot of credit for those couple of months. But it's all right, because we're doing fine, but they get credit for that because people started going wild with the stock. But I believe we have a record, from the time we got elected — from November 8th — we have a record, an all-time record, for the biggest increase in the stock market.

In this example, Trump again uses the pronouns *we* and its possessive form *our* in order to align himself with *the people*. He refers to *our election* and argues that *we're doing fine* and states that *we have a record, from the time we got elected*. Therefore, Trump is suggesting that the people who voted for him are now enjoying the economic boom as a result of the policies he has implemented – the policies that the people wanted and Trump delivered. Furthermore, Trump attempts to reinforce his argument that his election alone was the catalyst for the rising stock markets by suggesting that the credit the Obama administration receives is unjustified. He does this by making a point about the out-group, the Obama administration, getting *a lot of credit* for the months between the 2016 election and Trump's inauguration in January 2017 when *people started going wild with the stock*. In addition, Trump uses several hyperbolic expressions (*through the roof*, *going wild*, *all-time record*) and the superlative *the biggest increase* as an involvement strategy, signalling that this issue is of great significance, and he wants the audience to internalize that the rising stock markets should be associated with him alone.

7.1.2.3 Victory over Illegal Immigration

Another feat that Trump frequently claims credit for is the decrease in illegal border crossings. For example, in Speech 5 Trump employs the *topos of numbers* to argue that his election is the reason for this development.

> (21) Since I was elected, illegal border crossings... and this is without the wall, before the wall...have decreased by more than 75 percent, a historic and unprecedented achievement.

Firstly, Trump connects the 75 percent decrease in border crossings with his election, by beginning the statement with the phrase *Since I was elected* instead of a more general expression that would convey the same period of time, for instance, *since last November.* Secondly, he uses the hyperbolic adjectives *historic* and *unprecedented* to describe the *achievement,* a positively charged substantive in itself. In addition, Trump evokes his campaign promise of building a wall on the southern border of the United States by stating, *and this is without the wall, before the wall.* Therefore his argument is that his election has benefited the people, because the number of illegal border crossing has come down, and the fact that he has not even fulfilled his campaign promise of building the wall makes this development an achievement that should be credited to him simply because he holds the office of the presidency.

Trump also talks about the effect he has had on border security in terms that are much vaguer than numbers. For instance, he states as follows in Speech 2:

> (22) Now the wall is way ahead of schedule in terms of where we are. […] But the border by itself right now is doing very well. It is becoming very strong.

Trump begins by stating that the *wall is way ahead of schedule*. Using the adverb *way*, he conjures up an image of an unexpected achievement, even though he has not (at least not in this speech) defined what the schedule is. Later, he claims that even without the wall there has been positive developments at the border. Interestingly, by making the border the subject of the last two sentences, Trump makes it sound as if the border is a sentient organism. The phrases *doing very well* and *becoming very strong* could well be associated with a person recovering from a bout of illness. This is how Trump makes it appear as if his presidency is healing the problem of a broken border. Using descriptive language that employs adjectives and adverbs as an involvement strategy is an effective way for Trump to signal his involvement and engage the audience.

7.1.2.4 The Big, Beautiful Victory on November 8th

Another frequently occurring achievement that Trump talks about is his election victory. In many instances, he brings it up in the beginning of the speech as he is greeting the audience. For example, in his first speech of the year in Florida, Trump states,

> (23) This is a state where we all had great victory together.

Similarly, in the Speech 4 in Pennsylvania, Trump says of the state,

> (24) …it carried us through a big, beautiful victory on November 8th.

Firstly, in both these instances, Trump uses the first-person plural, when referring to the ones who won, creating an in-group of *we,* the people, who were the ones that had a *great victory*

and a *big*, *beautiful victory*. The hyperbolic adjectives magnify the importance of the event. Furthermore, the addition of the adverb *together*, enhances involvement by emphasising the importance of the connection between Trump and his voters. In addition, the subject in the quote from Speech 4 is the pronoun *it*, referring to the state of Pennsylvania. When he uses this toponym as a metonym, he propagates the impression that all of Pennsylvania voted for him, although in reality Trump only got 48.6 % of the votes, while Hillary Clinton came in a close second with 47.9 %, and the actual number of votes by which Trump won was only 44292 (CNN Politics 2016a).

Similar to Speeches 1 and 4, in Speech 3, Trump brings up the election victory only a few minutes into the speech. This time he talks about it more extensively:

> (25)   Most importantly, we are going to take power back from the political class in Washington, and return that power to you, the American people. It's happening. It's happening. It's happening. It started on November 8th. Remember that beautiful, beautiful day? That beautiful day. We're going to give it back. That was a beautiful day.

In example (25), Trump connects his victory to taking *power back from the political class in Washington* by stating, that November 8th was when it began. Trump is using repetition in order to convince the audience that *It's happening*. He names the specific date, November 8th, just like he did in Speech 3, suggesting high involvement. Next, he asks the audience, *Remember that beautiful, beautiful day?* By the excessive use of the adjective *beautiful* and the repetition *that beautiful day*, Trump signals the importance and significance of the event.

Trump frequently uses hyperbole to emphasize the importance of his victory. For instance, in speech 9, Trump states,

> (26)   But we had such a great victory. It was just something that was awe-inspiring and something that I think everybody in this room will never, ever forget.

This time Trump not only declares his election to be *a great victory,* but also takes the rhetoric even further by calling it *awe-inspiring*, an excessively hyperbolic adjective that signals high involvement.

In several instances Trump evokes the cognitive function of remembering when talking about his election victory. In speech 9, example (26), he used the antonym of remembering: something *that I think everybody in this room will never, ever forget.* In Speech 3, example (25), Trump asked if the audience remembered *that beautiful day*. In addition, in Speech 3. Trump went on to describe his victory in more detail.

> (27)   They weren't giving us a lot of chance, were they? Remember? "There is no path to 270."Remember the line? And you know, for the Republicans, the Electoral College was very, very hard, very hard to win. Do you remember the famous line? "There is no path to 270!" Well, there was a path to 306, but maybe not to 270.

The repeated references to remembering appear to be a way of engaging the audience and constructing a narrative of a legendary event, describing the victory as something the audience can remember and share among each other and to others. Wodak (2015: 12, 134-138) describes populist leaders as *performing* the role of the rock star -like saviour. In Trump's narrative, we can see him constructing a legend of himself as the underdog (*There is no path to 270!*), who against all odds achieved *a big, beautiful victory* that the people *will never ever forget.* Again, Trump employs attributive adjectives as an involvement strategy to signify the importance of this event.

In section 7.1.2, I have provided examples of the most prominent topics that Trump lists as his achievements in order to present himself as a competent leader and identified argumentation strategies, involvement strategies and referential strategies that Trump uses as means of positive self-representation and negative other representation. Firstly, he employs the topos of numbers when arguing for his competency. He does this when taking credit for the increase in jobs and the decrease in illegal immigration. Secondly, as involvement strategies Trump uses hyperbolic expressions, adjectives, metaphors and repetition. Thirdly, in terms of referential strategies, he uses deictics to create both polarizations between in- and out-groups and take credit for achievements and toponyms to exaggerate his popularity. Fourthly, Trump's lexical choices are designed to reflect positively to himself and negatively to his predecessors. Next, I will move on to the final sub-theme of The Charismatic Leader, Future Success.

7.1.3 Promising Future Success

In addition to emphasizing his personal qualities and recapping achievements that have already materialized during his presidency, Donald Trump also attempts to bolster his image as the saviour by making promises of future successes to come. Frequent topics are the increasing number of jobs and repealing and replacing Obamacare. In addition, Trump's repertoire includes vivid descriptions of a golden era that is dawning upon Americans. In this section, I will provide examples of these topics, and analyse them in relation to the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

7.1.3.1 The Bringer of Jobs

Trump frequently promises his supporters, that the number of jobs will increase. For example, in Speech 3 in Kentucky, Trump associates the decreasing number of jobs in coal industry with

environmental regulations implemented by previous administrations, and to counter this trend he is promising changes in the policies of the Environmental Protection Agency.

> (28)   As we speak, we are preparing new executive actions to save our coal industry and to save our wonderful coal miners from continuing to be put out of work. The miners are coming back! Our new EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, a Kentucky native, will turn the EPA – environmental – will turn the EPA from a job-killer into a job-creator. You watch.

In example (28), Trump uses several strategies of positive self-presentation to signal his involvement in creating jobs. Firstly, Trump involves his administration actively by beginning the sentence with the adverbial clause *As we speak* to create a sense of constant action behind the scenes. Furthermore, he is stating in the present continuous, that his administration is *preparing new executive actions* that will result in saving jobs in the coal industry – again, emphasizing action and signalling involvement. Secondly, Trump is signalling his attachment to the coal miners by adding the attributive adjective *wonderful* to describe them. In addition, he chooses to use the verb *to save* to describe the effects of the executive actions – literally invoking the image of the saviour. Furthermore, Trump creates a faceless enemy by using the passive voice when he suggests that the executive orders will save the miners from *continuing to be put out of work*. He does not define why and because of whom the miners are *put out of work*, but just simply states that the trend is *continuing* unless the administration interferes. Next, he promises the audience more jobs in coalmining with a short, sound-bite sized exclamation: *The miners are coming back* – a tag-line that is easy to remember. Trump then moves on to his new EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, describing him *a Kentucky native*. This noun phrase aligns him with the people in the audience, since the rally is being held in Kentucky, the implication being that Pruitt has the interests of the people of Kentucky at heart[2]. He then describes the effect that Pruitt will have on the EPA as turning it from a *job-killer to a job-creator*. Trump is using very graphic language when referencing the EPA, thus giving the referential strategy a predicational element when he contrasts *job-killer* with *job-creator*. The use of these two words evokes imagery of the previous administration taking life vs. the new administration giving life – the messianic saviour in action.

Another elaborate example of the ways in which Trump approaches the topic of jobs can be in Speech 6. He vividly narrates a story of himself and his wife casually pondering the employment situation in Ohio on his way to the rally.

> (29)   I'll tell you what. I rode through your beautiful roads coming up from the airport, and I was looking at some of those big once incredible, job-producing factories, and my wife, Melania, said "What happened?". I said, 'Those jobs have left Ohio.' They're all coming back. They're

---

[2] Before his appointment to lead the EPA, Scott Pruitt was the Attorney General of Oklahoma. In that position, he fought aggressively against environmental regulation, suing the agency multiple times. Pruitt eventually resigned amid ethics and management scandals (Brady and Eilperin 2018)

all coming back. Don't move. Don't sell your house. Don't sell your house. Remember, I got a lot of credit. This is hard to believe but the press gave me a lot of credit because a number of years ago I said this is the time to buy a house during one of my speeches. I said, "Go out and buy", and they did this big story, "Trump predicted". Let me tell you folks, in Ohio and in this area, don't sell your house. Don't sell your house. Do not sell it. We're going to get those values up. We're going to get those jobs coming back, and we're going to fill up those factories or rip them down and build brand new ones. It's going to happen.

Trump narrates the story from the first-person perspective, signalling his involvement in the issue. He also uses several adjectives (*beautiful, big, incredible)* and a participle to describe what he sees (*job-producing*). By describing the factories he sees as "once incredible, job-producing", Trump evokes the myth of the golden age when everybody had jobs and Ohio was a vibrant state. He then moves to add constructed dialogue between him and his wife, in order to highlight their personal interest in the issue. In addition, the line Trump attributes to his wife (*"What happened?")* is something a person might say when unexpectedly encountering a scene of devastation, thus giving an impression of a disaster that has hit the factories of Ohio. Trump narrates how he explains to his wife, that the *jobs have left Ohio*, thus suggesting that those jobs still exist, but companies have moved manufacturing overseas. Next, Trump moves on to address the audience, and declares *They're all coming back*, repeating it twice, thus emphasizing the bright future ahead. Trump then advices the audience to stay in Ohio (*Don't move. Don't sell your house. Don't sell your house*), again using repetition to emphasize his message. Trump continues with another narrated of a story as a legitimation for this advice. Employing t*he topos of history*, he argues that since he has previously given good investment advice, he must be right this time as well. Interestingly, Trump uses the press as an authority that gives validity to his claim (Thi*s is hard to believe but the press gave me a lot of credit […] I said, "Go out and buy", and they did this big story, "Trump predicted"*). Next, Trump again repeats his advice three times, and then moves on to promising a prosperous future. Trump credits this success to himself and his administration by using the pronoun *we* in reference to himself and his administration, and promising several positive outcomes by using the verb phrases *[a]re going to get those jobs coming back / [a]re going to fill up those factories / rip them down / build brand new ones*. Finally, with an air of inevitability, Trump asserts, *It's going to happen*. With all these strategies of positive self-presentation Trump constructs an image of himself as the all-knowing saviour who will restore the economy in Ohio and bring back the elusive golden age that has been lost.

7.1.3.2 Delivering Great Health Care

Another topic on Trump's list of future achievements is healthcare. Frequently, Trump approaches the topic by stating his intention to repeal and replace Obamacare, and by comparing the Republican plan to Obamacare. However, he is often somewhat hazy on the details. For example, in Speech 2 he declares,

(30)   The end result is when you have phase one, phase two, phase three. It is going to be great.

This statement does not have any meaningful details on what the new healthcare plan is like. In the first sentence Trump just declares that there will be three phases, and the second sentence only describes the plan only with a positive predicative adjective *great*. Similarly, in Speech 6, Trump states,

(31)   We're now one step closer to liberating our citizens from this Obamacare nightmare, and delivering great health care for the American people.

Again, Trump describes the Republican plan with the attributive adjective *great,* while Obamacare is referenced by the graphic noun phrase this *Obamacare nightmare*, in which the noun *nightmare* carries extremely negative connotations. In addition, Trump describes the process of repealing and replacing Obamacare as *liberating our citizens*. The phrasing carries associations of people being held hostage or under siege, and with the use of the possessive pronoun *our* as a modifier, the suggestion is that the one keeping the people hostage or under siege is not one of us. The end result is that the Democrats with their nightmare-like healthcare plan are the enemy while Trump and the Republicans are presented as saviours, who will make healthcare *great*.

7.1.3.3 Promises of the Elusive Golden Age

Frequently, towards the end of the speech, Trump spends a few moments describing a conservative golden age that is about to dawn. These passages appear to be scripted, since Trump's phrasing is fairly similar at the closing of most speeches. Therefore, it appears that the purpose of these passages is to serve as an uplifting ending to the rally and leave the audience with a sense of hope and expectation. For example, in Speech 4 Trump reads the following passage from the teleprompter:

(32)   Just imagine what we could accomplish, if we all started working together to rebuild this nation, the nation that we so dearly love. Our jobs will come back home, our dying factories will come roaring back to life. It will be a beautiful thing to watch. And this is what's going to happen in the United States of America, and it's going to happen soon. And it's actually already happening. Cities small and large will see a rebirth of hope, safety and opportunity. America's children will be taught to love their country and take pride in our great American flag. And other countries (and you see that happening) will finally treat America, and our citizens, with the respect that our country and our citizens deserve.

Trump begins this passage by directly addressing the audience and asking them to *imagine* this golden era that he connects with patriotism (*the nation that we so dearly love*). Next, Trump presents the future almost as a fact waiting to happen by forming the future tense with the auxiliary verb *will*, which includes no hedging. When he declares, *Our jobs will come back home*, the possessive pronoun *our* as a modifier for *jobs* suggests that the jobs of *the people* – the in-group – have been given to *the others* – the out-group – but this injustice is about to be corrected. The same strategy is used in the following sentence, with the addition of the participle *dying* as an adjective attribute to the noun *factories*, signalling even higher involvement in the narrative. Moreover, the contrast between the participle *dying* and the verb phrase *will come roaring back to life* gives the clause a poetic, animalistic nature, which emotionally involves the audience with the message. Trump continues with several affirmative sentences that employ adjectives and adverbs that assert that the future will be *beautiful*, and the promises will turn into reality *soon.* Interestingly, he suddenly switches from the future tense to the present continuous, when he declares, *And it's actually already happening*. This could possibly be an attempt to present himself as an effective leader, who is all about action. In addition, for those in the audience, who have not yet seen any change in their lives, this statement is an expression of prosperity manifesting somewhere close to them, giving them hope, that they are just on the cusp of that beautiful future.

Trump continues his message by promising *a rebirth of hope, safety and opportunity*, and extends these positive developments to everyone by employing the toponym *cities* to represent the people in those places. In addition, by referring to this development as *rebirth*, that the people will experience, he suggests that currently there is no hope, safety and opportunity, but their antonyms despair, danger and adversity. Thus, Trump is implicitly attempting to present his predecessors negatively. Next, Trump promises a future where patriotic values are held in high regard, with the education system teaching *America's children to love their country and take pride in our great American flag.* He emphasizes the homogeneity of the people by using the toponym *America's* as a modifier for children, and referring to *our great American flag,* implying that those who do not respect the flag are not Americans. It should be noted that this statement is a reference to NFL players protesting social injustice and police brutality against African Americans by kneeling during the National Anthem. Trump visits this topic in many of his rallies, and it be discussed more extensively in section 7.4.2. Finally, Trump's vision of the future includes other countries respecting America again. The use of the adverb *finally* implies that America has not been previously respected on the world stage. Moreover, by adding

the interjection *and you see that happening* in the middle of the sentence, Trump argues that his statement must be true, because the people see the increasing respect for America with their own eyes.

Finally, in all but one of the speeches, Trump recites an oath-like passage together with the audience. The content and the phrasing have little variation from speech to speech. For example, in Speech 4, the passage goes as follows:

(33)   Together, we will make America strong again. We will make America wealthy again. We will make America prosper again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again!

The overall message of the oath is that if the people support Trump, the future of America will be bright. In the oath Trump uses the collectivizing pronoun *we*, which suggests homogeneity and unity among the people. In addition, the pronoun aligns Trump with the people: he presents himself as the person who will deliver these common wants, if the people keep supporting him. The goals cited in the oath are to make America *strong / wealthy / prosper / proud / safe* and *great*. The adjective *strong* most likely implies military strength, since the quantitative portion of this study showed Trump scoring highest in the sub-theme of Patriotism and Military within the populist theme of Conservative Values (see section 7.2.2). Similarly, the goals to make America *wealthy* and *prosper* relate to his economic policies in terms of lower taxes and trade deals (see sections 7.2.3 and 7.3). However, when Trump states, *We will make America safe again*, it begs the question, safe from whom? According to the quantitative portion of this study, Trump represented immigrants and citizens who do not support him as the dangerous others (discussed in detail in section 7.4.2). Thus, when Trump vows to make America safe, he perpetuates the idea that right now his supporters are in danger from those dangerous others. Similarly, the adjective *proud* is perhaps intentionally vague. It may refer to pride of all the wealth and prosperity Trump is promising or, on the other hand, pride of American nationality, which in populist discourse refers to white, Christian identity. Interestingly, in example (33) Trump ends every sentence with the adverb *again*. The word choice suggests that at some point in the past America has been all these things he has just recited. Therefore, he attempts to evoke the conservative myth of the golden age that has been lost, but which he as the saviour will bring back.

Interestingly, example (33) has echoes of an authoritarian sub-move-set, *wishing further success*, identified by Khany and Hamzelou (2014: 919). The oath is usually preceded a sequence that describes conservative ideals like patriotism and the golden era that conservatives long for, as shown in example (32) and includes a racist dog-whistle, as discussed above.

Therefore, similar to Mussolini's call to arms "People of Italy! Rush to arms and show your tenacity, your courage, your valour!", Trump's call to *make America great again* is encouraging his supporters to stand for their common values and to fight for their common goal to make the country *great* the way Trump's white base understands it.

In section 7.1.3, I have analysed the most prominent topics in Trump's speeches that he uses to promise further success under his leadership from the perspective of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Trump frequently uses referential strategies that carry features of predication. This means that he employs nouns that carry positive or negative connotations in order to present an individual or a group in a positive or negative way. He also uses toponyms as a referential strategy to over-represent unity among the in-group. As strategies of involvement, Trump employs discourse representation and frequently uses adverbs and adjectives to engage the audience and bring more colour to the topic. Furthermore, Trump creates polarization through lexical choices. He assigns verbs and nouns with positive connotations to his administration's actions and negative connotations to those of his predecessors'. In addition, all but one of the speeches include a sequence similar to a sub-move-set called "wishing further, which can be found in dictator's speeches success (Khany and Hamzelou 2014: 919).

7.2 Conservative Values

As was shown the quantitative portion of this study, Trump scored second highest in the populist theme of Conservative Values. The sub-themes of the theme Conservative Values identified in the quantitative portion of this study are Patriotism and Military, Law and Order, Limited Government, Religion and Family Values. Patriotism and Military, Law and Order and Limited Government were the most frequently occurring ones of the sub-themes. Therefore, sections 7.2.2., 7.2.3 and 7.2.4 are devoted to examining the afore mentioned sub-themes in detail from the perspective of strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. First, however, I will provide an overview of how Trump uses conservative values in uniting his base.

7.2.1 The Conservative Values That Bind

Conservative values unite the Republican base. Trump uses these values as a strategy to create an in-group and to emphasize the homogeneity of the *demos*. In Speech 7, Trump summarizes conservative values as follows.

> (34) Everyone in the arena is united by shared values. We believe in God, we believe in family, we believe in country. We support the Constitution of the United States of America. We cherish and defend the Second Amendment. We believe schools should teach students to love our country, to have pride in our history, and to respect our great American flag. We stand with the incredible men and women of law enforcement. […] We believe strongly that a nation must defend and protect its borders. And above all else, we believe that we must take care of our own citizens and put America first.

Trump begins by stating that *everyone* who has come to his rally shares the same values leaving no room for diversity or dissenting opinions. He emphasizes the message by using simple short sentences with the personal pronoun *we* as the subject. These types of summaries about the beliefs of the in-group are where Trump explicitly mentions *God* and *family* but does not go into further detail on these topics.

In contrast, even in this short excerpt, Trump brings up patriotism in several sentences. When he states, *We believe schools should teach students to love our country, to have pride in our history, and to respect our great American flag*, he suggests that the education system should be used to spread the values of his base. Trump also brings up the military aspect of patriotism by stating, *We believe strongly that a nation must defend and protect its borders*. By choosing to use the verbs *defend* and *protect,* Trump invokes imagery of the borders being under attack by some unknown threat. Moreover, he emphasizes the importance of this homogenous belief with the adverb *strongly*, thus making it a key feature of their shared values. At the end of the excerpt Trump declares, *And above all else, we believe that we must take care of our own citizens and put America first*. The adverbial phrase *above all else* highlights Trumps focus on his nationalist *America first* -ideology. He creates an in-group of *our own citizens,* excluding, quite significantly, both legal and illegal immigrants by choosing to emphasize citizenship as the requisite to being taken care of.

Since the Republican Party has traditionally been the party of law and order, Trump brings up supporting the Constitution and the law enforcement as a value that his supporters share unanimously. In example (34), Trump lists three key topics that conservatives focus on: The Constitution, the Second Amendment and the men and women of law enforcement. As a strategy of positive self-presentation, he chooses to use the verb *to defend* in connection with supporting the Second Amendment, which implies the Second Amendment is under attack, thus presenting the out-group as a threat to *our* way of life. Furthermore, Trump declares the law

enforcement officials as a part of the in-group by using the verb phrase *stand with*. Furthermore, he highlights the importance of the officers both to himself and his base by using the attributive adjective *incredible*.

The one final conservative value that Trump did not reference in example (28) is the populist sub-theme Limited Government. However, according to the quantitative analysis presented above, Limited Government is the third most frequently mentioned conservative value in Trump's speeches. Indeed, in Speech 6 Trump declares, *In America we don't worship government. We worship God.* Once again, Trump represents the American people as a homogenous group by using the collectivizing pronoun *we* and suggests that limited government control and Christianity are values that all Americans share.

In this section I have provided an overview of how Trump defines conservative values and how he uses them to define the in-group and the out group. Next, I will move on to explore the three conservative sub-themes in detail.

7.2.2 Patriotism and Military

This section focuses on how Trump utilizes the sub-theme of Military and Patriotism in terms of strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. I will explore how Trump defines patriots and patriotism, how he connects patriotism and economy and how he discusses the military and the veterans.

In his speeches, Trump uses the strategy of predication; creating in-groups and out-groups by focusing on who are patriotic Americans and who are not. For instance, in Speech 1 he approaches the issue as follows:

> (35) I want to be in a room filled with hardworking American patriots, who love their country, who salute their flag, and who pray for a better future.

Firstly, Trump uses a nomination strategy as a strategy of positive self-presentation when he uses the word *patriots* do describe his audience. Secondly, as a predicational strategy, he uses the attributive adjectival particple *hardworking* to describe his audience, evoking the populist theme of the common people versus the elites. Thirdly, Trump not only defines the patriots as loving their country, which is the general definition of a patriot, but also adds the notion of saluting the flag.

Respecting, saluting or standing for the flag is a topic that Trump visits frequently in his Speeches. Indeed, the flag is a symbol of the country, but in this context the phrase has additional meaning – it excludes those who do not salute the flag from patriots, from belonging

to the in-group. Trump returns to this theme of standing for the flag in more detail in latter speeches and connects it to those who he presents as the dangerous others. (The topic will be further discussed in section 7.4.2 Dangerous Individuals or Groups). Finally, by stating that patriots *pray*, Trump connects religion with patriotism. Therefore, Trump defines patriots as religious conservatives, the majority of whom, incidentally, support him. This implies that he attempts to convey that religion is a key aspect of American conservatism. Moreover, taking into account the previous suggestion that Trump-supporters are patriots, his insinuation is that conservatives are the true patriots. This, in turn, implies that those who do not fall in this category not patriotic, and thus, belong to the out-group.

Similar to example (35), Trump contrasts the political elites with patriotic Americans in Speech 5:

> (36) It's always terrific to be able to leave that Washington swamp and spend time with the truly hardworking people. We call them American patriots.

Trump again defines patriots as *hardworking*, but this time contrasts them with the political elites that he references with the degrading metaphor *Washington swamp*. Just as in example (35), in which Trump stated, he wanted to *be in a room filled with American patriots*, in example (36) he aligns himself with the common people by expressing his desire to be with *the truly hardworking people* instead of the political elites, and expresses his involvement with the people by using the attributive adjective *terrific* and the adverbs *always* and *truly*.

Trump also engages in economic patriotism. He emphasizes that Americans are the ones that he is protecting with his job, trade and immigration policies. In Speech 4, there are several examples of how he approaches the topic.

> (37) We are ending the offshoring and bringing back our beautiful, wonderful, great American jobs.
> (38) And we're taking steps to renegotiate or cancel any agreement that fails to protect American interests.
> (39) We are operating on a very simple principle that our immigration system should put the needs of American workers, American families, American companies, and American citizens first.

In these examples, Trump uses the adjective *American* to define who or what his policies are benefiting. As was discussed in section 7.1.2, the word *American* in his discourse can be assumed to refer to white, Christian citizens, who form a large portion of his base. As a rhetorical strategy, this is similar to how the terms 'British' and 'Britons' in the discourse of the British Nationalist Party refer to white, Christian section of the British population (Richardson and Wodak 2009: 262).

In example (37), Trump uses three adjectives to describe jobs to signal his involvement. Interestingly, the adjectives that he has chosen to use are unusual in terms of the noun they are

describing: *beautiful* and *wonderful* are not adjectives generally associated with *jobs*, but Trump does use them frequently when he wants to express involvement to any issue (e.g. *beautiful construction jobs, beautiful clean coal, wonderful, beautiful tax cut.*). In addition, it should be noted that all three examples reflect simplistic solutions to the complex problem of unemployment. This topic will be further explored in section 7.3 Simplistic Explanations and Solutions.

When Trump discusses the military, he mainly talks about either increasing military strength or veterans' issues. The way in which he discusses the military's capabilities varies from short, vague, hyperbolic generalisations to more lengthy descriptions on the issue. For example, in Speech 2 he states,

> (40)   You see what we are doing with the military. Bigger, better, stronger than ever before.

Trump uses three adjectives in their comparative forms in order to contrast what he is doing now with the entire history of the US military *(than ever before)*. Similarly, in Speech 4, he declares,

> (41)   We will have the finest military that we've ever had at any time in the history of our country.

As an involvement strategy, Trump uses a superlative form of an adjective, *the finest,* the adverbial *ever* and the adverbial phrases *at any time* and *in the history of our country*.

In contrast to the vague, hyperbolic generalisations, Trump can go into great detail in describing how he supports the military, as demonstrated by the following excerpt from Speech 9.

> (42)   We've increased our military and defence budget to the highest level it's been probably ever. It's going to be over $700 billion. We're going to rebuild it. We are rebuilding. We're ordering new fighters; we're ordering new jets. You know what's been happening. The jets are so old that the father flew them, and then the son goes into the Air Force, and he flies the same plane.

Trump begins by describing hyperbolically the increase in spending, using the superlative *the highest* and the adverbial phrase *probably ever*. However, the adverb *probably* functions as a hedge to provide cover just in case fact-checkers prove this information to be inaccurate. This time, in comparison to other similar hyperbolic descriptions, Trump adds meaningful information by referring to numbers that support his claim. Next, he goes on to explain how they are using the money to rebuild the military, specifically by appropriating money for aircraft. He justifies this spending by describing the state of military planes with a vivid example that emotionally engages the audience in what is happening in the military. By describing how a son and a father may end up flying the same plane, Trump makes it easier for the audience to grasp the age of the planes, which negatively reflects on previous administrations, the allusion being that they did not supply sufficient funding for the military. This allusion is supported by the previous use of the verb *to rebuild*, which implies that the military infrastructure is in a state

of decay and must be repaired. At the same, the example evokes the conservative ideal of patriotic families, who serve the country generation after generation.

Trump's other approach to discussing issues related to the military is his administration's policies regarding veterans. For example, in Speech 6 he states as follows:

> (43) We have signed new legislation to hold federal workers accountable for the care they provide to our great, great veterans. Veterans Accountability Act. They've been trying to get that done for many, many, many years, even decades. And you understand why it was tough, but we got it done.

In example (43) Trump takes credit on signing the Veteran's Accountability Act into law, claiming that *they*, i.e. the previous administrations, could get it done *for many, many, many years, even decades*. He claims that passing the law was *tough*, but his administration *got it done*. Again, Trump represents himself in a positive light by emphasising how he was able to pass the law, even though it was difficult, and at the same time uses colloquial expressions to describe the complex process of legislation to relate to is base. In contrast, he presents his predecessors ability to legislate in a negative light by focusing on the time they had to pass the bill, using repetition *many, many, many years*) to emphasize his point.

Furthermore, in Speech 9, Trump goes into greater detail on what was happening to veterans before he took action.

> (44) For 40 years, they couldn't get it passed. So you would have people working in the VA who were sadists, who would abuse our great, great people, our great veterans. By the way, 25 years before, they would have had their ass kicked by the same person that they're abusing. They would have been in trouble. They would have been in trouble. Twenty-five years earlier, they wouldn't be doing it. But that's the way it is. But they're sadists, or they're doing a bad job, or they're not working. You couldn't fire them.

In example (44), Trump again states that other administrations could not get the bill signed, but this time, instead of repeating the vague adjective *many,* as he did in example (43), Trump cites a specific number, *40 years*. His intention is still the same: to present the previous administrations as ineffective. As a predicational strategy, Trump goes on to describe the care workers in fear-inducing terms, employing the strategy of nomination when he uses the predicative noun *sadists* and the descriptive relative clause *who would abuse* the veterans, who he, in contrast, characterizes by repeating a positive attributive adjective *great, great people*. Furthermore, as a collectivizing discursive strategy, Trump references the veterans with the possessive pronoun *our*, aligning them with the in-group, the Trump supporters. Therefore, Trump uses referential strategies to create a dangerous out-group who threatens members of the in-group. Next, Trump goes on to glorify the veterans' past military service by describing coarsely how the abusive care workers *would have had their ass kicked* by the veterans had they been in their prime. To emphasize the positive qualities of the in-group and the negative

qualities of the out-group, Trump goes on to repeat what he just said, using slightly different phrasing. Finally, Trump claims that before he signed the Veterans' Accountability Act into law, the workers could not be fired. This, however, is an oversimplified mischaracterization. According to Gore (2018), it has been possible to fire workers who neglect their duties in the past and the data shows, that since 2005, "terminations for discipline or performance" average about 2300 per year. The law only expedites the process of holding people accountable for their actions (Gore 2018).

In summary, Trump uses referential strategies, both strategies of nomination and predication, to represent in-group positively and the out-group negatively. For instance, through strategies of nomination, Trump defines his supporters, the in-group, as patriots, whereas with the out-group, he goes as far as to describe them as sadists. Trump also aligns himself with the in-group frequently with deictics; as has been shown several times, collectivizing pronouns appear frequently in his discourse, but his lexical choices, especially verb selection, also contribute to the alignment. As a strategy of predication, Trump assigns positive qualities to the in-group and negative qualities to the out-group mainly by using attributive adjectives. In discussing the military, Trump uses attributive adjectives and hyperbole as involvement strategy, to highlight the importance of the military. Similarly, Trump uses emotive examples to express his involvement in issues relating to the military and allusions of neglect to reflect negatively on previous administration.

7.2.3 The Law and Order President

The second most frequently occurring sub-theme found in the populist theme Conservative Values in Trump's speeches is Law and Order. In Trump's discourse, his support for law and order manifests in three distinct topics he frequently discusses. Firstly, he talks about the policies his administration implements in order to reduce crime, but without going into much detail. This topic frequently occurs with vows to protect law enforcement officials. Secondly, Trump puts law enforcement officials on a pedestal, describing them in glorifying terms. Thirdly, Trump emphasizes the importance of conservative judges and justices he has nominated and interpreting the constitution as written.

Trump summarizes these three topics of the sub-category of Law and Order in Speech 2, when he states,

> (45)   We are going to support the amazing, absolutely amazing men and women of law enforcement, protect your freedoms and defend the Second Amendment.

Firstly, Trump promises that his administration will support the law enforcement officials by using the collectivizing pronoun *we*. Secondly, as a strategy of predication, he describes the law enforcement officials as *amazing, absolutely amazing*, as if setting them on a pedestal by employing an adjective (*amazing*), which he repeats twice, and an adverb (*absolutely*). Thirdly, the declaration to *defend the Second Amendment,* which is a key issue for republicans, refers to the right to bear arms that is defined in the Constitution. Also, the phrase *protect your freedoms* can be interpreted as a reference to the Constitution, especially in terms of religious freedom, another key issue among conservatives, but it may also have additional meaning relating to limited government control over individuals, which is the topic of section 7.2.4

Trump frequently makes generalized statements about supporting law and order. For example, in Speech 5, he states as follows:

> (46) We're also working night and day to restore law and order to our country. Law and order. You know that. We're reversing the last administration's soft on crime policies that helped enable a tragic rise in violent crime.

To represent his administration in a positive light, Trump first creates an image of constant activity. He uses the idiom *night and day* to signal his administration's involvement. Second, Trump promises *to restore law and order*, emphasizing the significance of the issue by repeating the phrase *law and order*. Furthermore, by using the verb *restore*, he alludes that law and order no longer exists in the country. Moreover, in the last sentence of the excerpt. Trump places the blame on the previous administration, calling their policies *soft on crime*, and suggesting that those policies have resulted in increase in violent crime. By describing the rise of violent crime as *tragic,* Trump implies that the rate of the rise is high, since the adjective *tragic* can be associated with disastrous consequence. This, however, is a simplistic explanation on the issue. Even though the FBI reports increases in violent crime between 2004 and 2006 and between 2014 and 2016, the overall rate of violent crime in the US has fallen 49 % between 1993 and 2017, according to FBI data (Gramlich 2019). Therefore, Trump attempts to present the out-group, the previous democratic administration as dangerous, pro-crime administration, while in contrast, presenting himself as the head of a pro-law enforcement administration that acts quickly to right the mistakes of the opposition.

Trump's support for law enforcement officials can also be observed, for example, in Speech 6, in which he states as follows:

> (47) The Trump administration has the backs of our ICE Officers, our border patrol agents, and yes, our great police officers. And we have their backs 100%. We are going to also protect them, like they protect us.

Trump emphasizes his support by repeating twice that the administration stands by the law enforcement community with the colloquial expression *have someone's back*. He also promises to protect the law enforcement officials. On the surface, the remarks appear to convey traditional conservative ideas of respecting the law and law enforcement officials. However, earlier in the same speech, Trump described Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Officers as follows.

(48) We are dismantling and destroying the bloodthirsty criminal gangs, and well, I will just tell you, we're not doing it in a politically correct fashion. We're doing it rough. Our guys are rougher than their guys. I asked one of our great generals, "How tough are our people? How tough are they?" He said, "Sir, you don't want to know about it." Then I saw one guy come out, a customs officer who is a monster. I said, "So general, you think I could take that guy in a fight?" He said, "Mr. President, Sir, I don't even want to think about it." I said, "You're right, actually." We have tough people. Our people are tougher than their people. Our people are tougher and stronger and meaner and smarter than the gangs.

In the excerpt, Trump appears to glorify violent conduct by the ICE officers. First, Trump states that the way ICE operates is not *in a politically correct fashion* but *rough*. Second, Trump describes the ICE officers as *tougher and stronger and meaner […] than the gangs*, who he described as *bloodthirsty* in the beginning of the excerpt. The adjectives he has chosen to use imply physically violent behaviour, especially when taking into account that he begins the description by stating, that the operating procedure is not *politically correct*. Thus, such an expression is a euphemism for unlawful activities. Furthermore, Trump uses constructed dialogue to illustrate how *rough* the officers are. Interestingly, the exchange that Trump describes occurs with a *general*, which is a military rank. However, ICE is an agency operating under the Department of Homeland Security and does not have generals. Therefore, he appears to be conflating the military and civilian branches of government in order to represent the operations that happen at the Southern border as military scale operations in order to exaggerate the level of threat coming across the Southern border. In the conversation that Trump re-enacts, he first, recounts the general alluding that the officers are so *tough* that the President would not want to know about it – the implication being that the conduct is not legal or otherwise appropriate for the President to know. Secondly, as a strategy of nomination with predicative elements, Trump describes an ICE officer he saw with a predicative noun, *a monster*. He then goes on to engage the general in an exchange about whether or not the President *could take that guy in a fight*, to which the general replies, *"Mr. President, Sir, I don't even want to think about it"*. Trump's focus on the physical attributes of the officer (*a monster*) and his explicit reference to fighting the officer further conjures imagery of physical altercations happening at the border. Furthermore, Trump describes the agents as *tougher and stronger and meaner and smarter than*

the gangs – the gangs which he also describes as *bloodthirsty*. Therefore, I argue that Trump associates the adjective *tough* not with tenacity and perseverance but the ability to endure pain.

Within the populist theme of Conservative Values, the sub-category of Law and Order also includes discourse related to judges interpreting the constitution as written. Firstly, Trump frequently talks about his nominee for the Supreme Court. For example, in Speech 1 he states,

(49)   And there's another major promise I have kept to the American people: I've nominated a fantastic Justice to replace the late, great Justice Scalia.

Trump frames the nomination of the Justice as a campaign promise he has kept. Therefore, he is not only appealing to the audience's conservative ideology, but also emphasizing his own role in the process thus adding to the image of a champion of the people. Trump also signals his involvement in the issue having of conservative Justices in the Supreme Court by the using adjectives: The campaign promise of nominating a conservative justice, is referred to as *major*, thus highlighting its importance as a part of the campaign platform. The current nominee is described as *fantastic*, which is arguably even more positive an adjective than *great,* which is attributed to Justice Scalia. Scalia was a conservative Justice appointed by Reagan, whom Staab (2006: xxi) characterizes as "a staunch opponent of affirmative action, abortion rights, the right to die, and homosexual rights". Staab also describes Scalia being in favour of, for example,. a stronger role of religion in society, deregulation and property rights – all issues of significant importance to Trump's base. Therefore, by evoking the late Justice Scalia, Trump suggests that his *fantastic* nominee will continue the tradition of Justice Scalia in terms of supporting these conservative policies.

Secondly, Trump frames the originalist interpretation of the Constitution as a value that the people share and the others oppose. For instance, in Speech 6, he states,

(50)   We support the Constitution of the United States and believe that judges should interpret the constitution as written and not make up new meaning for what they read.

Using again the collectivizing pronoun *we*, Trump represents his supporters as a homogenous group, who support the originalist interpretation of the Constitution, which he more colloquially calls as interpreting the Constitution *as written*. In addition, Trump contrasts *the people* with *the others* with an air of righteousness, when he colloquially states that Justices should not *make up new meaning for what they read*. Trump alludes that judges appointed by democrats twist the meaning of the Constitution, and therefore, do not share the values of his base.

Similarly, in Speech 9, Trump brings up the Constitution, more specifically the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms, in a fear stoking example of what would have happened if Hillary Clinton would have been elected president.

(51) We're getting a lot of things done. They hate to admit it. Including we have a Supreme Court justice, Judge Gorsuch, who will save how about a thing called your Second Amendment, right. OK, remember that? If Crooked Hillary got elected, you would not have a Second Amendment, believe me. You'd be handing in your rifles. You'd go like… You'd be saying here, here, here they are. You'd be turning over your rifles.

Again, Trump touts nominating Neil Gorsuch into Supreme Court as his achievement, and in the process takes a jab at his opponents (*They hate to admit it*). By stating that Gorsuch will *save [...] your Second Amendment*, Trump implies that the Second Amendment is in danger of being repealed. Trump goes on to illustrate his point by narrating a hypothetical scenario, in which guns would be confiscated by the government. Trump turns Hillary Clinton into a symbol of liberal gun control policies, suggesting that, had a democrat been elected president, the right to bear arms would have been repealed. Trump signals his derision for Clinton and all she represents by employing a strategy of nomination, calling her Crooked Hillary, a reference that carries connotations of deceitful tactics and corruption – being against the rule of law, against the constitution.

In summary, Trump presents himself and his administration as supporters of the law enforcement community by using predicational strategies to present the law enforcement officials in a positive light. He also uses idioms, repetition and adjectives as involvement strategies to emphasize his involvement in issues relating to law enforcement. In contrast, Trump uses allusions to present previous administrations' relationships with the law enforcement community in a negative light. In the case of his political opponent, he implicitly accuses her of breaking the law through a strategy of nomination, thus representing as someone who does not care about the law. Disturbingly, Trump presents law enforcement officials as ready to bend the rules and engage in physical conflict through the frequent use of the predicative adjective *tough* and other lexical choices that relate to physical violence. Through this type of discourse, he implicitly, and on occasion even explicitly, endorses violent behaviour. In terms of appointing conservative judges and justices, Trump uses positive attributive adjectives as a strategy of predication to present these judges and justices favourably. He also uses collectivization to present the in-group as united in supporting the originalist interpretation of the Constitution and uses allusions as strategy of predication to suggest that the out-group distorts the meaning of the Constitution, thus presenting more liberal judges in a negative light.

7.2.4 Limited Government

The third most frequently occurring sub-category in the populist theme Conservative Values found in the quantitative portion of this study was Limited Government. Trump summarizes this sentiment in Speech 6, *In America we don't worship government. We worship God*, meaning that government should not interfere in the lives of the people, their faith should be their sole authority. His most common approaches to this sub-category include discourse on deregulation, taxation and healthcare policy.

In section 7.1.3, the topic of deregulation was discussed in terms of Trump using it as a device to prop up his image as charismatic saviour, who will bring jobs back through deregulation of the energy industry. Indeed, the main angle from which he approaches the topic is the creation of jobs. As previously discussed, he promises *to turn the EPA from a job-killer into a job-creator* (example (28)), the suggestion being that environmental regulations are the reason people are unemployed. Similarly, Trump states as follows in Speech 2:

> (52) We began a dramatic effort to eliminate job-killing federal regulations like nobody has ever seen before. Slash, slash. We are going to protect the environment; we are going to protect people's safeties. But let me tell you, the regulation business has become a terrible business, and we are going to bring it down to where it should be, okay?

Trump uses the adjective attribute *job-killing* when referring to regulation as a strategy of predication and involvement to present regulation as a threat to the people. Furthermore, as seems typical of him, Trump uses hyperbolic language to describe his administration's approach to environmental policies, calling it a *dramatic effort [...] like nobody has ever seen before*. He emphasizes this point with the onomatopoetic utterance *Slash, slash* with an accompanying hand movement to illustrate the brute force he is using to tackle regulation. Moreover, he simplifies the issue of environmental protection by stating, *they are going to protect the environment* and *people's safeties* but does not offer any actual solution on how the administration plans to do that. In contrast, he moves on to *tell* the audience, that regulation is *terrible business*, firstly, using the attributive adjective as an involvement strategy to express his feeling toward it, and secondly, using the noun *business* as a strategy of nomination to present environmental regulation as an industry from which some faceless entity benefits financially at the expense of the people. Finally, Trump offers a simplistic solution to *bring* [regulation] *down to where it should be*, again, not specifying anything, just vaguely promising to *bring it down*, which is what the conservative base wants.

As an involvement strategy, Trump uses many attributive adjectives that have extremely negative connotations to describe regulation, e.g. *job-killing* and *terrible* in example (52).

Similarly, in Speech 3 he refers to regulation as *devastating anti-coal regulation*. In addition to the negative attributive adjective, the noun phrase *anti-coal regulation* is a strategy of nomination that emphasizes how regulation is against the coal industry, and by extension against those Trump voters that work in the field.

Once again, Trump uses graphic metaphors for regulation both as a strategy of predication and involvement, especially when connecting regulation with the previous democratic administration. For instance, in Speeches 4 and 9 respectively, he states,

> (53)   We've removed the shackles on energy exploration imposed by the last administration, lifting the restrictions on the production of oil, shale, and natural gas.

> (54)   I've ended the Obama administration's war on coal, and we're putting our wonderful coal miners back to work producing beautiful clean coal.

In example (53), Trump references regulation of the fossil fuel industry as *the shackles on energy exploration*, a metaphor, which gives the impression that regulating the fossil fuel industry hinders progress, when it actually directs the energy production towards renewable sources of energy. Similarly, in example (54) he uses the metaphor *war on coal* (reminiscent of George W. Bush's very literal *war on terror*), to suggest that the Obama administration was on a deliberate campaign to eliminate the coal industry at the expense of the coal miners whom Trump, with a simplistic solution, promises to *put back to work*. Finally, Trump uses positive adjective attributes both as a strategy of predication and a strategy of involvement when he describes the miners as *wonderful* and the product itself as *beautiful*. Furthermore, he references the product as *clean coal*, a nomination strategy that includes an element of predication that implies that coal is an environmentally friendly form of energy, which is not.

As an involvement strategy, Trump uses detailed examples to describe how the environmental protection policies he is dismantling affect the people. In Speech 5, he states as follows:

> (55)   Homebuilders are starting to build again. We're not confiscating their land with ridiculous rules and regulations that don't make sense. Farmers are able to plough their field. If they have a puddle in the middle of their field, a little puddle the size of this, it's considered a lake and you can't touch it. And if you touch it, bad, bad things happen to you and your family.

In example (55), Trump refers to environmental regulation related to building and landscape protection as *ridiculous rules and regulations that don't make sense*. He is mitigating the importance of environmental protection by using the adjective attribute *ridiculous* and emphasizing it with a relative clause that appeals to common sense – an example of simplistic explanations. Furthermore, he mitigates the importance of environment with a strategy of nomination, when he employs the belittling noun phrase *a little puddle* to refer to a body of water, and emphasizes the point by repetition accompanied by a pinching hand gesture to

illustrate the insignificance of that body of water. In contrast, he exaggerates the reach of the EPA by suggesting that they arbitrarily consider this – according to Trump's definition – insignificant body of water a lake and, therefore, apply regulations under false premises. Furthermore, Trump attempts to stoke fear against the agency. He connects the vaguely threatening phrase *bad, bad things*, in which the emphasis on the repeated attributive adjective *bad* functions as an involvement strategy to engage the audience, with strategy of nomination designed to appeal to emotion, *you and your family*. The effect is that the EPA is presented as a mafia-like organization that punishes the people*,* if they do not adhere to rules and regulations.

In Trump's speeches an essential part of the sub-theme of Limited Government is lowering the tax rate. True to his style, he approaches the issue with hyperbole. For instance, in Speech 2, Trump declares, *We are going to reduce your taxes. Big league. Big! Big!*. Trump emphasizes his message by repeating the word *big*, in order to convince the audience of the enormous benefit that they will have because of his administration's policies.

In the last rally of the year, Speech 10, which was held only less than two weeks before the final vote on the Tax Cut and Jobs Act, Trump details what the plan entails, with the intention of presenting the in-group, Republicans, positively, while presenting the out-group, the Democrats and the media, negatively:

> (56) We're on the verge of passing that wonderful, beautiful tax cut. It's the biggest in the history of our country. It doubles the amount of income taxed at the rate of zero. It lowers tax rate. It expands the child -- you know that, the child tax credit so broadly. It provides relief from the estate tax, also known as the death tax. It cuts small business taxes. It reduces the corporate rate, very importantly, from 35 percent, which is the highest in the industrialized world, all the way down to 20 percent. You're going to have new companies coming in. You're going to have jobs, jobs, jobs. And it brings corporate money from overseas back where it belongs. And we're talking about possibly in excess of $4 trillion that we can finally bring back. The typical family of four earning $75,000 will see an income tax cut of up to $2,000 cutting their tax bill in half. People don't know it. And they don't want to report it. These people don't want to report it. Our business tax cut is expected to raise annual income for the typical household by more than $4,000. They don't want to tell you that. They don't want to tell you that. Fake news.

Once again, Trump begins with a hyperbolic characterization of the tax bill the Republicans are about to pass. He uses the adjectives *wonderful* and *beautiful* as a strategy of involvement to signal how beneficial the tax cuts will be, and as a strategy of predication, hyperbolically labels the tax cut as *the biggest in the history of our country*[3]. He goes on to provide several examples and to cite numbers in order to argue for the need to pass the bill; the corporate tax rate of 35

---

[3] This claim is false. There have been several larger tax cuts in US history (Jacobson 2017).

% being *the highest in the industrialized world*, corporations stashing $4 trillion overseas and married couples with two children getting their taxes cut in half. [4]

After this positive self-presentation, Trump moves to negative other-presentation. He claims conspiratorially, that *they* [the media] *don't want to report* the previously described benefits of the tax plan, using deictics to signal that the media belongs to the out group. Trump later repeats this claim in slightly different phrasing, *They don't want to tell you that*, which he repeats twice as a strategy of involvement. As a strategy of predication, he closes with his derogatory term for the mainstream media, *Fake news*. Furthermore, Trump's frequent use of the pronoun *they,* when referring to the media, reinforces the idea that the media is not on *our* side*, they* are the dangerous others.

Trump continues the characterization of the tax bill by positively presenting Republican policies and contrasting them with negative presentation of policies suggested by the Democrats.

> (57)   Our plan means more companies will move to America, stay in America, and hire in America. We want every American to know the dignity of work, the pride of a pay-check, and the satisfaction of a job well done. The Democrats in Washington want to grow our welfare rolls that you're going to pay for. They want to grow all sorts of things that you don't want to even think about.

Again, Trump uses the personal pronouns to create an 'us vs. them' –contrast in terms of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. When he describes the Republican (*our*) plan, he not only draws on patriotic values when he repeats the words *America* and *American,* but at the same time excludes immigrants. In addition, by employing the words *dignity*, *pride* and *satisfaction*, Trump evokes images of a better future for the middle class, which is what *we*, the Republicans, want. Moreover, the claim about companies coming to and staying in America and hiring American just because of the tax bill is a simplified solution to the complex problem of unemployment, which fails to consider automation and other economic incentives besides taxation for companies to transfer their operations abroad. Similarly, as an involvement strategy, Trump frames the Democrats' policy of strengthening social security as *want[ing] to grow our welfare rolls* and adding that his supporters are the ones to pay for it. He, then, goes on to intimidate the audience further by vaguely alluding, *They want to grow all sorts of things*

---

[4] Trump's description of the corporate tax rate being the highest in the world is misleading. While the number (35 %) Trump cites as the corporate tax rate, is correct, according to PolitiFact, the effective tax rate is only 22 %,, putting the US at the same tax category with its economic peers (Greenberg 2017a). Moreover, the claim about $4 trillion of corporate money coming back to the US is not true, since corporations have only about $2.5 trillion overseas (Tobias 2017). In addition, according to *The Washington Post*'s fact check, the couple Trump describes is likely to get a tax reduction, but the exact sum would likely vary (Kelly et al. 2017).

that you don't want to even think about. This is a strategy that is very similar to the one he used regarding regulation in example (55) in which he alluded that *bad, bad things will happen to you and your family*, if environmental protection regulations are not adhered to.

Another interesting feature of the tax bill that Trump frequently touts is eliminating the estate tax. For example, in Speech 5, he states as follows:

> (58)   And we're also working very, very hard to get rid of the death tax so that you can pass your farms onto your children and onto your grandchildren. I don't know if we're going to pull that one off, but we're working very hard to do it. Right, Chris? This way you can pass your motorcycle on, OK. Forget about the farm. That's not so bad either. I've seen what you -- what you ride. Not so bad.

In order to positively present his administration's efforts to eliminate the estate tax, Trump emphasizes the amount of work they are doing by repeating the adverbial phrase *very hard* as an involvement strategy. Next, Trump attempts to make the estate tax a personal issue for the members of the audience by addressing members of a group called Bikers for Trump, whom he had previously recognized in the speech, and claiming that they will benefit personally from the elimination of the tax cut[5].

Another frequently visited topic in the sub-theme of Limited Government is healthcare. In Speech 4, Trump states,

> (59)   We're going to give Americans the freedom to purchase the healthcare plans they want, not the healthcare forced on them by the government.

This sentence reflects the 'every man for himself'–thinking that is at the heart of many conservative policies. When Trump refers to *healthcare forced on them by the government*, he is talking about The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009, which includes the individual mandate, i.e. everyone must have some form of health insurance or pay a tax. When Trump references the Affordable Care Act as *healthcare forced on them by the government*, Trump is using a strategy of nomination with elements of predication to present the program negatively. In contrast, Trump uses the same strategy to positively present Republican policy regarding healthcare. He does this by referring to his policy as *the freedom to purchase the healthcare plans they want*, which in this case is a euphemism for private health insurance This indicates that Trump wants to move from a partially taxpayer funded health care system to a system provided by private health insurance companies.

---

[5] Trump completely misrepresents the nature of the estate tax, tying it with farms and motorcycles. According to Tax Policy Center (2016), only about 50 small farms in 2017 paid any estate tax and it most certainly does not apply to individual items such as motor cycles, since, according to Tax Policy Center (2016) "estates with a gross value under $5.49 million need not file this return in 2017".

In Speech 2, Trump gives many simplistic explanations on what the Affordable Care Act is to justify the *repeal and replace* –solution he is offering.

> (60)   ...we are going to repeal and replace horrible, disastrous Obamacare. If we leave Obamacare in place millions and millions of people will be forced off their plans. And your senators just told me in your state you are down to practically insurers. You're gonna have nobody. You're gonna have nobody. And this is true all over. The insurers are fleeing. The insurers are fleeing. It's a catastrophic situation. There is nothing to compare it to because Obamacare won't be around for a year or two. So it's not gonna be like oh gee, they have this… Obamacare is gone. Premiums will continue to soar, double and triple digits in many cases. It will drain our budget and destroy our jobs.

Firstly, as a strategy of nomination Trump repeats the colloquial name of the current healthcare system, *Obamacare*, instead of using the official name of the program, The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Using this nomination strategy, he plays into the prejudices his supporters have toward the former president. Secondly, Trump uses several involvement strategies in this extract. In order to emphasize and exaggerate the problems *Obamacare* poses, he uses negative adjective attributes, *horrible disastrous, catastrophic*, all referring to a negative outcome. He also uses repetition as an involvement strategy, when he repeats *You're gonna have nobody* twice, same with the sentence, *The insurers are fleeing*. Thirdly, Trump uses verbs that induce fear to describe the alleged effects of the Affordable Care Act: he uses the verb *to flee* to imply panic among the insurers and the verb *to destroy* to refer to effects on the job markets. With the same intention, he claims that *in a year or two* the current healthcare system will be gone will be *gone*[6]. Furthermore, in order to stoke fear toward this policy, Trump describes the rise of premiums with the verb *to soar*, which suggests an unstoppable, force of nature –like phenomenon. In addition, his claim that the premiums will rise *double and triple digits* is a cherry-picked statistic. According to a database maintained by *The Washington Post* (WP Fact Checker 2020a), the average rise in premiums is about 25 percent, thus Trump uses exaggeration as discursive strategy to present the democratic policy in a negative light.

Similarly, when Trump discusses the Republican healthcare plan he relies on adjectives and adverbs, repetition and exaggeration, but in this case the intent is positive presentation. In Speech 4, Trump states as follows.

> (61)   And, by the way, we're going to get something great. We're going to get the premiums down. We're going to get the deductibles way down. We're going to take care of every single need you're going to want to have taken care of. But it's not going to cost that kind of money. We're going to bring it down. You're going to see it. Premiums down. We will repeal and replace Obamacare.

Firstly, Trump emphasizes the Republicans' active role in fixing the healthcare system by using the phrase *we're going to* in cataloguing his promises. Secondly, he characterizes the substance

---

[6] As of April, 2020, Obamacare is still in effect.

of Republican healthcare policy vaguely, predicating it as *something great.* He promises to bring the premiums *down* and the decreases in deductibles is further emphasized by the employing the adverb *way* as an involvement strategy. In addition, as a strategy of involvement, Trump later repeats the word *down* twice more to further emphasize his point that all the costs will come down. Thirdly, he engages in hyperbolic exaggeration as an involvement strategy when he declares, "We're going to take care of every single need you're going to want to have taken care of". To sum up his intention, Trump finishes with the Republican catch phrase *We will repeal and replace Obamacare.* It should be noted that these characterizations of the healthcare policy are also categorized as simplistic solutions, since Trump does not provide any strategy on how the Republican party intends to lower the cost of healthcare, let alone *take care of every single need you're going to want to have taken care of.*

In summary, Trump's aim in discussing policies related to small or limited government is to present Republican policies as means to a near-perfect society where everyone prospers, whereas Democratic policies are presented as a path to disaster. Trump achieves this aim by employing strategies of predication and involvement often indistinguishably. He does this by using attributive adjectives and metaphors to designate policies either as good or bad and to engage the audience and express his own involvement in the issues. Other frequently occurring strategies of involvement are hyperbole and repetition. Trump uses hyperbole especially in promoting Republican policies to create an image of a prosperous future, whereas repetition functions as a rhetorical device to emphasize his point about a policy, positive or negative.

Now that I have analysed how Trump uses strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation in discourse related to the populist theme Conservative Values, it is time to move on to the third most commonly occurring theme found in the quantitative portion of this study – Simplistic Explanations and Solutions.

7.3 Simplistic Explanations and Solutions

This section focuses on the third most frequently occurring populist theme in Trump's speeches: Simplistic Explanations and Solutions. In the quantitative analysis this theme was found to intertwine with other populist themes, which is why it already has been discussed to a limited extent alongside with the analysis of other populist themes. The examples presented in this section, however, are chosen in a way that they clearly represent Trump's strategies of

simplifying the issues he brings up. The topics analysed in this section are immigration and trade policies, Trump's strategies for job creation, and the US relationship with NATO.

Trump's immigration policy focuses around his proposed wall on the Southern border, which he mentions in all the speeches analysed in this study. For instance, Trump states the following in Speech 6:

> (62) After spending billions of dollars defending other nations' borders, we are finally defending our borders. Don't even think about it, we will build the wall. Don't even think about it. I watched the media as they say, well, he just had some fun during the campaign on the wall. That wasn't fun, folks. We're building that wall, and walls do work and we're going to have great people come into our country, but we're not gonna to put ourselves through the problems that we've had for so many years.

Firstly, Trump frames the issue of immigration as a matter of protecting the homeland from a threat by using the verb *to defend*, which has military connotations. This connotation is reinforced by his direct references to US forces operating abroad. Secondly, he directly transitions from defending borders to building the wall, thereby implying that there is a threat coming from across the southern border. He offers a simplistic solution to this threat when he states, *We're building that wall, and walls do work, and we're going to have great people come into our country*. When Trump uses the attributive adjective *great* to describe the people who would be permitted to access the US, he is insinuating that the wall would prevent other people, dangerous people, from entering. He emphasizes this claim further by noting that previously *we*, that is the people, have been put *through the problems that we've had for so many years*. In addition, the wall on the southern border would prevent people from countries whose population is mainly people of colour entering the United States. When Trump talks about the great people whom he wants to come to the United States, there is also a racist connotation – he would prefer white people to enter.

In Speech 7, Trump further defines the qualities of immigrants he wants to accept to the US. This he does when he discusses the Raise Act, which would transform the US immigration system into a merit-based system.

> (63) I also proudly announced legislation this week with Senators Tom Cotton and David Perdue to reform our immigration system to protect American workers and American taxpayers. It is called the raise act. R-A-I-S-E - The Raise Act. For many years America has issued most of the green cards to lower-skilled immigrants and people who had no hope of getting a job, undermining blue collar workers and wages and costing taxpayers billions and billions of dollars a year. The Raise Act switches to a merit-based system. You come in largely based on merit. Doesn't that sound nice? Wouldn't that be nice? It is about time. Our proposal prevents new immigrants from going on welfare for at least five years. So you don't come in and go on welfare. Our plan favours applicants who can speak English, who can support themselves financially, and who demonstrate valuable skills that will strengthen our economy and strengthen our country. We believe decisions about who immigrates in our country should be based on the best interest of America and the best interest of the American people: You.

Trump justifies the need for the new merit-based system by using predicational strategies that imply a foreign threat to the in-group. He defines the in-group using the referential strategy of economisation, calling them American workers and American taxpayers, suggesting that Americans are good for the economy. In contrast, Trump, firstly, defines immigrants with the attributive adjective *lower-skilled* and a relative clause as people *"who had no hope of getting a job"*. Furthermore, he uses the *topos of finaces* when arguing for the merit-based system: he claims that the reform is justified because the current system undermines wages and costs *billions and billions of dollars a year*. Trump goes on to use the same argumentation strategy when he states, *Our proposal prevents new immigrants from going on welfare for at least five years. So you don't come in and go on welfare*, the implication being that this has been what the immigrants have been doing previously, taking advantage of the US social security network. Similarly, he uses the topos of finances to justify only specific individuals, those who *support themselves financially* and have *valuable skills that will strengthen our economy*. Furthermore, Trump summarises his argument for merit-based immigration by employing the topos of usefulness: America and the American people must benefit – *they* must be useful to *us,* hence *they* do not possess inherent human dignity, *their* value is defined by their usefulness to *us*.

In terms of trade policy, Trump's speeches include, firstly, discourse on trade agreements and secondly, protectionist policies. On trade agreements, Trump focuses on North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and also the World Trade Organization (WTO). He describes these agreements and WTO in Speech 2 as follows:

> (64) On trade, I have kept my promise to the American people and withdrawn from the Trans-Pacific Partnership disaster. Tennessee has lost one third of its manufacturing jobs since the institution of NAFTA, one of the worst trade deals ever in history. Our nation has lost over 60,000 factories since China joined the World Trade Organization. 60 000. Think of that. More than that. We are not going to let it happen anymore. From now on we are going to defend the great American worker and our great American companies.

Trump's argues simplistically that international trade agreements and the WTO are bad for the American people, because the number of manufacturing jobs has decreased by a third in Tennessee after NAFTA was instituted and the number of factories has decreased since China joined the WTO. Therefore, Trump employs the *topoi of numbers and history* to argue that his action to withdraw from TPP is justified. In addition, Trump creates a polarization between the Democratic administrations negotiated NAFTA and TPP and his administration. Firstly, Trump aligns himself with the American people, by stating that the withdrawal from TPP was a promise to the American people that he kept. Secondly, as an involvement strategy, Trump uses negative, hyperbolic nomination strategy to describe TPP (*disaster*) and a negative strategy of predication to characterize NAFTA (*one of the worst trade deals ever in history*). These types

of expressions function as involvement strategies, since the exaggerating characterization is sure to catch the audience's attention while also expressing Trump's own strong views on the quality of trade agreements. Thirdly, he implies that the previous administrations that negotiated NAFTA and TPP and joined the WTO did not have the best interests of American people at heart. He does this by using the adverbial phrase *from now on* as an involvement strategy when describing how his administration will *defend great American worker and our great American companies*. Thus, he creates a positive presentation of himself and his administration and aligns himself with American workers and companies, while presenting the others, in this case previous administrations, in a negative light. Furthermore, His use of the professionym *American worker* as a referential strategy presents his constituents positively as valuable members of society.

Trump appears to base his protectionist policies on Henry Clay's idea of an American System which he offers as a simplified solution to fixing trade imbalances. In Speech 3, he states as follows:

(65)   He [Henry Clay] said, very strongly, "Free trade, which would throw wide open our ports to foreign production without duties, while theirs remains closed to us". That was his quote. He knew, all the way back, early 1800s. Clay said, that trade must be fair, equal and reciprocal. Boom. He said, fair, equal and reciprocal. I'm talking about reciprocal trade. Reciprocal.

In example (65), Trump begins by using two involvement strategies: Firstly, he shares a direct citation, a form of involvement strategy that projects his familiarity with the topic. Secondly, he states that Clay delivered the quote *very strongly,* implying that this is the policy that a strong leader, the kind Trump wants to present himself to be, would follow. The quote itself presents the trading environment of the time as being imbalanced to the detriment of the United States. Trump brings this 200-year-old trade policy to the current economic environment as it is, and further simplifies the argument into three buzzwords that are easy to remember: *fair, equal and reciprocal*. He uses repetition as an involvement strategy, focusing especially on the word *reciprocal*, implying that other nations currently benefit more from trade agreements than the United States.

Trump's strategy to create jobs appears to be an extension of his protectionist attitude to trade policy. In fact, in Speech 3, he connects them directly, by stating,

(66)   Like Henry Clay, we want to put our own people to work. We believe in two simple rules: Buy American and hire American.

Trump is employing the *topos of history* to argue for his simplified strategy: if something worked in the past, it must work now as well. In other words, since Henry Clay's trade policies worked in the 1800s, they must work in the 21st century as well. Furthermore, Trump explicitly

presents his simple strategy as a core belief that he and *the people* share in a form of the catch phrase that reflects economic patriotism: *Buy American and hire American*.

Trump's *Buy American, hire American* –slogan carries over to his plan to increase jobs through infrastructure reform. In Speech 6 Trump states as follows:

> (67) One of the ways we will put more Americans to work is by rebuilding our nation's crumbling infrastructure. That is why I have called on legislators to pass a bill that generates $1 trillion in new infrastructure investments. We're going to fix our roads, our bridges our tunnels, our airports. We are going to fix all of the things that once made us great. And we are going to use American iron, American steel, American aluminium. We will buy American, and we will hire, finally, American. We want once again to have the best infrastructure, the best schools, the best jobs, the best factories. And we want products that proudly carry the label "Made in the USA."

Trump describes the infrastructure in the US as *crumbling*, and he presents a simplistic solution to the problem, investing in infrastructure, which, in turn, would create new jobs. This 'two birds with one stone' -strategy is straightforward and easy to grasp.[7] He further intensifies the message by providing an assortment of examples that *we* will *fix* and *want,* repeating the pronoun at the beginning of every sentence. The pronoun *we* again aligns Trump and his administration with the people, emphasising that these are things that we are going to do together and things that we all want, our shared goals. Furthermore, Trump's all-encompassing, hyperbolic statement, *We are going to fix all of the things that once made us great,* invokes Trump's campaign slogan *Make America Great Again*, which serves as an additional reminder of their unity. Trump catalogues all the things *American* that will be used in the rebuilding as a strategy to highlight the significance of economic patriotism. Notably, Trump adds the adverb *finally* to his 'Buy American, hire American' –slogan, suggesting that the previous administrations have ignored the people and his administration will bring a change to this.

Similar to Trump's view of trade relations, Trump's view of NATO is also influenced by the simplistic idea that other countries are taking advantage of the US, and his simplistic solution is that other countries must pay more than they are currently paying. For instance, in Speech 1, Trump approaches the issue as follows:

> (68) I'm a NATO fan, but many of the countries in NATO, many of the countries that we protect, many of these countries are very rich countries. They're not paying their bills. They're not paying their bills."

Trump begins with a statement of support for NATO, stating he is *a NATO fan* but quickly pivots to calling other countries out for not sharing the costs. He frames United States as militarily superior to the other countries when he says that the United States *protects* many of the countries. He also suggests that there is malign intent in not sharing the costs by stating that

---

[7] As of April 2020, no major infrastructure bill has been taken up by Congress.

while *the very rich countries* re *not paying their bills*. In other words, he suggests that the countries could afford to pay more but choose not to. However, the simplicity of this explanation is in that NATO does not work this way. The funding of NATO consists of direct and indirect contributions from the member countries, but there are no mandatory "bills" for each country (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018a). Rather, the member countries have agreed to a guideline to increase their defence spending to 2 % of their GDP by 2024 and the amount of other direct and indirect contributions are determined by either the member countries themselves or in joint negotiations among the member countries participating in the operations in question (ibid.)

Similarly, in Speech 4, Trump claims that NATO countries owe a lot of money:

> (69)   We're also getting NATO countries to finally step up and contribute their fair share. They've begun to increase their contributions by billions of dollars, but we are not going to be satisfied until everyone pays what they owe. And I've been complaining about that for a long time. And it's a lot different now, but they still owe a lot of money."

In this example, Trump's intention is to present NATO as an organization that is taking advantage of the United States. Trump conveys relentlessness and positions his administration in a position of power over other NATO members by stating *we are not going to be satisfied until everyone pays what they owe*" The use of the verb *satisfied* implies that the US is making the decisions, which, as previously mentioned, is not the case. Furthermore, because of the way NATO functions which was discussed above, the representation that the member countries *owe a lot of money* is also false. Thus, Trump's simplified explanation of how the NATO works, is an attempt to negatively present other NATO countries as taking advantage of the United States and his administration as the one that is addressing this transgression.

Trump uses the *topos of numbers* to argue for his case against NATO. Trump offers detailed data on cost sharing percentages to present the other NATO member countries negatively and the United States positively. In Speech 10, Trump states the following.

> (70)   But you know what, we're paying for 80 percent of NATO, could be higher. They say 72 percent. So, we're paying for 80 percent of NATO. Now, I can only tell you one thing: it helps them a hell of a lot more than it helps us, okay?

Trump claims that *we,* in other words the United States, is paying 80 percent of NATO's costs, but then casts doubt on this number by stating *could be higher*. Then he employs an anonymous *they* in a conspiratorial statement, *They say 72 percent*, as if the data that *they* provide is intentionally false. Trump then goes on to repeat the number he prefers, 80 percent, presenting it as a fact, and further adds to his point that NATO is taking advantage of the US by claiming that NATO *helps them a hell of a lot more than it helps us* – a classic *us vs*. *them* –polarization using deictics.

In the same speech, Trump delves further into to oversimplifying the financial complexities of NATO by bringing up Germany as an example of the imbalance in defence spending and using discourse representation as an involvement strategy:

(71)   Germany's paying 1%. We're paying 4%. Explain that one to me, right? And Germany has unsustainable cash flow. I read a report. Their cash flow is unsustainable. So, I said to Angela, I said, "Angela, send a little of that cash flow our way." And she said, "But Donald..." Because we're protecting them... We have 40,000 soldiers in Germany. Nobody even knows that.

Trump begins by fairy accurately stating that Germany spends one percent of their GDP on their defence while the United States spends four percent[8]. Trump highlights the discrepancy by asking the audience to explain that to him, suggesting that common sense dictates that this should not be the case; i.e. if the people cannot provide a reason for Germany spending less, the argument that Germany should spend the same as the US must be true. Trump goes on to claim that Germany has an *unsustainable cash flow*, repeating this claim twice for emphasis. Trump does not specify what this ominous sounding *unsustainable cash flow* means or where exactly he got the information; Trump simply cites *a report* as a source. Next, Trump goes on to describe a conversation he had with the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel using constructed dialogue, which both signals high involvement and engages the audience effectively. First, Trump strips Merkel from her title: he simply introduces her as *Angela* to the audience. Trump uses the imperative form when he claims to have stated, *Angela, send a little of that cash flow to our way*" as if he had the power to make such demands. Moreover, the demand to send *the cash flow to our way*, because the US is *protecting them* does not make sense, since NATO countries do not pay each other for protection (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018a) Therefore, by once again oversimplifying how NATO works, Trump presents other member countries as the others who take advantage of the United States.

Interestingly, in the same speech in the context of other NATO members not yet meeting the defence spending guidelines, Trump references the Article 5 of NATO – attack on one is an attack on all – as follows:

(72)   So we'll have a nation that doesn't pay. Then the nation gets frisky with whoever, Russia. So, we have a nation doesn't pay. The nation gets aggressive. We end up in World War III for somebody that doesn't even pay.

In the excerpt, Trump frames the NATO countries as possible aggressors (*the nation get's frisky*) in a military conflict with Russia. After this framing he states, *We end up in World War III for somebody that doesn't even pay*. The statement implies that for him, it does not make sense that the United States would be required defend a member country under Article 5, if that

---

[8] Germany spent 1.2 and USA 3.6 percent of their GDP on defence in 2016 (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018b).

country does not meet the defence spending guidelines. In addition, the fact that Trump frames the NATO countries as possible aggressors towards Russia is quite curious, because NATO was originally founded to provide security against aggression from the Soviet Union. This negative other-presentation of European countries in the triangle between the United States, Europe and Russia is a possible indication on how Trump would react, if Russia were to attack an allied nation: he might use the simplistic and inaccurate representation of NATO's spending guidelines as an argument for inaction.

In summary, Trump's simplistic approach to immigration, trade, jobs and NATO relies largely on the concept of others taking advantage of *us* – the core of populist ideology. Firstly, Trump creates polarizations between the in-group and out group by using referential strategies. As a strategy of nomination, Trump uses deictic choices to highlight the polarization and to align himself with the in-group. Similarly, he uses the discursive strategies of professionalisation, and ethnification to positively present the in-group. Secondly, Trump frequently relies on argumentation strategies as strategies of negative other-presentation. He employs, for instance, *the topoi of history, usefulness* and *numbers* to justify why these others are taking advantage of *us* or are bad for *us*. Thirdly, Trump uses involvement strategies for both positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. He uses adverbs and adverbial phrases that express time to emphasize the proactivity of his administration and the inactivity of previous administrations. Moreover, Trump repeats phrases and words to engage the audience and to highlight his point. Furthermore, he uses discourse representation both to signal his familiarity with the topic he is discussing and to engage the audience and signal his own active involvement in defending America's interests.

This section has described Trump's simplistic view of others taking advantage of us permeating throughout the policies he promotes. This view manifests even more drastically in the next section of this study, 7.4 The Dangerous others.

7.4 The Dangerous Others

According to the quantitative portion of this study, the fourth highest scoring populist theme in Trump's discourse was The Dangerous Others. The theme was divided to four different sub-categories of *others* who pose a threat to *the people*. These categories were The Media, Dangerous Individuals and Groups, The Elites and Foreign Countries. The way Trump discredits the media, demonizes and dehumanizes people of colour and people of different

beliefs, and propagates conspiracy theories about the elites is quite similar to how authoritarian leaders around the world operate. This section is divided into four parts, in which the different sub-themes are analysed from the perspective of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

7.4.1 Delegitimizing the Media

Trump goes to great lengths in his efforts to delegitimize the media, employing several strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. For instance, in Speech 1, he states as follows:

> (73) I also want to speak to you without the filter of the fake news. The dishonest media, which has published one false story after another, with no sources, even though they pretend they have them. They make them up in many cases. They just don't want to report the truth, and they've been calling us wrong now for two years. They don't get it, but they're starting to get it, I can tell you that. They've become a big part of the problem. They are part of the corrupt system. Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, and many of our greatest Presidents, fought with the media and called them out, oftentimes on their lies. When the media lies to people, I will never, ever, let them get away with it. I will do whatever I can that they don't get away with it. They have their own agenda, and their agenda is not your agenda. In fact, Thomas Jefferson said, "Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper." "Truth itself," he said, "becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle." That was June 14th -- my birthday -- 1807. But despite all their lies, misrepresentations and false stories, they could not defeat us in the primaries, and they could not defeat us in the general election, and we will continue to expose them for what they are. And, most importantly, we will continue to win, win, win. We are not going to let the fake news tell us what to do, how to live, or what to believe.

Firstly, Trump's uses referential strategies to convey that the media is not trustworthy. As a strategy of nomination with the purpose of delegitimizing the media, Trump uses the words *lies*, *misrepresentations* and *stories* that explicitly refer to hiding the truth. He also uses the attributive adjectives *fake, dishonest, false* and *corrupt* as a strategy of predication to portray the media and the news coverage in a negative light. Most prominent of these adjectives is *fake*, which Trump uses in the phrase *fake news*, a phrase he repeats in all but one of the speeches. In some cases, Trump goes on to label specific news organizations as *fake news*. For instance, in Speech 4 Trump declares that *Media outlets like CNN and MSNBC are fake news*. The phrase *fake news* can be associated with the German word *Lügenpresse,* which was used in war propaganda already in World War I, but perhaps most notoriously in World War II by the national-socialist propaganda machine to discredit the press (Denner & Peter 2017: 274, Noack 2016).

Secondly, Trump creates an *us vs. them* polarization between the people and the media. HE begins by describing the media as *a big part of the problem* and *a big part of the corrupt system*, suggesting that media acts against the people to benefit the elites. This suggestion is highlighted

by the statement *Their agenda is not your agenda* which, firstly, implies that instead of reporting the facts, the media has a hidden agenda. Secondly, the statement implies that there is a conflict between the people's interests and the media's interests. In addition, Trump uses the verbs *pretend, make up* and *lie* to suggest that the media is actively deceiving the people. Similarly, he uses the verb *defeat* to suggest that the media is actively working against himself and the people, not wanting them to succeed but to be defeated. Similarly, at the end of example (73) Trump states, *We are not going to let the fake news tell us what to do, how to live, or what to believe*. This suggests that the media is actively trying to manipulate the people's beliefs and change their way of life, alluding that the media is functions like a propaganda machine. Furthermore, in the statement *we will continue to expose them for what they are*, the verb *continue* alludes that the media has already been proven to be biased against Trump and his supporters.

Thirdly, Trump emphasizes the conflict between the media and the people by using collectivising pronouns. Throughout example (73), Trump uses the pronoun *they* or *them* to refer to the media and *we* or *us* in reference to the people. His alignment with the people comes especially clear at the end of the excerpt when he states *they could not defeat us in the primaries and they could not defeat us in the general election, and we will continue to expose them for what they are. And, most importantly, we will continue to win, win, win.* Here, the pronouns *us* and *we* create the victorious in-group, which consists of Trump and his supporters. The media, in contrast, are presented as the threatening but losing out-group.

Fourthly, Trump implicitly argues that his fight against the media is justified by employing the *topoi of history and authority*. He names three former presidents, who *fought with the media*, implying that when he defames the media, it is justified by past presidents who have also engaged in the same fight. He also cites Thomas Jefferson, a Founding Father as an authority figure in order to argue that the media cannot be believed. By using discourse representation in the form of a direct citation, Trump emphasizes the importance of the argument. Interestingly, He brings up the date of Jefferson's speech which coincides with his birthday and Flag Day (Trump mentions this factoid in Speech 5). This may possibly be an attempt to build a myth of himself as a saviour whose life is intertwined with the history and destiny of the nation.

Another argumentation strategy that Trump uses to discredit the press is employing the *topos of numbers*. For instance, Trump states as follows in Speech 4:

> (74) According to a Morning Consult poll, more than half of Americans say the media "is out of touch with everyday Americans." And they've proven that. According to Media Research Center, 89 percent of the media's coverage of our administration has been negative — and purposefully

negative. And perhaps that's because, according to the Center for Public Integrity, 96 percent of journalists who made donations in the last election gave to our opponent.

In example (74), Trump cites three different statistics to argue that representatives of the media are against him and his supporters. First, he cites a poll that measures the opinion of "everyday Americans", i.e. the people. He combines the *topos of numbers* with *argumentum ad populum*. His argument is that since a majority of the people experience the media being *out of touch* with their lives, therefore, it must be true. Second, Trump cites a statistic from the Media Research Center, but adds a conspiratorial spin to this statistic: *purposefully negative*, implying with the adverb *purposefully* that the media is actively working against his administration; *they* have a purpose, and it is negative to *us*. Third, he bolsters this conspiratorial implication by citing a statistic from another organization, the Center for Public Integrity, suggesting that because journalists made campaign contributions to *our opponent*, Hillary Clinton, they must be actively working against *us*. Furthermore, the pronoun *our* accentuates the allusion that the media is not for *us* but for *the others*.

Trump also attempts to weaken the people's trust in the media by providing concrete examples in the form of discourse representation of how the media distorts facts. He frequently narrates what is happening at the rally he is holding and claims that the media will deliberately distort what is going on. For example, in Speech 2, Trump states as follows:

(75)　And by the way, watch what happens. You just booed Obamacare. They will say, "Trump got booed when he mentioned..." They are bad people, folks. They are bad people.

Trump takes an incident that happened at the rally, *You just booed Obamacare*, and distorts it into an imaginary constructed discourse by an unnamed member of the media in which the event reflects negatively on Trump. Based on this imaginary quote, Trump asserts that *they* [the media] *are bad people*. Thus, he uses the deictic choice as a strategy of nomination to differentiate them from us and the adjective attribute *bad* as a predicational strategy to negatively present the media as the dangerous others. In addition, Trump repeats this sentence twice as an involvement strategy to emphasize his point.

Trump engages in similar negative other-presentation in an off-script diatribe by the means of discourse representation in Speech 6, but this time goes on to question he patriotism of the members of media.

(76)　Every single president on Mount Rushmore… Now here's what I'd do: I'd ask whether or not you think I will someday be on Mt. Rushmore But, but here's the problem: If I did it joking, totally joking, having fun, the fake news media will say, "he believes he should be on Mt. Rushmore." So I won't say it, okay? I won't say it. But every president…They'll say it anyway tomorrow. "Trump thinks he should be on Mt. Rushmore." Isn't that terrible? What a group. What a dishonest group of people, I'll tell you. And you know the funny thing is that you would think they'd want to see our country be great again. You would really think so. But they don't.

> Someday they'll explain it to me why. Every president on Mt. Rushmore believed in protecting American industry.

In example (76), Trump veers off from his scripted remarks that were intended to emphasize the importance of protecting American industry. This he does by invoking the the iconic presidents depicted on Mt. Rushmore. This time, he describes an imaginary conversation he would have had with the audience, but which decided not to have, because the media would misrepresent it. Trump provides several direct (but hypothetical) quotations of journalists reporting the rally, signalling high involvement in the issue. He presents himself engaging in positive, light-hearted activities (*joking*, *having fun*), and, conversely, presents the media as taking his words literally as a sinister self-important boast. This imaginary chain of events presents the media as deliberately distorting the facts, which Trump declares to be *terrible*. From there on, Trump launches a personal attack against the members of the media. As a strategy of predication, Trump uses the attributive adjective *dishonest* to characterize the members of the media and questions their patriotism, going as far as to claim that the members of the media do not *want to see our country be great again*. By invoking his campaign slogan, *Make America Great Again*, Trump suggests that the media are the dangerous others who are not with *us*. Before continuing his scripted remarks, he finishes with an ominous statement, *Someday they'll explain it to me why*, the implication being that one day the media will be accountable to him, even though the role of the fourth estate is to hold the government accountable, guard democracy.

Questioning the patriotism of the members of the media is a recurring topic in Trump's Speeches. In Speech 8, he likens negative media coverage to not being patriotic and to an attempt to divide the country

> (77)   And do you ever notice, when I go on and I'll put, like, out a tweet or a couple of tweets, "He's in a Twitter-storm again!" I... I don't do Twitter-storms. You know, you'll put out a little tweet: "I'm going to be with the veterans today." They'll say, "Donald Trump is in a Twitter-storm!" You know the thing I don't understand? You would think -- you would think they'd want to make our country great again, and I honestly believe they don't. I honestly believe it. If you want to discover the source of the division in our country, look no further than the fake news and the crooked media, which would rather get ratings and clicks than tell the truth.

In example (77), Trump is using discourse representation as an involvement strategy to present himself positively and the media negatively. He begins by providing an exaggerated description of how the media covers him. He directly quotes both his tweets and imagined responses from the media. Trump mitigates the importance of his Twitter behaviour by characterizing it as putting out *a tweet or a couple of tweets* and later by using the adjective *little*. Furthermore, the tweet he chooses to represent *("I'm going to be with the veterans today")* is a form of positive self-presentation in that it describes Trump as a patriotic leader who spends time with veterans.

In contrast, he exaggerates the media reaction by performing an impression of an outraged reporter describing his neutral tweet as a *Twitter-storm*, thus creating a narrative that reflects positively on him and negatively on the reporters covering him. In this narrative, Trump is presented as the patriotic, calm and collected leader, whereas the reporters are presented as rabid, overreacting sensationalists who unpatriotically criticize Trump about tweeting about visiting the veterans. Once Trump has established the narrative, he implicitly suggests that this type of media coverage is unpatriotic. Similar to the previous example from Speech 6, Trump invokes his campaign slogan when he states *you would think they'd want to make our country great again, and I honestly believe they don't*, implying that because the media does not cover him positively, they must be against *our country*. Trump uses the adverb *honestly* signal that his belief that the members of the media are not patriotic is genuine, repeating it twice for emphasis. He goes on to further discredit the media by using predicational strategies: he uses the phrase *fake news* and adds another explicitly delegitimizing predication, the *crooked media*. He also alludes that there is a financial motivation for the media to cover him in a dishonest way (*rather get ratings and clicks than tell the truth*). Furthermore, Trump even blames the media for the political division that exists in the country by referencing them as the *source of division*, as if they are the root cause for the polarization that exists in the United States.

Trump also makes an *us vs. them* contrast between his administration and the media in Speech 5, framing the conflict between him and the media as a result of the media not wanting to see his administration succeed.

> (78) And we are making such incredible progress. We are making progress like nobody can believe. These people are being driven crazy, crazy. I mean, they have phony witch hunts going against me.

Trump presents his administration's efforts positively, using the adjective *incredible* to describe the progress being made and emphasizing the progress by repetition and the addition of the hyperbolic modifier *like nobody can believe*. He implies that the conflict between him and the members of the media is personal by using the adjective *crazy*, which describes the mental and emotional state of the reporters, who Trump frames as working against him by using personal deixis (*they have phony witch hunts going against me*). In addition, for the first and only time in the speeches analysed in this study, Trump uses the delegitimizing reference *phony witch hunts*, a metaphor he has used to describe media reports of collusion between his campaign and Russia and the investigation itself. As discussed in Section 6.1, his use of the word may stem from the escalation of the investigation into coordination between his campaign and Russia

during the 2016 election and his resulting need to frame himself positively and to delegitimize the media to his base.

Disturbingly, Trump appears to issue an implicit threat against the media in Speech 5:

(79)   …we have the hardest working, the smartest people, the toughest people. They're very lucky that our people don't protest, believe me. Believe me. They're very lucky.

Trump creates a positive representation of the in-group, *us*, by attaching positive attributes to Republicans. As a predicational strategy, he describes the in-group with adjectival attributes in their superlative forms, *the hardest working, and the smartest people, the toughest people*. In addition, he emphasizes the in-group vs. out-group dynamic by stating, *We have* the people with the positive attributes, i.e. they belong to our in-group, the people that vote Republicans. However, when Trump characterizes Republican voters as *the toughest people*, it should be noted that *tough* is an adjective which he uses in example (48) (section 7.2.3) in a manner that led me to argue Trump associates the adjective *tough* not with tenacity and perseverance, but the ability to endure pain. Thus, when Trump finally states, *They're very lucky that our people don't protest, believe me. Believe me. They're very lucky*, he is issuing an implicit threat to the media by euphemizing violence against the media as protesting. Furthermore, Trump is employing apophrasis, when he states, *our people don't protest* to hide his intended meaning for plausible deniability. Furthermore, the euphemism is very similar to what Khany and Hamzelou (2014: 919) found out about dictators: according to them, they use euphemisms to convey orders. It should be noted that one of the key issues for conservative Republicans is the right to bear arms. Therefore, when Trump refers to *our people*, he is referring to the people who bear arms, which makes the implicit threat all the more sinister.

The quantitative content analysis identified a spike in the sub-theme of the Media in Speech 8. A closer examination of the data shows that this anomaly relates to the fact that Speech 8 was given after the Charlottesville riots and the negative press coverage Trump received because of his failure to unequivocally condemn white supremacy (Thrush and Haberman 2017). Firstly, Trump uses this speech as an opportunity to delegitimize the press repeatedly, calling them, for instance, *fake news* for allegedly treating him unfairly or giving detailed examples of how they allegedly criticized him. Secondly, Trump goes as far as to blame the media for the division in the country, stating,

(80)   If you want to discover the source of the division in our country, look no further than the fake news and the crooked media,[…]

Trump is explicitly blaming the media for the divided state of the country. In a moment, when the nation is going through a crisis, Trump appears to react by rejecting all the

criticism he faces, refuses to take any responsibility and assigning blame to *the others*, in this case of the media.

To sum up, Trump's goal is to delegitimize the media by using strategies of negative other presentation and to create polarization by alluding that they are working against us. Trump uses referential strategies that include strategies of nomination and predication to characterize the media and the media coverage as manipulative, untrustworthy and unpatriotic. Trump uses argumentation strategies and involvement strategies to the same effect. Just as Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 180) noted, this type of rhetoric that delegitimizes the media the comes directly from the authoritarian playbook to discredit the media and silence opposition. Furthermore, Trump is even implicitly encouraging his supporters to commit violent attacks against the media, which also, according to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 65-66) is an aspect of authoritarian behaviour.

7.4.2 Dangerous Individuals and Groups

In the quantitative portion of this study, the second most frequently occurring sub-category of The Dangerous Others was found to be Dangerous Individuals and Groups. Trump focuses mainly on immigrants as a threat to the people, conflating them with criminal gangs, but also singles out Americans who criticize his policies.

In Trump's discourse on immigration, the themes of Dangerous Others and Protecting the Fatherland tend to overlap. Trump presents the in-group, *us,* as victims that need to be protected from the dangerous out-group, *them*. In the following example from Speech 5, Trump uses strategies of positive self-presentation when describing the police, immigration officials and the victims of crimes and their families and contrasts them with the dangerous others by employing strategies of negative other-presentation.

(81) The other thing that I have to tell you: You have a gang called MS-13. A friend of mine who's a very, very high-level police officer said to me in describing them, "They are the equivalent or worse than al-Qaeda". I would say that's a bad statement. They don't like to shoot people. They like to cut people. They do things that nobody can believe. These are true animals. We are moving them out of the country by the thousands. By the thousands. And the people moving them out are guess what, a hell of a lot tougher and meaner than they are. But they're on our side. We're getting them out, MS-13. During my campaign for president, I met with the families of Americans killed by illegal immigrants, many, many families. Including the parents of Sarah Root, a 21-year-old Iowa girl who was killed the day after she graduated from college with a 4.0 GPA. Do you know what that is? To those of you who don't know, that means solid A's straight across, number one student. Thousands of beautiful American lives like Sarah's have been stolen for the simple reason that our government has refused to enforce already existing laws. The media, these people, like to talk about separating families. But the families they never talk about are the American families separated forever from the ones they love because we don't protect our borders and uphold the immigration laws of the United States.

In example (81), Trump constructs contrasting representations of the in-group, *us* and the out group, *them*. Trump uses strategies of nomination and strategies of predication to positively represent the in-group with which he aligns himself. He refers to the police officer as *a friend of mine* in order to align himself with law enforcement officials, and a as a predication strategy uses an adverb and an attributive adjective to emphasize the police officer's positive features (*very, very high level police officer*). Next, Trump describes the immigration officials who deport illegal immigrants with the predicative adjectives *tougher* and *meaner*, and as an involvement strategy shows his emotional involvement and engages the audience by using the colloquial adverbial phrase *hell of a lot*. Although the adjectives *tougher* and *meaner* carry negative connotations, he uses them as a strategy of positive predication, because the adjectives project strength and power over those he deems dangerous. Finally, Trump turns to the victim and her family. He uses her given name as a strategy of nomination to involve the audience emotionally with her case. Furthermore, he uses her academic success to emphasize her positive attributes and even describing her with the adjective *beautiful* to signal his own emotional involvement in her case. In addition, Trump employs membership categorization to emphasize that these people belong to our in-group when he uses the phrases *American lives* and *American families*, thus implicitly categorizing individuals who are not American as the dangerous others.

In contrast to these positive in-group presentations, Trump uses strategies of negative other-presentation to describe the dangerous others in example (81). This includes dehumanizing language commonly used by authoritarians. Firstly, Trump shares a direct quote from a police officer, who is an authority figure, therefore giving the quote more value. The quote itself equates the MS-13 gang members with the terrorist group that is responsible for the 9/11 attacks and even suggests the gang members are worse than the terrorists. Secondly, Trump chooses verbs that elicit fear when he states that the gang members *like to cut people*. He also uses a hyperbolic expression, *They do things that nobody can believe* that is vague enough to let the audience to imagine the worst possible scenario. Thirdly, Trump calls the gang members *true animals*, a word that explicitly dehumanizes the out-group.

Interestingly, Trump also brings up the media talking about *separating families* in example (81). At the time of this speech in May 2017, family separation at the Southern border was not an issue discussed in the media. It was not until May 2018 that the then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced the Zero Tolerance -policy. It resulted in migrant children being separated from their parents, because, according to the new policy, all adults who crossed the border illegally were criminally prosecuted and detained (Department of Justice 2018). Therefore, this

remark appears to be a case of preparatory propaganda to pre-emptively delegitimize the media as being biased against the *American families* and only having concern for the migrant families. In effect, Trump is setting the desired narrative in the minds of his supporters before the government policy in question was even announced.

In example (81), Trump used the word *animals* to dehumaize immigrants who commit crimes. The dehumanizing word choice is a feature of authoritarian discourse and employing this type of language is not uncommon to Trump. In fact, in Speech 10, he talks about the criminal gang MS-13 out his view of the gang by stating

> (82) Not only are we defeating these killers, these savage killers, horrible, horrible… **You don't even want to say people.**

In example (82), he not only does not want to call the human beings associated with gangs as people but also references the gang members with the crimionym *killer* to highlight the social problems they cause. Furthermore, he adds the predicational adjective *savage* to emphasize his message that these people are not part of a civilized society but have an animalistic nature.

Trump continues to use fear-stoking and dehumanizing language about the out-group, immigrants, in Speech 6.

> (83) The predators and criminal aliens who poison our communities with drugs and prey on innocent, young people, these beautiful, beautiful, innocent young people will, will find no safe haven anywhere in our country. And you've seen the stories about some of these animals. They don't want to use guns, because it's too fast and it's not painful enough. So, they'll take a young, beautiful girl, 16, 15, and others, and they slice them and dice them with a knife because they want them to go through excruciating pain before they die.

In this extract Trump uses strategies of nomination and verb choices with negative connotations to present the out-group in an unfavourable way. Firstly, in terms of nomination strategies, he again refers to immigrants as *animals* but this time calls them also *predators* – in other words. animals that hunt other living beings. Furthermore, he uses the discursive strategy of explicit dissimilation when he categorizes immigrants as *criminal aliens*, a xenonym with an added attributive adjective *criminal* to emphasize the negative attributes of the out-group. In contrast to the negative nominations of the out-group, Trump describes the in-group with several positive attributive adjectives. He calls them *beautiful, innocent* and *young*, repeating these words for emphasis. Secondly, the verb phrases that Trump uses to describe the actions of the out group aim to stoke fear and dehumanize the out group. When he states, *They **prey on** innocent, young people*, the verb phrase is intended to dehumanize. The verb *prey* is used to describe the behaviour predators (a word Trump also used in this example) hunting for game. Thus, he alludes that the members of the out-group behave like animals, which he stated clearly in example (81) *These are true animals*. Trump sets the blame over drug problems in the

community solely on the out-group by stating that they *poison our communities with drugs*. Poisoning is considered to be an action performed without the consent of the target of the poisoning. However, he ignores the fact that there is also a demand for drugs in the community. Therefore, the claim that the out-group is poisoning communities ignores the larger issue of drug addiction, and consequently the claim is only meant to stoke fear. In addition, Trump attempts to intimidate the audience by using graphic sentences like *They don't want to use guns, because it's too fast and it's not painful enough* and *they slice them and dice them with a knife because they want them to go through excruciating pain before they die*. He is offering the audience a window into the minds of the out-group by using mental processes that describe what the others *want*, which in this case is to induce *excruciating pain*. Thus, Trump is representing the out-group as dangerous, because they have a goal to inflict physical harm on the in-group.

Similarly, in Speech 7, Trump depicts immigrants as ruthless criminals.

> (84) We are taking the fight to the drug smugglers, human traffickers and the vile criminal cartels like MS-13 who are being thrown out of our country so quickly you can't even count. Just last week I visited Long Island, where MS-13 has brought violence to a once-peaceful and beautiful neighbourhood right where I grew up. We are liberating American communities from the vicious, violent gangs. One by one we're finding the drug dealers, the gang members, the predators, thieves, criminals, and predators and killers, and we're throwing them out of our country.

As a strategy of negative other presentation, Trump propagates a series of crimionyms, which he associates solely on immigrants by using a relative clause, thus creating the impression that all crime in the United States occurs because of immigrants. First, he catalogues those who the law enforcement is targeting by using crimionyms: *drug smugglers, human traffickers and the vile criminal cartels like MS-13*. Then he uses a relative clause *who are being thrown out of our country*" to signal that the criminals are not Americans but immigrants from another country. Secondly, he uses the language of war and membership categorization (*liberating American communities*) to suggest that these gangs are like a foreign army that has conquered a town and it needs to be liberated. Thirdly, Trump recites another list of crimionyms and adds the dehumanizing word *predators.* This he repeats twice, and finishes with the sentence, *and we're throwing them out of our country*, which is in essence a repetition of the idea from the beginning of the excerpt, expressed in the form of the relative clause, that criminals are foreigners.

Trump also characterizes MS-13 in war-like terms in Speech 6, as if it is invading the United States like a foreign army that that has the ability take over entire cities.

> (85) We are throwing MS-13 the hell out of here so fast. You know, we're actually…hard to believe that we're talking about our great country. We are actually liberating towns and cities. We are liberating. People are screaming from their windows, "Thank you; thank you!" to the border

patrol…and to General Kelly's great people that come in and grab the thugs and throw them the hell out. We are liberating our towns, and we are liberating our cities.

In the example, Trump refers to deporting gang members colloquially as *throwing* [them] *the hell out of here*. Firstly, he is alluding that all gang members are immigrants, since he suggests that his administration is deporting them. Secondly, because of the verb choice (*throw*) and the destination (*hell*), the expression aggressive and graphic, which is a strategy to express his own involvement and engage the audience. In terms of verb selection, Trump uses the verb *liberate* repeatedly, as if the *towns and cities* had been under siege by a foreign army. He also uses discourse representation as an involvement strategy to create a vivid picture of *liberating towns and cities* when he claims *that People are screaming from their windows, "Thank you; thank you!"*. Also, the fact that he mentions the military rank of his then Director of Homeland Security John Kelly, although, as previously discussed, there are no generals in the Department of Homeland Security, thus adding to the imagery of a military operation against foreign invaders.[9]

In addition to characterizing immigrants as dangerous criminals, Trump positions some American citizens who express dissent in the same sub-category of The Dangerous Others. For instance, in two of the rallies he references African American NFL players who protest against police brutality against African Americans by kneeling during the national anthem. In Speech 9, which was held in Alabama in support for then-senatorial candidate Luther Strange, he discusses the issue as follows.

(86) Luther and I, and everyone in this big arena, are united by the same great American values We're proud of our country. We respect our flag. Wouldn't you love to see one of these NFL owners when somebody disrespects our flag to say, "Get that son of a bitch off the field right now! Out, he's fired! He's fired!" You know, some owner is going to do that. He's going to say, "That guy that disrespects our flag, he's fired". And that owner, they don't know it, they don't know it, they're friends of mine, many of them, they don't know it, they'll be the most popular person for a week, they'll be the most popular person in this country because that's a total disrespect of our heritage.

First, Trump defines the in-group by spelling out what unites all the people attending the rally: patriotic values. According to Trump, those *great American values* include being *proud of our country* and respecting *our flag*. The possessive pronoun *our* defines the country and the flag belonging only to those who are one of us, people who attend the rally, people who support Trump. Thus, the implication is that if you do not abide by those values you are not one of us, not one of Trump's Americans. Second, he moves directly to describe what he would want to

---

[9] Since this speech, Trump has frequently used similar language of siege and liberation, but no government agency has been able to provide evidence of such conditions in any of the cities where MS-13 operates (Valverde 2018).

happen to those who disrespect *our flag*, the out-group. As an involvement strategy, Trump uses discourse representation, posing a rhetorical question to the audience: *Wouldn't you love to see one of these NFL owners when somebody disrespects our flag to say, 'Get that son of a bitch off the field right now! Out, he's fired! He's fired!'*. Trump evokes his catchphrase from his days as a reality star on the TV-show *The Apprentice, "He's fired!"*. By animatedly re-enacting his role as the decisive leader, Trump emphasises his involvement in the issue, and the aggressive tone of the catchphrase increases the desired effect. Furthermore, by using the pejorative *son of a bitch*, Trump introduces a dehumanizing aspect in describing the mainly African American athletes who choose to protest by taking the knee, since the word *bitch* refers to a female dog. Together with the dehumanizing pejorative, the fact that Trump specifically mentions *the owners*, mainly white men who *own* predominantly African American players, it is possible that Trump is drawing a dog-whistle-like parallel between owning slaves and NFL ownership: When Trump employs dehumanizing language when he suggests the owners fire the dissenting players, he is asserting supremacy. Furthermore, Trump uses the word *heritage*, when he claims that kneeling during the National Anthem is *total disrespect of our heritage*. According to Atkinson (2018: 309), Vincent Law, an editor on a prominent white supremacist site altright.com, has used the word *heritage* in connection with protesting the removal of Confederate monuments in Charlottesville as defending "White Heritage" and standing up for "your history, your race and your way of life". In fact, Trump references the issue of removal of confederate monuments in the previous speech, Speech 8, *They're trying to take away our culture. They are trying to take away our history*. The phrasing Trump uses is strikingly similar to the language of a white supremacist. Whether or not Trump is aware of these connotations, the fringe elements of the alt-right may interpret these assertions as affirmations of their ideology.

Trump also alleges physical threat of violence from other Americans to his supporters. In Speech 8, Trump is discussing security and the rule of law, but digresses to remembrances of past rallies during his presidential campaign in which there were violent altercations with protestors.

> (87) When this started at the beginning, they used to send in thugs. They had -- our people are tougher than them, so it wasn't always very good for them. But they'd send in thugs, and our people would protect themselves, and then you'd go home, and you'd watch this violence. Let me tell you, see this room? You've got people outside, but not very many. But see this room? You're safe in this room. You're very safe in this room. It's a big room.

Trump uses two referential strategies of negative other-presentation. Firstly, Trump creates a faceless enemy with the discursive strategy of collectivisation by using the pronoun *they* as the

entity who actively *used to send in thugs*. Secondly, Trump again employs the crimionym *thugs* to describe the protestors in his rallies, making their actions seem illegal. On the other hand, Trump references the attendees in the rallies as *our people*, aligning himself with the in-group with the pronoun *our* and frames their involvement in the altercations as self-defence, by using the verb phrase *would protect themselve*s. Also, in as a strategy of positive self-presentation, Trump uses the predicative adjective *tougher*. Previously, I have argued that Trump has uses the adjective *tough* to describe law-enforcement officials and his supporters (see sections 7.2.3 and 7.4.1) in a manner that suggests he associates it with the ability to endure pain, not with perseverance or tenacity. In this instance Trump clearly states, *our people are tougher than them, so it wasn't always very good for them*, alluding that the others suffered injuries, which further supports my argument.

Disturbingly, in example (87) Trump appears to relish the physical confrontations that occurred. The entire compound sentence *But they'd send in thugs, and our people would protect themselves, and then you'd go home and you'd watch this violence* creates a narrative of an event in which the enemy attacked *our people*, who in turn were victorious. Trump himself would watch his supporters commit these acts of violence, which he euphemizes as self-defence. The fact that Trump ends these musings by marvelling at the size of the room (*It's a big room*) and stating that there are only a few people outside and repeating the phrase *You're very safe in this room* may not be one of his typical self-aggrandizing boasts about crowd size, but instead an implicit strategy to convey his supporters that they outnumber the *people outside*. Trump also implies that he does not condemn the violence his supporters have engaged in in the past; it was just a way for *our people* to *protect themselves*. Therefore, Trump is implicitly implying that he would not condemn his supporters if they were to engage in a physical altercation with the protestors.

In conclusion, Trump yet again creates polarization between us and them by highlighting the positive attributes of us and the negative attributes of them. He does this firstly, by using referential strategies, most notably employing crimionyms and xenonyms. Secondly, he uses strategies of predication to positively present the in-group by using adjectives as a predicational strategy that either reflect innocence and vulnerability or toughness and the willingness to defend oneself and. In contrast, he presents the out-group negatively with attributive adjectives that suggest either criminality or inhumanity. It does not appear to make any significance whether the others are legally Americans or not, since Trump depicts all who do not support the same values as his base either as unamerican or the very least aligned with the dangerous

others who are not American in the sense Trump defines Americans, that is to say, white, Christian, conservatives. Furthermore, Trump's discourse on Dangerous Individuals or Groups includes dehumanizing strategies of nomination and predication, which is a feature of authoritarianism. In addition, Trump uses colloquial phrases that are quite aggressive in tone, thus further engaging the audience with his angry statements.

7.4.3 The Elites

A large portion of Trump's discourse in terms of The Dangerous Others focuses on fighting *the elites*. According to the quantitative portion of this study, the sub-theme The Elites was the third most prominent one in the populist theme The Dangerous Others. In this study, the elites are defined to include political elites (primarily Democrats), special interest groups and their lobbyists, and also the judiciary and government law-enforcement agencies. In this section, I will analyse how exactly Trump represents them through strategies of negative other-presentation and contrasts himself with them through strategies of positive self-presentation.

Trump has weaponised the immigration issue to fight the Democrats. In Speech 4, Trump talks about how the Democrats do not support his border wall, and frames the issue as Democrats supporting criminal actives, thus aligning them with the out-group.

> (88) And if the Democrats knew what the hell they were doing, they'd approve it so easy, because we want to stop crime in our country. Obviously, they don't mind illegals coming in. They don't mind drugs pouring in. They don't mind, excuse me, MS-13 coming in. We're getting them all out of here. Members of Congress who will be voting on border security have a simple choice: They can either vote to help drug cartels and criminal aliens trying to enter the United States, like, frankly, the Democrats are doing. Or they can vote to help American citizens and American families be safe. That's the choice.

Firstly, Trump depicts the Democrats as incompetent, because they do not support his border wall by using the colloquial phrase *if the Democrats knew what the hell they were doing*. He also presents the wall as a simplistic solution to *stop crime* in the United States, which *we,* the in-group, support. Secondly, Trump employs referential strategies to separate *them* from *us*. By using the pronoun *they* to reference the Democrats, he deictically presents them as the out-group. Also, the word *Democrats* itself is a politonym, which differentiates those belonging to the party from *us*, the Republicans. When characterizing the immigrants, he employs the crimionyms *illegals* and *drug cartels*, and also the xenonym *aliens* with the attributive adjective *criminal* to enhance the negative other-presentation. Conversely, Trump presents the in-group positively by using the politonym *American citizens*, to present the in-group in a more privileged position in terms of political rights in contrast with the *illegals.* he also employs

membership categorization when he references these families and citizens as *American* as if to claim that the Democrats are not on the side of Americans.

In Speech 7, Trump represents the political elites as a selfish enemy that does not work for the interests of the American people:

> (89) Countless citizens, Democrat, and Republican, independents, have been neglected and ignored by Washington. But we will make sure they are never ignored again. We know there are powerful forces in Washington who want to stop us. But we won't let them. We are fighting for every American who has been overlooked, pushed aside, or told to put their dreams on hold but we will win, and we're winning now. The failed voices in Washington who oppose our movement are the exact same people who gave us one terrible trade deal after another, who gave us one foreign policy disaster after another, and who sacrificed our sovereignty, our wealth, and our jobs. They gave them away. We don't need advice from the Washington swamp. We need to drain the swamp. Washington is full of people who are only looking out for themselves.

Firstly, Trump uses the toponym Washington as a personification for the people working in Congress to make them appear to be a faceless enemy that is against the rest of the country Later, he adds the predicative noun *swamp* to the toponym in order to evoke associations of an opaque system, which operates behind a foggy veil that is difficult for the ordinary citizen to penetrate. Secondly, as a predicational strategy, Trump uses attributive adjectives and relative clauses to negatively present politicians as a faceless enemy that attempts to resist his agenda. Trump calls the politicians *powerful forces* and *failed voices*, the former description attempting to create an image of a formidable enemy, but the latter interestingly mitigates their competence by predicating them as *failed voices*. Furthermore, by choosing to use imprecise nouns like *forces* and *voices* that do not specify who these people are, he enhances the image of a faceless enemy that is the elites. Thirdly, both these definitions of the elites are followed by relative clauses that represent these opponents as enemies actively working against Trump and his supporters by using the verbs *to stop* and *to oppose*. As a predicational strategy of negative other-presentation, Trump uses relative clauses that include attributive adjectives and nouns that carry negative connotations. He calls the trade deals *terrible* and defines challenges in foreign policy as *one foreign policy **disaster** after another*. Fourthly, Trump uses verbs and verb phrases to convey the elites' disregard for the good of the people. He uses the verb phrase *sacrificed our sovereignty, our wealth and our jobs,* implying that politicians failed the American people in benefit of others, *sacrificed* these things to benefit other nations. Similarly, as an involvement strategy, he chooses to use verb phrases that convey indifference by the elites toward the people: *overlooked*, *pushed aside*, *told to put their dreams on hold*. On the other hand, in this example (89) Trump presents himself as the one who will solve these problems, he, together with his supporters, will *drain the swamp* and *will win*.

Similarly in Speech 10, Trump depicts the elites as opposing the will of the people, but this time he adds the element of self-interest as their motivator.

> (90)   Yet there are powerful forces in Washington trying to sabotage our movement. These are bad people. These are very, very bad and evil people. They know who they are. These are the people who made their money, their names, their careers, their power off the corrupt and broken system, and they liked it the other way. So, they will do anything, at any time, and they'll never stop. But you know what we're stopping them. You're seeing that right now, you're seeing that right now, we're stopping them. It's corrupt, it's rigged. And we're stopping them. They will lie and leak and smear, because they don't want to accept the results of an election where we won by a landslide.

Firstly, Trump's lexical choices imply that there is a conspiracy that is actively trying to resist the will of the people. He, again employing the strategy of nomination, creates a faceless enemy, *powerful forces in Washington* who attempt *to sabotage our movement*. The verb *to sabotage* implies a covert operation to disrupt or destroy something. Therefore, when he asserts that these powerful faceless Washington elites attempt to do this to *our movement*, he alludes that there is active conspiracy happening to subvert the will of the people. Secondly, as predicational strategy Trump uses attributive adjectives to characterize the elites and the political process: he, first, calls his opponents *bad people* and next doubles down by repeating this assertion and adding another attribute adjective, *evil*. After this, he characterizes the political process with the attributive adjectives *corrupt* and *broken*. Later, he repeats his claim that the system is *corrupt, it's rigged*, this time using adjectives as a predicational strategy to delegitimize the political process. Trump concludes by offering another motive besides personal benefit for these malevolent activities: the fact that he won the presidential election and the elites *don't want to accept the results*. Propagating tis conspiratorial narratives about political opponents is typical to authoritarian leaders who attempt discredit politicians in the opposition.

Similarly, Trump delves into conspiracy theories to attack his political opponents, and even suggest that the Justice Department should open investigations into Hillary Clinton, his former rival form the 2016 presidential election in Speech 7:

> (91)   The Russia story is a total fabrication. It is just an excuse for the greatest loss in the history of American politics. That's all it is. It just makes them feel better when they have nothing else to talk about. What the prosecutor should be looking at are Hillary Clinton's 33,000 deleted e-mails, and they should be looking at the paid Russian speeches, and the owned Russian companies. Or let them look at the uranium she sold that's now in the hands of very angry Russians.

Trump begins by attempting to delegitimize the Russia investigation. As a referential strategy, Trump refers to the Special Counsel's investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election as *The Russia story*. The noun *story* itself implies that the investigation into Russian interference is fiction and Trump makes this explicit by characterizing it as *a total fabrication*. He also hyperbolically references it as *an excuse for the greatest loss in the history of American politics*. Next, Trump pivots from the investigation into his campaign to suggest

an investigation of a political opponent, which, if realised, would be an abuse of power authoritarian leaders engage in. As an involvement strategy, he provides examples of alleged crimes that Clinton and her associates engaged in. First, he details the number of emails that he alleges to be missing, which functions as an involvement strategy to emphasize the magnitude of the alleged misdeed. Second, he references a right-wing talking-point about Clinton's husbands speaking engagements that were paid for by Russians, the implication being that there is something nefarious in these payments. Third, he makes a reference to *owned Russian companies.* Incidentally, the claim that Clinton owned any companies in Russia no truth to it, according to a fact check database maintained by *The Washington Post* (WP Fact Checker 2020b). Therefore, the assertion functions as an attempt to discredit his political opponents with false accusations. Finally, Trump brings up a wide-spread alt-right conspiracy theory about Hillary Clinton's role in granting uranium rights to a company that is largely owned by Russia's nuclear energy agency (Putterman 2018). Again, this is actually a false accusation: according to Putterman (2018), there is, in fact, no evidence that Clinton had any personal role in the approval of the deal which requires review and authorisation by multiple US agencies. Trump goes on to stoke fear about the consequences of this misdeed that never happened by characterizing the Russians as *very angry*, implying that Clinton endangered national security by giving uranium to an aggressive adversary

Not only does the president traffic in conspiracy theories about Clinton personally, he also attempts to demonize the Democratic Party as a whole, by depicting them as a party that attempts to subvert democracy. In Speech 7 Trump states as follows.

(92) They can't beat us at the voting booths, so they are trying to cheat you out of the future and the future that you want. They are trying to cheat you out of the leadership that you want with a fake story that is demeaning to all of us and most importantly, demeaning to our country and demeaning to our Constitution.

Firstly, Trump's lexical choices are evidence of a strategy of negative-other presentation. When Trump states that the Democrats *can't beat us at the voting booths, so they are **trying to cheat you out of the future and the future that you want***, he is explicitly claiming that the Democrats are attempting to delegitimize the results of a democratic election. He repeatedly uses the verb *to cheat* as an involvement strategy to emphasize the dishonesty of his political opponents and the gravity of their alleged actions. Similarly, he repeats the adjective *demeaning* as an involvement strategy to engage the audience personally, and in addition, to question the Democrats' loyalty, to the *country* and *the Constitution.* Secondly, as a strategy of involvement he uses a very similar sentence structure to emphasize his point, when he states *they are trying to cheat you out of the future and the future that you want* and *They are trying to cheat you out*

of the leadership that you want. Moreover, by choosing to use the phrases *the future that you want* and *the leadership that you want*, Trump equates the future of the people with himself, their leader. Similarly, when cataloguing the targets of the Democrats' demeaning actions, he equates us, himself and his voters with the country and the Constitution, thus representing the Democrats as the dangerous others.

In Speech 10, Trump goes even further in his attempts to erode his constituents' belief in democracy. Not only does he attack the political elites, but he expands his criticism to entire institutions. In example (93), Trump is responding to the crowd chanting "Lock her up" – *her* being Hillary Clinton.

> (93) Look, it's being proven we have a rigged system. It doesn't happen so easy. But this system, there will be a lot of changes. This is a rigged... this is a rigged system. This is a sick system from the inside. And, you know, there is no country like our country, but we have a lot of sickness in some of our institutions, and we're working very hard. We have a lot of them straightened out. But we do have, we really do. We have a rigged system in this country. We have to change it. Terrible. Terrible. They are resisting progress. They're resisting change. Because the only thing they really care about is protecting what they have been able to do, which is really control the country, and not to your benefit.

In the excerpt, Trump's strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation relies on lexical choices, repetition and allusion. Since Trump is responding to the "Lock her up" chants, he appears to refer to the Department of Justice and by extension the FBI by the *rigged system*, and to jailing his political opponent by stating *It doesn't happen so easy*. As an involvement strategy, Trump repeats the attributive adjective *rigged* four times in this short excerpt, and also uses the attributive adjective *sick* and the noun *sickness* that carries negative connotations to describe what is happening in these institutions that are responsible for law enforcement, and are supposed to be apolitical. As another involvement strategy to convey his strong emotions towards the institutions, Trump repeats the adjective *terrible* twice. However, Trump implies that he intends to interfere in these apolitical institutions, by stating that *there will be a lot of changes* and repeating the verb *to change* and the noun *change(s)* several times in the excerpt. Finally, Trump alludes to the right-wing conspiracy theory of the "deep state". Trump uses the pronoun *they* to create the faceless enemy, who resists progress and change and most ominously attempts to *control the country, and not to your benefit*. These attacks on the Department of Justice and the FBI and the promises of changes to come suggest that the apolitical role of law enforcement may be in danger.

In addition to attacks on his political opponents and independent institutions under the Executive branch, Trump attempts to delegitimize the third branch of government – the Judicial

branch. In Speech 2, he is discussing the ruling from the Ninth Circuit that stopped his administration's plan to ban citizens from Muslim-majority countries from entering the US.

> (94) Moments ago, I learned that a district judge in Hawaii, part of much-overturned Ninth Circuit court… And I have to be nice, otherwise I will get criticized for speaking poorly about our courts. I will be criticized by these people. Among the most dishonest people in the world, I will be criticized. I'll be criticized by them for speaking harshly about our courts. I would never wanna do that. A judge has just blocked our executive order on travel and refugees coming into our country from certain countries. The order he blocked was a watered-down version of the first order, that was also blocked by another judge, and should have never been blocked to start with. This new order was tailored to the dictates of the Ninth Circuit's, in my opinion, flawed ruling. This is the opinion of many. An unprecedented judicial overreach.

In example (94) Trump combines his criticism of the judicial branch with criticism of the media. As soon as Trump uses the attributive adjective *much-overturned* to delegitimize the Ninth Circuit, he pivots to criticizing the media, predicting that he would be held accountable for what he is saying, and pre-emptively delegitimizes the members of the media by characterizing them with the superlative *the most dishonest*. This indicates that Trump knows he is breaking a norm by questioning the authority of the judicial branch. Next, Trump goes on to explain the events to the audience, and in the process criticizes the previous ruling by another judge, saying *it should have never been blocked to start with*, alluding that the ruling was not in compliance with the law or that the law should not matter in this case. Next, Trump asserts that the most recent version of the bill was composed *to the dictates of the Ninth Circuit's, in my opinion, flawed ruling*. Trump explicitly claims that the ruling was *flawed*, and garners support for his opinion employing the fallacious *argumentum ad populum*; *This is the opinion of many*. Finally, Trump emphasizes the gravity of such allegedly flawed ruling using the attributive adjective *unprecedented* and describing the action itself with the noun phrase *judicial overreach*, implying that the Ninth Circuit had no Constitutional authority to intervene in executive orders.

Trump also criticizes the Judicial branch in Speech 5, when he suggests he is about to pardon Sheriff Joe Arpaio, a prominent anti-illegal immigration figure, who was convicted of engaging in systemic racial profiling of Latinos (Greenberg 2017b). Trump, however, euphemized the ruling as Arpaio being *convicted for doing his job*. The euphemism implies that immigration law enforcement does not need to follow the law. Instead, the only thing that matters is getting the job done. Although, Trump as the President of the United States has the authority to pardon anyone he wants, Trump's decision to pardon the former Sheriff indicates to the people that Trump himself is the ultimate arbiter of what is right and what is wrong, not the judicial branch.

In conclusion, when Trump discusses the political elites, he employs referential and predicational strategies to create a faceless enemy by choosing to use nouns and adjectives or combinations thereof, which carry connotations of entities with nefarious intentions working

against the people. Trump enhances this image through involvement strategies, especially by choosing to use verbs and verb phrases that carry connotations of conspiratorial activity. Trump uses the same strategies of negative other-presentation in attempt to delegitimize law-enforcement agencies and even the judiciary. This conspiratorial language regarding the judiciary is a part of how authoritarian leaders attempt to delegitimize it, and the fact that Trump conflates himself with the country and the Constitution signals that in his opinion, he should be the one to define the law.

7.4.4 Foreign Countries

Trump's approach to the sub-theme of Foreign Countries as a part of The Dangerous Others relates mainly to economic grievances – other countries taking advantage of the US financially. In addition, he discusses the threats foreign countries might represent to national security. The economic side of the threat has been discussed in part in section 7.3. where it was found that Trump represents other NATO countries as free loaders, who *are not paying their bills*. In this section, I will further explore the strategies of negative-other presentation and positive self-presentation on the topic of trade and international agreements and his representation of how other countries act against the US in terms of immigration and the threat of North Korea, which occasionally occur in Trumps discourse.

In terms of trade agreements, Trump represents other countries as taking advantage of the US. For instance, he discusses renegotiating trade agreements in Speech 10, when he states:

> (95)   They then come back because we're the big piggy bank that everybody likes robbing. The whole world robs it.

As an involvement strategy Trump uses a metaphor that depicts the US as a rich country and other countries as illicit actors, who commit a crime (robbery) through these agreements. Statements like this are also a very simplistic way of representing how trade relations work or do not work, and it is typical for him to combine the theme of Simplistic Explanations to the theme of The Dangerous Others in an attempt to create more polarization between us and them, in this case, the US and the world.

Trump uses similar language of crime and victimhood when discussing the Paris Climate Accord in Speech 4.

> (96) And I'll be making a big decision on the Paris accord over the next two weeks. And we will see what happens. But they're all part of a broken system that has profited from this global theft and plunder of American wealth at the expense of the American worker. We are not going to let other countries take advantage of us anymore.

Firstly, Trump depicts every country in the Paris Climate Accord negatively by generalising all member countries as profiters of a *broken system*. As an involvement strategy, he emphasises the threat from other nations' actions by using the attributive adjective *global* as a modifier in referring to two nouns *theft* and *plunder,* which have explicitly criminal connotations. Trump is, therefore suggesting that all other countries engage in these illicit actions. The nouns he uses to describe their actions engage the audience because of their illicit connotations. Secondly, Trump presents *the American worker* and their *American wealth* as the victims of these actions, thus once more creates an *us vs. them* polarization through membership categorization: America against the rest of the globe. Next, he clearly spells out what has been happening by choosing to use the verb phrase *to take advantage of us*, which, again, carries a negative connotation and involves the audience emotionally as victims. The target taken advantage of is *us*, the in-group, Americans – another *us vs. them* polarization.

In the speeches analysed in this study, Trump's discourse on foreign countries as a threat to the US national security frequently relates to how they contribute to immigration issues. Perhaps the clearest example of Trump representing foreign countries as deliberately attempting to misuse the US immigration system can be found in Speech 10.

> (97) How about the lottery system, folks? Do you see that? That's the guy in New York City, the lottery system, where they put names in a bin. You know, you think these countries are legit when they do their lottery system. So, what they do, I would say, but more than just saying, they take their worst and they put them in the bin. And then when they pick the lottery, they have the real worst in their hands. Oh, here we go. And we end up getting them.

In this excerpt, Trump is addressing the alleged problems in the Diversity Visa Program, which he references depreciatively as *the lottery system*. First, Trump makes a connection with a terrorist attack that happened in New York, where the perpetrator had entered the US via the Diversity Visa program, alluding that it is easy for terrorists to enter the country via the program. Second, he misrepresents how the Diversity Visa Program works, claiming that it is a literal lottery that other countries use to send criminals to the United States. Trump accomplishes this negative-other presentation by alluding that the countries participating in the programme are not *legit*, thus claiming that there is misuse of the system happening. In addition, he explicitly claims that these countries *take their worst* or *the real worst*, alluding again that the people who are selected are criminals or otherwise dangerous, and the foreign countries send them intentionally to the United States. By employing these allusions Trump presents even government regulated immigration from other countries as a threat to the United States.

Trump's discourse on foreign countries as a threat to national security relates also to North Korea. In speech 9, Trump discusses the issue as follows:

(98)   But we want nations that cooperate together to create better for all people. That's what we're all about, all people. And we can't have madmen out there shooting rockets all over the place. And by the way, "Rocket Man"" should have been handled a long time ago.   He should have been handled a long time ago by Clinton. I won't mention the Republicans. By Obama. Why did this -- you know, this is a different time. This should have been handled eight years ago and four years ago and honestly 15 years ago and 20 years ago and 25 years ago. This shouldn't be handled now. But I'm going to handle it because we have to handle it. Little "Rocket Man." We're going to do it because we really have no choice. We really have no choice. Now he's talking about a massive weapon exploding over the ocean, the Pacific Ocean, which causes tremendous calamity. Where that plume goes, so goes cancer, so goes tremendous problems. And I want to tell you something, and I'm sure he's listening because he watches every word. And I guarantee you one thing, he's watching us like he never watched anybody before; that I can tell you; that I can tell you.

Trump uses a message of cooperation among nations as a segue to the threat that North Korea poses to the international community. He presents the issue of North Korea conducting ICBM tests in a colloquial and graphic way: *shooting rockets all over the place* – a strategy to involve the audience; you must fear them, because they attack indiscriminately. As a referential strategy, Trump gives the North Korean leader Kim Jong Un a derogatory nickname, *Rocket man*, later mitigating his stature by connecting the nickname with the attributive adjective *little*. Furthermore, he references Kim as a *madman*, thus depicting him as an unpredictable and irrational leader. This strategy of nomination with an aspect of predication functions as a strategy of negative other-presentation that is designed to intimidate his audience. Next, Trump uses this issue to attack former democratic administrations by pivoting to criticising them about their failure to deal with the North Korean threat and explicitly naming the Clinton and Obama administrations. He does recognize that there was a Republican president in office between Clinton and Obama by stating, *I won't mention the Republicans*, but chooses not to name the president in question, thus avoiding criticism of his own party. Trump, then, contrasts himself with the previous presidents and their inaction by declaring that he is *going to handle it* and stresses the importance of action by repeating twice that there is *no choice*, suggesting that without action, the situation will escalate. This is another strategy to involve the audience through fear-inducing rhetoric. Next, he goes on to provide a narrative of what might happen in the near future: a nuclear test conducted in the atmosphere above the Pacific Ocean. As an involvement strategy, he uses attributive adjectives to describe the size of the bomb (*massive* weapon) and the consequences (*tremendous* calamity). He also brings up *cancer* as a specific example of the consequences. Then he moves to reassure the audience of himself being able to affect Kim, by claiming that *he's watching us like he never watched anybody before*, suggesting that North Korea has not taken the previous presidents seriously, but him they do. Therefore, in this example, Trump not only presents North Korea as a danger, but uses this opportunity to

bash his political opponents and prop himself up as a unique leader who is there to *handle* everything.

To summarize, Trump's discourse on foreign relations relies yet again on polarization: Trump represents the United States as a victim taken advantage of by the rest of the world. To negatively represent other countries, Trump relies on involvement strategies, but also uses referential and predicational strategies. He uses metaphors, colloquial and graphic expressions to characterize the alleged abuse of international agreements by the other countries and chooses to use verbs and nouns that carry negative connotations to engage the audience. As a referential strategy, Trump uses membership categorization to emphasize that *the Americans* are the victims of these actions. On the other hand, when Trump discusses the Diversity Visa Program, he employs allusions as an involvement strategy to engage the audience by playing to their fears and prejudices. Finally, in terms of discussing the military threat posed by North Korea, Trump involves the audience by using attributive adjectives and a specific example to emphasize the gravity of the situation and a predicative noun to accentuate the unpredictability of the North Korean leader. All these strategies aim at presenting the world as unfair and dangerous, and Trump as the leader who can fix it.

8   DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to examine what kind of populist ideology Mr. Trump propagates to his core base in his campaign speeches and to what ends he is trying either to mould or to reinforce his constituents' views, beliefs and values. In addition, given the authoritarian behaviour that Trump has engaged in, as already established in previous research (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018), another key aim of this thesis was to examine how this trait manifests in his speeches. The data consisted of ten speeches that Trump gave at campaign rallies that in addition to being scripted for advertising the policies of the administration include off-script remarks that provide insight into Trump's views on society and institutions.

The study was conducted in two phases. First, a quantitative content analysis was conducted to identify which populist themes were the most prominent in Trump's speeches. The content analysis was also used to identify discourse that related to authoritarian behaviour and to determine whether there was any change in the number of occurrences of the populist and authoritarian discourses throughout the speeches. Second, a qualitative discourse analysis that relied on theories of strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation was conducted to show in detail how Trump uses populist and authoritarian discourse to affect and appeal to his base.

Before I discuss the findings of the analysis, I would like to address my observations regarding the suitability of quantitative content analysis for the purposes of my study. The quantitative content analysis served its purpose well as a diagnostic tool to estimate which populist themes Trump employs the most in the speeches analysed in this study. However, as a result of the large quantity of data and the fact that the coding process was conducted by a single coder, the accuracy of the results is questionable. For instance, sentences could be categorized under different populist themes, since they may have several discursive functions. Therefore, the coding of similar sentences may vary depending on how the coder subjectively perceived a sentence to reflect those populist themes at a given moment. Furthermore, Trump's discourse was found to be not only fragmented and meandering but also lacking either coherence or, at times, substance, which made it difficult to assign sentences into coding categories. Therefore, even though the content analysis provided relevant information on how frequently Trump uses populist themes in his speeches, I would not recommend this quantitative content analysis as a sole method of analysis for this type of freewheeling campaign discourse.

The results of the quantitative content analysis suggest that Trump strongly relies on four populist themes: The Charismatic Leader, Conservative Values, Simplistic Explanations and Solutions, and The Dangerous Others.

In the next four sections I will discuss in detail the results of the content and critical discourse analyses that provide answers to my research questions:

1. What kinds of populist themes does President Trump use in his speeches?
   1.1. Which themes are the most prominent ones?
   1.2 Does the emphasis evolve during his first year in office?
2. How does President Trump use strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation?
3. What kinds of features associated with authoritarianism can be found in President Trump's speeches?

Furthermore, I will discuss the implications of these results to the policies the Trump administration already has or may take in the future, and how Trump's campaign discourse may influence his supporters' beliefs and behaviours.

8.1 The Dear Leader

Populist movements are formed around a charismatic leader (Wodak 2015: 67). Trump's discourse suggests that he is well aware of the fact, since the most prominent populist theme in the speeches that were analysed was indeed The Charismatic Leader. Trump emphasizes his personal attributes the most, playing the role of the charismatic saviour. He also builds his image as an effective leader by touting what his administration has done for the people and promises to implement policies that his voters support and by making promises of a better future – to make America great again.

The results of the quantitative content analysis suggest that while Trump consistently advertises his personal characteristics and connection to the people the most, he appears to increase the utilization of this sub-theme when events in the political environment do not reflect positively on him. For instance, in Speech 1 the number of occurrences in the sub-theme of Personal Attributes and Connection to the People was more than double that of the other sub-themes, suggesting that since he did not yet have any demonstrable achievements, he resorted in convincing to his audience of his intent to deliver his promises and his commitment to the people. Similarly, in Speech 5, there was a marked spike in the sub-theme of Personal Attributes

and Connection to the People, which appears to be a reaction to the appointment of Special Counsel Robert Mueller to investigate Trump's campaign's role in the Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election and to the resulting negative media coverage. The data suggests that in that rally Trump attempted to counter the media narrative about his wrongdoings by highlighting his positive personal characteristics.

In performing the role of the charismatic leader, Trump utilizes the similar tripolar approach to representing the world as Rooyackers and Verkuyten (2012: 130) found Geert Wilders to use. Firstly, Trump explicitly declares himself as the messenger by stating *I am the messenger* already in Speech 1, positioning himself with the people, but at the same time as above the people, the one delivering their message and fighting for them. Furthermore, Trump appears to differentiate himself from his base by explicitly describing how *weird* it was that people from Alabama *love* him, even though he is a *guy who lives on 5th Avenue in the most beautiful apartment you've ever seen comes to Alabama and Alabama loves that guy*, as demonstrated in example (1).

Trump uses many discursive strategies to align himself with the people. For instance, he frequently resorts to collectivization by using the first-person plural for this purpose, and on the other hand, the third-person plural to differentiate *them* from *us*. Furthermore, Trump chooses to use verbs such as the above mentioned *to love,* to signal his emotional involvement and, thus, align himself with the people. In addition, Trump uses positive adjectives to describe his supporters to signal further involvement.

Secondly, Trump creates many foes as the third pole of the equation; his political opponents and political elites, for example, Hillary Clinton and the Democrats, illegal immigrants, dissenting voices in the community and the media. Elliot (2017: 8-9) found that in the 2016 presidential campaign Trump used significantly more fear inducing rhetoric, personal insults and political myths than the then-candidate of the GOP John McCain did in the previous presidential election. The results of this study affirm that Trump continues to use fear-inducing discourse. For instance, in his attempt to present himself as the Charismatic Saviour, Trump presents himself as the protector of the people by highlighting how the out-group is a danger to the people. For instance, when Trump positions himself as the saviour from the political elites, he uses fear inducing language, as was demonstrated in example (3). In describing the state of governing, Trump uses the adjective *dangerous* and asserted that the country was *weakened* and *endangered*, and *our people* were left *defenceless*, while vowing not *to stop fighting for the safety* of the people. Similarly, in example (7), Trump uses very graphic language to describe

attacks from undocumented immigrants, using the adjectives *viciously* and *violently*, and vowing to *protect American lives*.

A very prominent way for Trump to highlight his personal abilities as the leader is discourse representation. In several instances, e.g. examples (8)-(11), Trump recounts stories of important people, such as CEOs, the Prime Minister of Japan, lawyers and politicians either offering praise for him or being amazed by his decision and deal-making abilities. In all these instances Trump uses constructed dialogue, which according to Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (2004:135) is a form of storytelling that engages the audience effectively and signals the audience that the speaker is also involved. Therefore, it can be presumed that for Trump it is especially important to present himself as a powerful, respected leader that is capable of impressing people even at the highest echelons of government, corporations and even leaders of powerful nations.

The second most prominent sub-theme of the populist theme The Charismatic Leader found to be Materialized Success. In this category Trump continues to use similar strategies as with the sub-category of Personal Attributes. He aligns himself with the people using deictics and positive predication and involvement strategies. He also and points out the failings of his opponents while claiming he has *done far more* or *more than anybody* as demonstrated in example (14). However, Trump does not usually provide any evidence for his claims, but instead tends to use vague phrases, like the ones from example (14) or buzzwords, such as *win* in example (15), to describe his achievements. He also uses hyperbolic expressions and superlatives as involvement strategies to emphasize the magnitude of his achievements.

Interestingly, Trump frequently talks about his election victory and attempts to construct a legend-like narrative around the event. In examples (25), (26) and (27) Trump engages the audience in the cognitive acts of *remembering* or *never forgetting* the night he was elected. Furthermore, by using repetition and positive and hyperbolic attributive adjectives, Trump is implanting in the listeners' minds how *awe-inspiring* and *great* an event his election was. However, according to an analysis by *The Washington Post's* Phillip Bump (Bump 2016) using the numbers gathered by the Cook Political Report's David Wasserman (Wasserman 2016), Trump was elected only because 80 000 people voted for him in three key states even though he lost the popular vote by 3 million (CNN Politics 2016b). Therefore, Trump's strategy of describing his achievements in glorified terms, repeating his claims, engaging the audience in cognitive exercises and distorting the facts to make himself seem like an absolute winner or messianic saviour in every event he encounters appears to be a very effective way of convincing the audience of his seemingly undeniable excellence.

In employing the third sub-theme of the Charismatic Saviour, Future Success, Trump plays heavily into the concept of the saviour who is there to fix everything and do so quickly. Firstly, he uses verb tenses in a way that suggest constant action either behind the scenes or out in the open. Secondly, Trump frequently uses short tag-line type of declarations that are easy to remember in his promises. For instance, in example (28) he declares, *The miners are coming back!* Thirdly, Trump's lexical choices evoke imagery relating to his ability to resurrect the American dream. For instance, in example (28) Trump talks about turning *the EPA from a job-killer to a job-creator*, and in example (29) he promises that dying factories will *come roaring back to life*. Similarly, Trump declares in example (31) that his administration is *liberating our citizen from this Obamacare nightmare*, again using a verb that has connotations of saving the people from oppressors.

Another key theme found within the sub-theme Future Success is the perpetuation of the conservative myth of the golden age that has been lost. For instance, in example (32) Trump describes a future of prosperity in which patriotism and conservative values form the foundations of society and the world respects America and its citizens. These types of passages occur near the end of the speeches close to the closing sequence

> (33) Together, we will make America strong again. We will make America wealthy again. We will make America prosper again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again!

The qualitative analysis suggests that this wealthy and prosperous America does not necessarily apply to all Americans. The proud America, may reflect nativist sentiments, being proud of the white, Christian America. Furthermore, Trump's demonization of immigrants and dissenting individuals, who often are people of colour, is intended to convey that the safety of Americans is threatened by minorities, which in turn could suggest policies that limit the rights of immigrants and perhaps other minorities as well.

In terms of Trump's campaign slogan *Make America Great Again*, which appears in the oath-like closing sequence presented in example (33), it should be noted that the Republican icon Ronald Reagan used a similar slogan in his presidential campaign against Jimmy Carter in 1980, "Let's make America great again!" (Margolin 2016). Although Trump claims to have come up with the slogan himself (ibid.), it is possible that the slogan, because of the association with Reagan, is designed to appeal to those Republican voters who might otherwise be put off by this President's behaviour. However, the slogan has a more sinister side – a function as a racist dog-whistle, especially if one considers the connotations the words *safe* and *proud* mentioned in this oath. Even though America has been great for white people for a long time, some of

them now perceive immigration and minorities as a threat – a sentiment that Trump tapped into in his 2016 presidential campaign. Therefore, it can be argued that for some of Trump's supporters, the time when America was great may mean the time when minorities had fewer rights and the white man was in control of society and economy.

In addition, after all the self-aggrandising by employing the different sub-themes of the populist theme of The Charismatic Leader, this oath-like final sequence functions also as a sub-move-set, *wishing further success*, which Khany and Hamzelou (2014: 919) found in dictators' speeches. Arguably, Trump's call to *make America great again* can encourage his supporters to take a stand for their common values and to fight for their common goal to make the country *great* the way the white-nationalist segments of his base understand it. Furthermore, Trump's construction and propagation of the myth that he always wins and is always right can make his claims and promises more credible to those who are inclined to support him.

8.2 Trump's Authoritarian Conservatism

The second most prominent populist theme in Trump's speeches that was found in the content analysis was Conservative Values. This theme could be divided into six sub-themes of which Patriotism and Military, Limited Government and Law and Order were the most prominent ones. Interestingly, Trump's use of the sub-theme of Patriotism and Military increased as the year progressed, while the other two themes appeared to fluctuate in relation to significant events happening in society or policies being pushed in Congress.

In his discourse Trump relies heavily on the sub-theme of Patriotism and Military, glorifying the troops and veterans and vowing his support for them. According to Davidson (2007: 251) and Wodak (2015:67), emphasizing the importance of the military to protect the country is typical for neo-conservatives and right-wing populists, and, also, according to Paxton (2004: 157), a feature of authoritarian and fascist regimes. The parameters set for this study, however, prevented this type of discourse from being categorised as authoritarian discourse in the content analysis portion of the analysis. Two other sub-categories that Trump was found to emphasize in his campaign speeches were Law and order and Limited Government.

When Trump discusses the sub-themes of Patriotism and Military and Law and Order, he constructs the in-group, his supporters, and the out-group, everyone else, in a way that presents the in-group as patriots who want to protect and support the country and follow the law, while presenting the out-group as being opposed to the United States and its citizens being safe and

protected. Trump again uses the same tripolar approach as Geert Wilders did (Rooyackers and Verkuyten 2012: 130), presenting himself as a charismatic leader who functions as the messenger of the people, aligning himself with the common man and woman who work hard and support their families while distancing himself from the elites, as was shown in example (36).

> (36)   It's always terrific to be able to leave that Washington swamp and spend time with the truly hardworking people. We call them American patriots.

Furthermore, Trump uses the adjective *American* in a similar manner the British Nationalist Party uses the terms *British* and *Britons* to refer to white, Christian section of the British population (Richardson and Wodak 2009: 262). For instance, in examples (37) and (39) Trump discusses the economic benefits Americans should enjoy as follows:

> (37)   We are ending the offshoring and bringing back our beautiful, wonderful, great American jobs.

> (39)   We are operating on a very simple principle that our immigration system should put the needs of American workers, American families, American companies, and American citizens first.

Therefore, it can be argued, that when Trump uses the rhetoric of economic patriotism, he is directing his message to his largely white, Christian base, suggesting that they are the true *American citizens* who he will be put *first*, who will benefit from his policies.

Trump attaches conservative values and issues essentially to patriotism, while alluding that any other type of political alignment is un-patriotic. Trump frequently ties the military and the law-enforcement very strongly to the in-group through collectivizing strategies. He also uses glorifying attributive adjectives and hyperbole to signal his involvement in issues that relate to military and law-enforcement. On the other hand, he suggests that the out-group does not care about the military, claiming other administrations neglected military infrastructure and the veterans, going as far as to allude that because of the policies of the out-group, veterans had been *abused* by *sadists*, as discussed in example (44). When Trump creates these polarizations regarding the military, including military and veterans in the in-group and painting the policies of the out group as indifferent or out-right dangerous, he is politicizing the military, which is quite disconcerting. When Trump as the commander-in-chief suggests that the military is part of the in-group, while the out-group is presented as unpatriotic and unsupportive of the military, does that mean that the out-group should no longer be under the protection of the military? In the long run, this type of rhetoric may affect the non-partisan position the military has always had.

Similar concerns may be raised regarding Trump's rhetoric considering the actions of law-enforcement officials. For instance, in example (48) from Speech 6 he discusses Immigration and Customs enforcement officials as follows.

> (48) We are dismantling and destroying the bloodthirsty criminal gangs, and well, I will just tell you, we're not doing it in a politically correct fashion. We're doing it rough. Our guys are rougher than their guys. I asked one of our great generals, "How tough are our people? How tough are they?" He said, "Sir, you don't want to know about it." Then I saw one guy come out, a customs officer who is a monster. I said, "So general, you think I could take that guy in a fight?" He said, "Mr. President, Sir, I don't even want to think about it." I said, "You're right, actually." We have tough people. Our people are tougher than their people. Our people are tougher and stronger and meaner and smarter than the gangs.

Trump's focus on the physical attributes of the ICE agents and their ability fight suggests that he implies that part of law-enforcement officials' job is to engage in physical altercations, Trump euphemises their alleged contact as *not doing it in politically correct fashion*, and then in the next sentence explicitly spells it out: *We're doing it rough* This type of rhetoric becomes increasingly problematic when it is compared to what Trump said in an official White House event in which he addressed police officers in Long Island on July 28, 2017, only three days after Speech 6:

> And when you see these towns and when you see these thugs being thrown into the back of a paddy wagon — you just see them thrown in, rough — I said, please don't be too nice. (Laughter.) Like when you guys put somebody in the car and you're protecting their head, you know, the way you put their hand over? Like, don't hit their head and they've just killed somebody — don't hit their head. I said, you can take the hand away, okay?" (The White House 2017).

Trump talks about *throwing* detained individuals into police vehicles, with an added emphasis on how – *rough* – the same adjective he used in Speech 6 to describe the conduct of ICE agents. he also explicitly encourages violent behaviour: *I said, please don't be too nice; I said, you can take the hand away, okay?* In effect, the president, the highest law enforcement official in the country, gives police officers his permission to ignore the law and bang the head of the detained individual against the door frame. Furthermore, in Speech 6, Trump also promised to protect members of the law-enforcement *one hundred percent* (example (47)) after he had glorified the possible violent behaviour of ICE agents, as demonstrated in example (48). Therefore, one can argue that Trump's remarks in Speech 6 and in the official White House event three days later take on a more sinister tone; the president is condoning extrajudicial activities committed by law-enforcement officials unconditionally – *one hundred percent*.

The sub-theme of Law and Order also includes discussion regarding appointing judges and justices who support the originalist interpretation of the Constitution. Indeed, Trump explicitly spells out that the judges and justices he has and intends to nominate *should interpret the constitution as written*, as demonstrated in example (51). By expressing his support to the

originalist interpretation of the constitution, Trump appears to promote the ideological principles of traditional conservatism, which according to Farmer (2005: 49-50) include the allegedly decaying society being restored to the way it was in the mythical past, which manifests as a call to change society to "what the founding fathers intended". Trump's vision of how society should be restored becomes clear when he touts the nomination of Neil Gorsuch *to replace the late, great Justice Scalia* in example (49). Staab (2006: xxi) characterizes Scalia as "a staunch opponent of affirmative action, abortion rights, the right to die, and homosexual rights", while being a in favour of a stronger role of religion in society. Therefore, it can be expected that the rights of minorities and women's right to choose may be threatened by Trumps policies and the judges and justices he will appoint.

The third most frequently occurring sub-theme of the populist theme of Conservative Values was found to be Limited Government. Deregulation, reducing taxes and replacing Obamacare with a Republican non-government funded healthcare plan emerged as the central topics that Trump discusses in his speeches. This suggests that Trump continues the tradition of neo-conservative Tea Party movement, which emphasized a literal interpretation of the constitution in order to justify their claims for a limited government control over the life of citizens and, by extension, a limited form of welfare system (Schmidt 2011, Thompson 2007: 11).

Trump's preferred strategy to argue for the superiority of Republican policies is to demonize the Democratic Party. In terms of federal regulation, mainly environmental regulation, his strategy relies heavily on fearmongering tactics. He uses metaphors like *shackles on energy exploration* in example (53) and *war on coal* in example (54) to create an atmosphere of threat and oppression that his administration, in contrast, is fighting against with *dramatic efforts*, as stated in example (52). Similarly, he employs fear-inducing allusions, the best example of which can be found in example (55), in which he states in part,

> If they have a puddle in the middle of their field, a little puddle the size of this, it's considered a lake and you can't touch it. And if you touch it, bad, bad things happen to you and your family.

Trump is very skilled at providing simplistic but often inaccurate examples of how environmental regulation works. Furthermore, the allusion *And if you touch it, bad, bad things happen to you and your family* functions as an involvement strategy to represent the agencies that enforce regulations as mafia-like organizations that can destroy peoples' lives. With these types of strategies Trump very effectively presents agencies that implement federal regulations – which are mainly supported by Democrats – while Republicans see regulation as an infringement on individual liberty – as intimidating bureaucratic organizations that are a danger to the people. Indeed, during his presidency Trump has rolled back several environmental

policies that helped protect the environment. For instance, according Harvard Law School Regulatory Roll Back Tracker (2019), Trump has been able to repeal dozens on environmental policies, for instance the Clear Water Rule, which he appeared to reference in example (55).

In terms of tax and healthcare policies, Trump uses very similar strategies to present policies supported by the Democratic Party as a threat, while hyperbolically promising to deliver *Big league* tax cuts or, in terms of healthcare, *to take care of every single need you're going to want to have taken care of* (example (61)). For instance, in example (57) Trump states in part,

> The Democrats in Washington want to grow our welfare rolls that you're going to pay for. They want to grow all sorts of things that you don't want to even think about.

Firstly, by euphemizing expanding the social security network that many of his voters benefit from, as growing *welfare rolls that you're going to pay for*, Trump misleads the audience to perceive the policy as a negative for them. Second, he uses a similar scare tactic as he did regarding environmental regulation in example (55), when he alludes that the democrats *want to grow all sorts of thing that you don't want to even think about*. Similarly, in terms of healthcare Trump predicates the current state of the healthcare system as a *catastrophic situation* in which *Premiums will continue to soar, double and triple digits in many cases. It will drain our budget and destroy our jobs*, as demonstrated in example (61). Furthermore, as shown in example (60), Trump plays heavily into the prejudices his supporters harbour toward the former president, Barack Obama, by repeating the colloquial name of the healthcare plan, Obamacare, instead of using the official title, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Trump uses strategies of nomination, predication and involvement quite effectively to present the Democratic Party and the policies they support into the dangerous other, an enemy that threatens the jobs, freedoms and even the lives of the people. Employing these politics of fear Trump aims to keep the support of the Republican base, pass a tax cut and repeal the Affordable Care Act. As of March 2020, the ACA is still in effect, but Trump did manage to pass his tax reform in 2018.

In summary, Trump chooses to emphasize traditional conservative issues that have defined the Republican party for decades, suggesting that the policies he will implement during his presidency will mostly be aligned with the Republican ideology – reducing regulation and taxation, nominating conservative judges and providing increased funding for the military and law-enforcement. However, Trump's tendency to align himself politically with the military and law-enforcement and his quips that allude implicitly and sometimes quite explicitly to approval of extrajudicial tactics reveal an authoritarian inclination to secure the support of the

military and law-enforcement against the others, the perceived enemies – both foreign and domestic.

8.3 Cutting Corners with Oversimplification and Mischaracterization

The third most frequently occurring populist theme in Trump's discourse was Simplistic Explanations and Solutions. The number of occurrences of the sub-theme Simplistic Solutions was quite consistent throughout the speeches, but the sub-theme Simplistic explanations peaked considerably in the last speech of the year. This anomaly can be explained by Trump's attempt to recap everything he had done during his first year in office, and his attempt to explain his successes and failures in simplistic terms, either crediting himself or blaming others respectively.

The theme of Simplistic Explanations and Solutions frequently overlapped with other populist themes, which indicates that Trump attempts to represent every issue as a common sense, clear cut, either or -type of polarized explanation or solution. Trump's remarks on immigration, employment, and trade and defence-cooperation policies provided clear examples of Trump's strategy of oversimplifying and mischaracterizing issues to create polarization between us and them.

Trump approaches immigration mainly from two perspectives. Firstly, Trump presents it as an invasion that must prevented. He uses militaristic language to describe immigration. For instance, in example (62) he talks about *defending our borders*, as if there is an invasion coming, creating an *us* versus *them* situation, and suggests the simplistic solution of building the wall to defend the nation against this threat. Indeed, in February 2019 Trump issued a Proclamation, in which he declared a national emergency on the southern border, which gave him the authority to divert funding from the military to build his wall (Federal Register 2019). As Reisgl and Wodak (2001: 36-40) suggest, political rhetoric transitions across different fields of action and may result in concrete consequences. In this case the rhetoric of defending the country in the field of political advertising transitioned to the field of political executive and manifested as an executive action.

Secondly, Trump presents immigrants as a burden to the American people. In example (63), he employs the *topoi of finances and usefulness* to argue for a merit-based immigration system that would prevent immigrants from using the welfare system. Just like Trump's rhetoric on defending the southern border by building the wall transitioned from the field of political

advertising to the field of political executive, Trump's immigration as a financial burden manifested as an official policy in August 2019 when the Trump administration announced a new policy to limit legal immigration by imposing restrictions on who can apply for a Green Card (The White House 2019d). According to the policy, those who themselves or whose family members benefit from social security programs funded by the government, who, for example, use Medicare of receive foods stamps no longer qualify for residency. When the Acting Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Ken Cuccinelli, defended this policy on NPR, he went as far as to rewrite the poem by Emma Lazarus that is engraved on the Statue of Liberty, which is emblematic of the values that the United States has stood for as a nation of immigrants (Ingber and Martin 2019). In that interview Cuccinelli rephrased the line "Give me your tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free" as "Give me your tired who can stand on their own two feet and don't become public charges". Later, Cuccinelli appeared on CNN explaining his comments and added that the poem was originally supposed to apply to Europeans – in other words white people (CNN Politics 2019). Cuccinelli's rationale exposes the racist implications of the policy change, to keep people of colour from entering the United States, just like Trump's wall on the southern border would stop people from Central America, in other words, people of colour from poor conditions from entering the United States.

Trump's view of immigrants taking advantage of the United States appears to be a part of his fundamental world view – everyone else is taking advantage of the United States. This view also manifests in his discourse on trade agreements and military alliances, NATO in particular. Firstly, in terms of trade and employment, Trump's views reflect a protectionist ideology that he appears to have adopted from Henry Clay, an influential policymaker in the 1800s, as shown in example (65). Trump represents both the North American Trade agreement and Trans-Pacific Partnership negatively, while presenting American workers as victims of those agreements and him and his administration as a defender of the American people (example (64)). This is another example of Trump utilizing the same tripolar strategy that Rooyackers and Verkuyten (2012: 130) found Geert Wilders to use. He represents himself as the defender of the people aligning himself with them while suggesting that the rest of the world is only attempting to harm the people through unfair trade practices. It should be noted that in the past, Republicans have been in favour of free trade. Trump's economic patriotism and protectionist views on trade are leading the party to a new direction.

Secondly, in terms of NATO, Trump employs a similar rhetoric of abuse and victimization. Through examples (68) to (72), Trump makes the case that United States is there to protect all

other countries, while other countries are essentially freeloaders who are not *paying their bills* as he states in example (68). Trump appears to be heavily invested in this issue, since he uses constructed dialogue to involve the audience, as shown in example (71). Furthermore, contrary to many other topics he discusses, he provides numerical data – some of which he appears to exaggerate – to support his argument. Trump's mischaracterization of how NATO works and how it is funded negatively presents the organization as an organization that only benefits other countries at the expense of the United States. This suggests that Trump is not committed to the alliance and the common western values and interests it was founded to protect. Instead, he appears to view NATO as a transactional partnership that should financially benefit the United States. The most disconcerting example of this transactional view was demonstrated in example (72)

> (72) So we'll have a nation that doesn't pay. Then the nation gets frisky with whoever, Russia. So, we
>   have a nation doesn't pay. The nation gets aggressive. We end up in World War III for somebody
>   that doesn't even pay.

Trump expresses deep reservations about whether the United States should adhere to the collective defence principle expressed in Article 5 (North Atlantic treaty Organization 2018c). Firstly, Trump appears to condition the joint protection on payments, as if NATO a protection racket; pay up or you are one your own. Secondly, the fact that Trump frames the allied nation as the aggressor attempts to delegitimize the principle of attack on one is an attack on all, in other words, if the conflict is self-inflicted, why should the United States take any part in it. Trumps rhetoric raises serious concerns about his commitment to NATO or any other allies. In fact, on October 9, 2019, Trump made the decision, to withdraw American troops from the Turkish-Syrian border leaving American allies, the Kurds, vulnerable to attacks from the Turkish military (Graham 2019, The White House 2019a). Trump explained his reasoning in an official White House event as follows.

> […] we have spent tremendous amounts of money on helping the Kurds — in terms of ammunition, in
> terms of weapons, in terms of money, in terms of pay. With all of that being said, we like the Kurds.
>
> Now you have different factions in there. Again, you have PKK — that's a different faction. And they
> worked with us. It's a rough group, but they worked with us. But we've spent a tremendous — and they're
> fighting for their lands. So when you say, "They're fighting with us" — yes, but they're fighting for their
> land. (The White House 2019b)

Trump's remarks display a complete lack of commitment to American allies. The Kurds helped the United States military to fight ISIS, sacrificing 11 000 lives in the battle (Ignatius 2019). But when the physical caliphate was defeated and the Kurds became from Trump's perspective no longer useful, he chose to disregard the threat that Turkey posed to the Kurds and withdrew the American troops that helped stabilize the region. In his remarks Trump argues that the Kurds were not really fighting for *us* but for *their land*. Furthermore, he points out that the United

States has *spent tremendous amounts of money on helping the Kurds — in terms of ammunition, in terms of weapons, in terms of money, in terms of pay.* This is the very same rationale that Trump uses in example (72) – he frames the ally under attack as the aggressor and points out that the United States is losing money because of the conflict. Thus, both Trump's discourse and his actions demonstrate that under his leadership the United States is no longer a reliable partner.

Overall, Trump's simplistic explanations and solutions reflect his America First -ideology. According to him, Americans should be the ones to benefit from immigration, trade and military alliances, and if *the others* are not financially useful to *us*, there is no value in allowing *them* into the country or forming trade agreements or adhering to military alliances. His discourse suggests that if the rest of the world does not conform to his demands, Trump will redefine his America First -policy as "America Alone – Who Cares about the Rest".

8.4 Dangerous Enemies Everywhere

The fourth most prominent populist theme found in the quantitative content analysis portion of this study was The Dangerous Others. I was able to identify four sub-categories of *others* that Trump brought up in his discourse: The Media, Dangerous Individuals, The Elites and Foreign Countries. Within the three first sub-categories I was able to identify three forms of authoritarian discourse: (1) undermining the free press, (2) undermining members of co-equal branches of government and the intelligence community and (3) dehumanizing minorities and immigrants, of which category (1) was the most prominent with 360 occurrences, while the latter two scored 30 and 26 occurrences respectively.

In terms of discourse relating to the media as a threat, Trump again relies the tripolar approach that Rooyackers and Verkuyten (2012: 130) found Geert Wilders to use. He aligns himself with his supporters by using collectivization strategies while representing himself as the leader who will protect his people from the *dishonest media*. This strategy is especially evident in example (73). In the example, Trump uses attributive adjectives with negative connotations, such as *dishonest, false* and *corrupt* as a predicative strategy to present the media negatively. Furthermore, his choice of verbs to describe the actions of the media suggest an active attempt to mislead the people. For instance, Trump uses the verbs *to pretend, to make up* and *to lie* to suggest that the media is actively deceiving the people. Similarly, Trump uses the verb *to defeat* to assert that the media wants to take *us* down. Furthermore, Trump's claim that the media is

working against the people becomes explicit when he states, *Their agenda is not your agenda*, while he vows to *never, ever, let them get away with their lies.*

Perhaps the most common phrase that Trump uses to discredit the media is *fake news*. It can be associated with the German word *Lügenpresse,* which was used in war propaganda already in World War I, but perhaps most notoriously in the World War II by the national-socialist propaganda machine to discredit the press (Denner & Peter 2017: 274, Noack 2016). The connection with the phrase *fake news* and its German counterpart *Lügenpresse* has not gone unnoticed by Trump supporters. In an October 2016 rally the German term was shouted by the members of the audience at members of the media, and after the 2016 election the alt-right activist Richard Spencer used it in a speech in which he celebrated Trump's victory (Levi and Rothberg 2018: 357, Noack 2016). The fact that Trump's supporters associate the *phrase fake news* with a word that the Nazis used raises questions if it is not only a strategy to delegitimize the media but also a dog-whistle to the white supremacist fringe elements of his base.

Trump also uses strategies of negative other-presentation to depict the media as unpatriotic. For instance, in examples (76) and (77) Trump alludes that the media does not want to make the *country great*. According to the information gathered on Factbase (Factbase, "enemy of the people"), also noted by Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 181), Trump has further escalated his rhetoric by calling the press the enemy of the people. They report that Trump has used the phrase not only in tweets and interviews, but also in official White House events, which indicates that this language is in the process spreading from the field of political advertising to the field of executive and administration as defined by Reisgl and Wodak (2001: 36-40).

Trumps strategy to represent the media as a threat to the country may encourage his supporters to commit violent acts against the members the media. In example (79) Trump makes an implicit threat to the media

> (79)   …we have the hardest working, the smartest people, the toughest people. They're very lucky that our people don't protest, believe me. Believe me. They're very lucky.

I have previously argued that Trump associates the adjective *tough* with the ability to endure pain. When Trump states that the members of the media are *very lucky that our people*, who he just described as tough *don't protest*, he euphemises violence as protesting. Therefore, Trump's frequent cultivation of discourse that delegitimizes the media and represents journalists as unpatriotic in connection with implicit threats of violence poses a real threat to journalists. Indeed, in October 2018 a Trump supporter sent pipe bombs to several individuals considered to be critics of the president, including the former Director of National Intelligence, James

Clapper, who is a contributor at CNN (Robbins 2018). According Robbins (2018), Trump had tweeted,

> Clapper lied about (fraudulent) Dossier leaks to CNN' @foxandfriends FoxNews He is a lying machine who now works for Fake News CNN.

Although correlation does not necessarily imply causation, the President's rhetoric does nothing to de-escalate the tensions between his supporters and the media. Furthermore, this systematic endeavour to delegitimize and even intimidate the media by tacitly condoning violence suggests that just like other authoritarians, according to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 180), Trump is actively attempting to silence the opposition.

The second most frequently occurring sub-category of The Dangerous Others was found to be Dangerous Individuals and Groups. According to the critical discourse analysis, these he includes both citizens and non-citizens into this category. Most of his discourse focuses on migrants but he also finds private citizens, often members of minorities, who oppose his policies as enemies. Trump uses strategies of negative other-presentation to present these individuals a danger to the in-group. He uses the discursive strategies of societal problematisation and explicit dissimilation by employing criminonyms and xenonyms to demonize migrants, the out-group, while he uses strategies of nomination and predication to present his supporters, the in-group as the innocent victims. Furthermore, Trump uses dehumanizing language to describe the out-group, which, according to Kteily et al. (2015: 915), is common to right-wing authoritarians. For instance, an excerpt from example (83) demonstrates how Trump describes the in-group through strategies of positive self-presentation and the out-group through strategies of negative other-presentation.

> (83) The predators and criminal aliens who poison our communities with drugs and prey on innocent, young people, these beautiful, beautiful, innocent young people will, will find no safe haven anywhere in our country. And you've seen the stories about some of these animals. They don't want to use guns, because it's too fast and it's not painful enough. So they'll take a young, beautiful girl, 16, 15, and others, and they slice them and dice them with a knife because they want them to go through excruciating pain before they die.

To present the in-group positively, Trump employs attributive adjectives with positive connotations (*beautiful, innocent, young*) as a strategy of predication, and through the use of the verb *to poison* suggests that the outgroup is to blame for drug problems in *our communities* while the in group is *innocent*. In contrast, Trump resents the out-group negatively by using a xenonym with a negative attributive adjective (criminal aliens) and dehumanizing nominations (predators, animals). He also uses the verb to pray which in itself is associated with animals not humans to emphasize this dehumanizing message. In addition, Trump recounts a graphic example of the crimes the out-group inflicts on the in-group as an involvement strategy.

Similarly, individual citizens have also become a target for Trump's dehumanizing discourse. An excerpt of example (8) provides an example of how he dehumanizes an African American NFL player Colin Kaepernick who protested social injustice by kneeling during the national anthem.

> (86) Wouldn't you love to see one of these NFL owners when somebody disrespects our flag to say, "Get that son of a bitch off the field right now"

In this case, the dehumanization is more implicit in comparison to Trumps rhetoric regarding immigrants. However, by choosing to use the term *owners* in connection with an African American player, he evokes the terminology of slavery. Furthermore, by employing the phrase *son of a bitch* Trump denies the player his humanity and degrades him to the level of animals. Furthermore, Trump's animated discourse about Kaepernick's protest during the national anthem plays in to the mindset of conservatives with authoritarian personality traits, since, according to Altemeyer (1996: 11), those with right-wing authoritarian personalities have a strong affinity to patriotic values, such as respect for the flag and the national anthem.

In sum, based on the results of the critical discourse analysis I argue that Trump is actively trying to take away the humanity of migrants and individuals who oppose his policies to convince his supporters that the others are a threat. Furthermore, by dehumanizing immigrants and dissenting citizens, he attempts to make his base more susceptible to his draconian policies, like the zero-tolerance policy that resulted in family separation (Department of Justice 2018). Moreover, Trump's dehumanizing rhetoric has already spread from the field of political advertising to the field of executive action and administration, because in May 2018 the White House provided a statement titled "What You Need To Know About The Violent Animals Of MS-13" (The White House 2018b). Kteily et al. (2015: 913) suggest, those right-wing authoritarians who engage in dehumanizing rhetoric, tend not to sympathise with the minorities when they face social injustice. Therefore, his dehumanizing discourse may be especially persuasive for his supporters and it becomes even more effective when the language comes directly from the White House, suggesting that this is the official position of the administration.

It should also be noted that Trump does not condemn violence against immigrants or his critics. In addition to condoning physical violence committed by law-enforcement officials, as demonstrated in examples (47) and (48), and alluding to violence against members of the media in example (79), Trump signals his supporters that they may engage in physical altercations with his critics. He goes as far as to imply he relishes watching the violence, as demonstrated in example (87). It appears, that he does not even try to unify the already politically divided country, but further stokes division and pits the sides against each other.

Indeed, Donald Trump's inflammatory rhetoric in political rallies has real life consequences. Reisgl and Wodak (2001: 36-40) argue that discourses from fields of political action may spread to other areas of society. Indeed, Trump's discourse has created ripples through the societal fabric of the nation. His dehumanizing rhetoric and the glorification of physical violence towards the others has affected the actions of his supporters. In a study conducted by Edwards and Rushin (2018: page n/a) it was found that the number of hate crimes spiked after Donald Trump's inauguration, and the counties that voted for Trump experienced the steepest rise in hate crimes. They argue that Trump's election validated his hateful rhetoric, which encouraged the perpetrators to act.

Trump's discourse on the sub-theme The Elites, which in this study includes the political elites, government law-enforcement agencies, special interest groups and the judicial branch, relies heavily on a conspiratorial narrative that the elites attempt to subvert the will of the people by actively conspiring behind the scenes. This finding is in accordance with Wodak's (2015: 67) assertion that it is common for or right-wing populists to adopt and propagate conspiracy theories of the elites conspiring against the people. Furthermore, Trump uses the tri-polar approach described by Rooyakers and Verkuyten (2012: 130-137), in which he aligns himself with the people while representing the elites as an enemy that, firstly, attempts to take down himself as the leader and, secondly, to ignores the welfare of the people.

Trump attempts to discredit his political opponents by employing several strategies of negative other-presentation. He uses strategies of nomination for this purpose by choosing to use nouns that represent a faceless enemy (e.g. in example (89) *forces*, *voices* and *the Washington swamp*) and reinforces the perception by employing verb phrases that suggest opposition to the will of the people (e.g. in example (90) *sabotage our movement*) or ignoring the people (e.g. in example (89) *overlook*, *push-aside*, *sacrifice our sovereignty* and in example (92) *trying to cheat you out of the leadership that you want*). Moreover, he chooses to use adjectives that demonize his political opponents (e.g. in example (90) *bad*, *rigged* and *corrupt*) and in example (93) he spells out his conspiracy theory *, the only thing they really care about is protecting what they have been able to do, which is really control the country, and not to your benefit*.

In terms delegitimizing of law-enforcement agencies, namely the FBI, and the judicial branch Trump uses very similar tactics. He claims that the investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 elections was based on a story and a *fabrication* (example (91)) and claims that the Justice Department and the FBI are a *rigged system* that he has *straightened out* (example (93)). Similarly, he delegitimizes the judiciary by strategies of predication, claiming that their

decisions are *flawed* and accuses the judge of an "*unprecedented judicial overreach* (example (94)). Authoritarian leaders attempt to consolidate their power by politicizing the institutions by appointing loyalists in positions of power (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018: 77-81; Mickey et al. 2017: 21). In fact, Trump has appointed a record number of federal judges during his first three years an office and appointed an attorney general who has an extremely expansive view of presidential power (Lau 2019, White House 2019c). Trump's discourse relating to these institutions is intended to delegitimize the judges and officials within the Department of Justice who oppose or investigate him, which in turn is intended to legitimize the steps is taking to remake the judiciary and the Department of Justice.

The least frequently occurring sub-category of the populist theme The Dangerous Others was found to be Foreign Countries. Trump's discourse relies on the language of crime and victimhood and allusions of other countries deliberately attempting to take advantage of the United States. For instance, in example (96) Trump decries the *global theft and plunder at the expense of the American worker*, when referring to multilateral agreements. Trump frequently alludes through lexical choices that other countries are committing illegal acts against the United States. According to Wodak (2015: 66-67), it is typical for populists to represent the demos as the victims of the others, and Trump plays into this narrative through strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other presentations, pitting the entire world against the United States.

In fact, this narrative of victimhood is threaded through all the sub-categories of The Dangerous Others. Trump's rhetoric suggests that the media is attempting to suppress the will of the people by dishonest reporting, the *criminal aliens* […] *poison our communities with drugs and prey on innocent, young people*, the elites are *trying to sabotage our movement* and the other countries view the United States as the *big piggy-bank that everyone likes to rob*. By creating these dangerous enemies, both foreign and domestic, though strategies of negative other-presentation, Trump is using fear to consolidate power over his base. He is signalling to the audience that they cannot trust anyone within the country who disagrees with them politically or cooperate with foreign allies, because *the others* are out to get *us*. The conspiratorial discourse that creates division within the country and increases distrust of other nations isolates Trump's base though fear and prejudice from Americans who may have differing political opinions and the international community. Donald Trump's America is under siege – by Donald Trump himself.

9   CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mickey et al. (2017: 20) argue that Donald Trump has the potential to propel the United States into a mild form of competitive authoritarianism. The findings presented in this study appear to support that assertion. Trump uses populist discourse to strengthen his hold on his base. Using strategies of positive self-presentation, he presents himself as the invincible leader who is the only one his supporters can trust while denigrating his political opponents and even allies of the United States through strategies of negative other-presentation. He propagates conspiracy theories about the intelligence community and his political opponents and presents allied countries as a threat, while politicizing the military and the law-enforcement community by including them in the in-group. Furthermore, mostly implicitly but sometimes explicitly, he encourages acts of violence against the media, immigrants and private citizens on the other side of the political aisle. Disconcertingly, he has employed this type of discourse not only in his rallies but also in an official White House event featuring members of the law-enforcement community.

In the speeches analysed his study, Trump floated conspiracy theories about his political opponents and the investigation relating to Russian interference in the 2016 election. After Trump appointed a political loyalist William Barr as Attorney General, the Department of Justice has begun an investigation into the origins of the Russia investigation, focusing on the actions of the members of the intelligence community who Trump perceives as his political opponents. Indeed, According to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018: 77-81 and Mickey et al. (2017: 21), a strategy for an authoritarian leader to consolidate power is to politicize institutions by appointing loyalists and partisans in positions of power, which gives him the resources to go after his political opponents. In this case, Trump's discourse from the field of political advertising has transitioned to the field of executive action, with possibly devastating consequences for the right to express political opinions – a key pillar of a democratic society.

It is unlikely that Trump will face much opposition against his authoritarian tactics from the Republican party. Altemeyer (1996: 9) asserts that conservatives, who tend to have authoritarian personalities, are willing to support their leader fully, no matter what they do. They not only accept their statements and actions without question, but also reject any criticism toward their chosen authority figure, which may lead them to accept even criminal behaviour from the leader, because they believe that the leader has "an inherent right to decide for themselves" (Altemeyer 1996: 9). Therefore, Trump's repeated declarations of the media being *fake news* and *the enemy of the people*, and his suggestions that the opposition party is out to

sabotage our movement most likely only consolidate his power over his base. Trump manipulates his supporters to believe that they cannot trust anyone but him and that he has the right to use whatever means possible to silence the dissenting voices.

With the acquiescence of his loyal Republicans in Congress, Trump is blurring the limits of the power of the executive branch. His unique style of unabashedly breaking the norms of public discourse and the actions he takes to put the independence of government agencies into question inevitably reshape the political landscape in the United States. Even though the institutions in the United States are strong, Donald Trump, both with his discourse and actions, is slowly corroding the guardrails of democracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Speech 1

President Trump Rally in Melbourne Florida. http://www.c-span.org/video/?424154-
    1/president-trump-holds-rally-melbourne-florida&live. (27 November, 2019).

Speech 2

President Trump Rally in Nashville, Tennessee. http://www.c-span.org/video/?425428-
    1/president-trump-calls-revised-travel-ban-freeze-unprecedented-judicial-overreach. (27
    November, 2019).

Speech 3

President Trump Rally in Louisville, Kentucky. http://www.c-span.org/video/?425711-
    1/president-trump-promises-pass-health-care-bill-in-form. (27 November, 2019).

Speech 4

President Trump Remarks in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. http://www.c-
    span.org/video/?427466-1/president-fake-news-media-touts-record-100-days. (27
    November, 2019).

Speech 5

President Trump Remarks in Iowa. http://www.c-span.org/video/?430256-1/president-trump-
    urges-gop-add-money-health-care-bill. (27 November, 2019).

Speech: Donald Trump Holds a Political Rally in Cedar Rapids, Iowa - June 21, 2017.
    http://factba.se/transcript/donald-trump-speech-rally-cedar-rapids-iowa-june-21-2017.
    (27 November, 2019).

Speech 6

President Trump Rally in Youngstown, Ohio. http://www.c-span.org/video/?431659-
    1/president-trump-holds-rally-youngstown-ohio. (27 November, 2019).

Speech 7

President Trump Rally in Huntington, West Virginia. http://www.c-span.org/video/?431931-
    1/president-trump-holds-rally-west-virginia. (27 November, 2019).

Speech 8

President Trump Rally in Phoenix, Arizona. http://www.c-span.org/video/?432748-1/president-trump-criticizes-dishonest-media-defends-charlottesville-remarks-rally-phoenix. (27 November, 2019).

Speech 9

President Trump Remarks at Senator Strange Campaign Rally. http://www.c-span.org/video/?434480-1/president-trump-campaigns-alabama-senator-luther-strange. (27 November, 2019).

Speech 10

President Trump Rally in Pensacola, Florida. http://www.c-span.org/video/?438191-1/president-trump-holds-rally-pensacola-florida. (27 November, 2019).

Secondary Sources

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Harvard University Press: USA.

Atkinson, D. (2018) Charlottesville and the alt-right: a turning point?, *Politics, Groups, and Identities,* 6 (2), 309-315. doi: 10.1080/21565503.2018.1454330.

Beauzamy, B. (2013). Explaining the rise of the front national to electoral prominence: Multi-faceted or contradictory models. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik and B. Mral (eds.), *Right-Wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*, 177-190.

Betz, H. and Johnson, C. (2004). Against the current--stemming the tide: The nostalgic ideology of the contemporary radical populist right. *Journal of Political Ideologies,* 9 (3), 311-327. doi: 10.1080/1356931042000263546.

Blake, A. (2017, May 2). Trump wants more power and fewer checks and balances — again. *The Washington Post*. [online] Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/04/29/trump-is-now-talking-about-consolidating-his-own-power/?utm_term=.1dc05fbaa18b. (1 February, 2020).

Bump, P. (2016, December 1). Donald Trump will be president thanks to 80,000 people in three states. *The Washington Post*. [online] Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/12/01/donald-trump-will-be-president-thanks-to-80000-people-in-three-states/. (24 September, 2019).

Bonikowski, B. and Gidron, N. (2016). The populist style in American politics: Presidential campaign discourse, 1952-1996. *Social Forces*, 94 (4),1593-1621. doi: 10.1093/sf/sov120.

Brady, D. and Eilperin, J. (2018 July 5). Scott Pruitt steps down as EPA head after ethics, management scandals. *The Washington Post*. [online] Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/trump-epa-head-steps-down-after-wave-of-ethics-management-scandals/2018/07/05/39f4251a-6813-11e8-bea7-c8eb28bc52b1_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.e167c06d7964. (2 February, 2019).

Bugaric, B. (2016). The assault on postcommunist courts. *Journal of Democracy,* 27 (3), 69-82. doi: 10.1353/jod.2016.0047.

Burghart, D. and Zeskind, L. (2010). Tea party nationalism. Institute for Research and Education on Human Rights [online]. http://dig.abclocal.go.com/wtvd/docs/IREHR_Report_102010.pdf. (30 October, 2019).

Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the people! Populism and the two faces of democracy. *Political Studies*, 47 (1), 2-16. doi: 10.1111/1467-9248.00184.

CNN Politics (2016a). Pennsylvania results. Presidential results. http://edition.cnn.com/election/2016/results/states/pennsylvania. (30 October, 2019).

CNN Politics (2016b). Election 2016 – Presidential results. http://edition.cnn.com/election/2016/results/president. (9 September 2019).

CNN (2017). Trump pardons former Sheriff Joe Arpaio. http://edition.cnn.com/2017/08/25/politics/sheriff-joe-arpaio-donald-trump-pardon/index.html. (20 November 2019).

CNN Politics (2019). Cuccinelli rewrites Statue of Liberty poem to make case for limiting immigration. http://edition.cnn.com/2019/08/13/politics/ken-cuccinelli-statue-of-liberty/index.html. (19 November, 2019).

Committee on Ways and Means 2017: With the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the typical family of four earning the median family income of $73,000 will receive a tax cut of $2,059. http://gop-waysandmeans.house.gov/house-passes-generation-tax-reform-legislation-deliver-tax-relief-grow-economy/. (30 October, 2019).

Gore, D. (2018). VA Could Fire Workers Before Trump Signed Law. *FactCheck.org® - A Project of The Annenberg Public Policy Center*. http://www.factcheck.org/2018/07/va-could-fire-workers-before-trump-signed-law/. (30 January, 2019).

Davidson, L. (2007). One-Dimensional Men Neoconservatives, Their Allies and Models. In M Thompson (ed.), *Confronting the New Conservatism: The Rise of the Right in America. New York University Press, 2007*. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=865926. 247-268.

Dean, J. W. (2006). *Conservatives without conscience*. (Kindle ed.). New York: Penguin Group.

Denner, N., & Peter, C. (2017). Der Begriff Lügenpresse in Deutschen Tageszeitungen. *Publizistik*, 62 (3), 273-297. doi: 10.1007/s11616-017-0354-4.

Department of Justice (2018). Attorney General Sessions Delivers Remarks Discussing the Immigration Enforcement Actions of the Trump Administration San Diego [online]. http://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/attorney-general-sessions-delivers-remarks-discussing-immigration-enforcement-actions. (24 August 2019).

Edwards, G. S. and Rushin, S. (2018) The Effect of President Trump's Election on Hate Crimes. *SSRN*, n.pag. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3102652.

Elliott, R. D. (2017). It's just a jump to the right: The tea party's influence on conservative discourse. *European Journal of American Studies*, 12 (2), 1-16. doi: 10.4000/ejas.12212.

Esen, B. and Gumuscu, S. (2016). Rising competitive authoritarianism in turkey. *Third World Quarterly,* 37 (9), 1581-1606. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2015.1135732.

Factbase, "enemy of the people" http://factba.se/search#%22enemy%2Bof%2Bthe%2Bpeople%22. (21 October, 2019).

FactSquared in the media. http://pro.factsquared.com/press.php. (19 November, 2019).

Federal Register (2019). Declaring a National Emergency Concerning the Southern Border of the United States – A Presidential Document by the Executive Office of the President on 02/20/2019. *Federal Register. The Daily Journal of the United States Government*. [online]. http://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/02/20/2019-03011/declaring-

a-national-emergency-concerning-the-southern-border-of-the-united-states. (11 October 2019).

Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee and M. Handford (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of critical discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Farmer, B. R. (2005). *American conservatism: History, theory and practice*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Feldman, S. (2003). Enforcing social conformity: A theory of authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 24 (1), 41-74. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00316.

Gallup 2019: Highly Religious, White Protestants Firm in Support for Trump. http://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/248384/highly-religious-white-protestants-firm-support-trump.aspx. (21 Novembeer, 2019).

Graham, L. (2019). Press Releases - Senators Graham, Coons Request Briefing on US Withdrawal from Northern Syria. http://www.lgraham.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2019/10/senators-graham-coons-request-briefing-on-us-withdrawal-from-northern-syria. (11 October, 2019).

Gramlich, J. (2019). 5 facts about crime in the U.S. *Pew Research Center*. http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/03/5-facts-about-crime-in-the-u-s/. (31 January, 2019).

Georgakopoulou, A. and Goutsos, D. (2004). *Discourse analysis: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Greenberg, J. (2017a). Once again, Trump overstates U.S. tax ranking. *Politifact*. http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2017/oct/18/donald-trump/once-again-trump-overstates-us-tax-ranking/. (25 November, 2019).

Greenberg, J. (2017b). Arpaio falsely ties conviction to Obama administration. *Politifact.* http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2017/aug/29/joe-arpaio/arpaio-falsely-ties-conviction-obama-administratio/. (25 November, 2019).

Hawkins, K. A. (2009). Is chávez populist? measuring populist discourse in comparative perspective. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (8) 1040-1067. doi: 10.1177/0010414009331721.

Harvard Law School Environmental & Energy Law Program 2019: Regulatory Rollback Tracker. http://eelp.law.harvard.edu/regulatory-rollback-tracker/. (4 October, 2019).

Heim, J. (2017, August 14). Recounting a day of rage, hate, violence and death. *The Washington Post*. [online] Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2017/local/charlottesville-timeline/. (27 November, 2019).

Hirano, S., Snyder, J. M., Ansolabehere, S. and Hansen, J. M. (2010). Primary elections and partisan polarization in the U.S. congress. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 5 (2), 169-191. doi:10.1561/100.00008052.

Holsti, O. R (1963). Computer Content analysis. In North, R.C. (ed.). *Content analysis: A handbook with applications for the study of international crisis*. USA: Northwestern University Press, 131-145.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Huq, A. Z. and Ginsburg, T. (2017). How to lose a constitutional democracy. *UCLA Law Review* [online] 65 (1), 78-169. http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=13666&context=journal_articles.

Ignatius, D. (2019, October 7). As Trump abandons Syrian Kurds, a top commander pleads for U.S. support. *The Washington Post*. [online] Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2019/10/07/trump-abandons-syrian-kurds-top-commander-pleads-us-support/. (11 October, 2019).

Ingber S, and Martin R. (2019). Immigration Chief: 'Give Me Your Tired, Your Poor Who Can Stand on Their Own 2 Feet'. http://www.npr.org/2019/08/13/750726795/immigration-chief-give-me-your-tired-your-poor-who-can-stand-on-their-own-2-feet. (19 November, 2019).

Jacobson, L. (2017) Donald Trump wrong that his tax plan is biggest cut ever. *Politifact*. http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2017/oct/26/donald-trump/donald-trump-wrong-his-tax-plan-biggest-cut-ever/. (25 November, 2019).

Johnson, J. (2016, Septeber 16). Trump admits Obama was born in U.S., but falsely blames Clinton for starting rumors. *The Washinghton Post*. [online] Retrieved from

http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/09/16/trump-admits-obama-was-born-in-u-s-but-falsely-blames-clinton-for-starting-rumors/ (19 November, 2019).

Khany, R. and Hamzelou, Z. (2014). A systemic functional analysis of dictators' speech: Toward a move-based model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 917-924. doi: //doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.500.

Kiely, E (2018). Timeline of Russia Investigation: Key moments in the FBI probe of Russia's efforts to influence the 2016 presidential election. *FactCheck.org® - A Project of The Annenberg Public Policy Center,* June 7, 2017. Updated on July 19, 2018. http://www.factcheck.org/2017/06/timeline-russia-investigation/. (30 July, 2018).

Kornai, J. (2015). Hungary's U-turn: Retreating from democracy. *Journal of Democracy* [online] 26 (3), 34-48. http://muse.jhu.edu/article/586477

Kreis, R. (2017). The "Tweet politics" of President Trump. *Journal of Language and Politics,* 16 (4), 607-618. doi: 10.1075/jlp.17032.kre.

Krippendorff, K. (2013). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A. and Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109 (5), 901-931. doi: 10.1037/pspp0000048.

Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. London: Verso.

Lau, T. (2019). Analysis - William Barr's Troubling View of Presidential Power. *Brennan Center*. http://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/william-barrs-troubling-view-presidential-power. (24 October 2019).

Levi, N. and Rothberg, M (2018). Memory studies in a moment of danger: Fascism, postfascism, and the contemporary political imaginary. *Memory Studies,* 11 (3), 355-367. doi: 10.1177/1750698018771868.

Levitsky, S. and Way, L. (2002). The rise of competitive authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy*, 13 (2), 51-65. doi: 10.1353/jod.2002.0026.

Levitsky, S. and Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die.* (Kindle ed.). New York: Crown.

Margolin E. (2016). 'Make America Great Again'—Who Said It First? *NBC News*. http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/make-america-great-again-who-said-it-first-n645716. (23 November, 2018).

Merriam-Webster: Sentence. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sentence.(30 October, 2019).

Mickey, R., Levitsky S. and Way, L. A. (2017). Is America still safe for democracy? Why the United States is in danger of backsliding. *Foreign Affairs* [online] 96 (3), 20. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1909733916?accountid=11774.

Mohammadi, M. and Javadi, J. (2017). A critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's language use in US presidential campaign, 2016. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6 (5), 1-10. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.5p.1.

Mudde, C. (2004). The populist zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*, 39 (4), 541-563. doi: 10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00135.x.

Noack, R. (2016, October 24). The ugly history of 'Lügenpresse,' a Nazi slur shouted at a Trump rally. *The Washington Post*. [online] Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/10/24/the-ugly-history-of-luegenpresse-a-nazi-slur-shouted-at-a-trump-rally/. (28 February, 2019).

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2018a). Funding Nato. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_67655.htm. (21 February 2019).

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2018b). Defence Expenditure of NATO Countries (2010-2017). http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2018_03/20180315_180315-pr2018-16-en.pdf. (21 February, 2019).

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2018c). Collective Defence – Article 5. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm (10 October, 2019).

Oliver, J. E. and Rahn, W. M. (2016). Rise of the Trumpenvolk: Populism in the 2016 election. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 667 (1) 189-206. doi: 10.1177/0002716216662639.

Paxton, R. O. (2004). *The anatomy of fascism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Pelinka, A. (2013). Right-wing populism: Concept and typology. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik and B.Mral (eds.), *Right-wing populism in Europe: Politics and discourses*. London Bloomsbury, 149-162.

Politico 2016: Full text: Donald trump 2016 RNC draft speech transcript. http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974. (20 November, 2018).

Potter, W. J. and Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27 (3), 258-284, doi:10.1080/00909889909365539.

Putterman, S. (2018). Complex tale involving Hillary Clinton, uranium and Russia resurfaces. *Politifact*. http://www.politifact.com/facebook-fact-checks/statements/2018/dec/07/blog-posting/complex-tale-involving-hillary-clinton-uranium-rus/. (25 November, 2019).

Reisigl, M. (2017). The discourse-historical approach. In J. Flowerdew and J. E. Richardson (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies*. London: Routledge, 44-59.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London; New York: Routledge.

Richardson, J. E. and Wodak, R. (2009). Recontextualising fascist ideologies of the past: Right-wing discourses on employment and nativism in Austria and the United Kingdom. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6 (4), 251-267. doi: 10.1080/17405900903180996.

Roberts, K. M. (2006). Populism, political conflict, and grass-roots organization in Latin America. *Comparative Politics*, 38 (2), 127-148. doi: 10.2307/20433986.

Robbins, L. (2018, October 26). They Were Sent Pipe Bombs. Here's What Trump Said About Them — and What They Said About Trump. *The New York Times*. [online] Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/26/nyregion/who-received-pipe-bombs-explosives.html?module=inline. (5 March, 2019).

Rooyackers, I. and Verkuyten, M. (2012). Mobilizing support for the extreme right: A discursive analysis of minority leadership. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51 (1), 130-148. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02008.x.

Rydgren, J. (2007). The sociology of the radical right. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 241-262. doi: 10ai46/annurevjoc.33.040406.131752.

Sakki, I. and Pettersson, K (2016). Discursive constructions of otherness in populist radical right political blogs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46 (2), 156-170. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2142.

Schmidt, C. W. (2011). The tea party and the constitution. *Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly* [online] 39, 193-951.

http://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1545&context=fac_schol.

Staab, J. B. (2006) The Political Thought of Justice Antonin Scalia: A Hamiltonian on the Supreme Court. *Rowman & Littlefield Publishers*. [online] search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=656002&site=ehost-live. (30 January 2019).

Strijbos, J., Martens, R. L., Prins, F. J. and Jochems, W. M. G. (2006). Content analysis: What are they talking about? *Computers & Education,* 46 (1), 29-48. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2005.04.002.

Tax Policy Center (2016). Tax Policy Center Briefing Book. http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/sites/default/files/briefing-book/briefing_book_-_chapter_4.pdf. (11 February, 2019).

Terms & Conditions. (2014). http://www.c-span.org/about/termsAndConditions. (21 November, 2019).

The White House 2017: Remarks by President Trump to Law Enforcement Officials on MS-13. http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-law-enforcement-officials-ms-13/. (31 January, 2019).

The White House 2018a: Statement by the press secretary on the presidential advisory commission on election integrity. https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-press-secretary-presidential-advisory-commission-election-integrity/. (31 October, 2019).

The White House 2018b: What You Need To Know About The Violent Animals Of MS-13. http://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/need-know-violent-animals-ms-13/. (31 October, 2019)

The White House 2019a: Statement from the Press Secretary.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-press-secretary-85/. (11
October, 2019).

The White House 2019b: Remarks by President Trump at Signing of Executive Orders on
Transparency in Federal Guidance and Enforcement.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-signing-
executive-orders-transparency-federal-guidance-enforcement/. (11 October, 2019).

The White House 2019c: President Donald J. Trump is Ensuring Non-Citizens Do Not Abuse
Our Nation's Public Benefit http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-
donald-j-trump-ensuring-non-citizens-not-abuse-nations-public-benefit/. (19 November,
2019).

The White House 2019d: The Washington Times: "'Historic Milestone': Senate Confirms
150th Trump Judicial Nominee". http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-
statements/washington-times-historic-milestone-senate-confirms-150th-trump-judicial-
nominee/. (24 October, 2019).

Thompson, M. (2007). America's Conservative Landscape. The New Conservatism and the
Reorientation of American Democracy. In M. Thompson (ed.), *Confronting the New
Conservatism : The Rise of the Right in America*. New York University Press. ProQuest
Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-
ebooks/detail.action?docID=865926. 9-30.

Thrush, G. and Haberman, M. (2017, August 12) Trump Is Criticized for Not Calling Out
White Supremacists. *The New York Times*. [online] Retrieved from
http://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/12/us/trump-charlottesville-protest-nationalist-
riot.html. (21 November, 2019).

Titscher, S., Jenner, B., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and
discourse analysis*. London: SAGE.

Tobias, M. (2017). Are there over $4 trillion of untaxed corporate earnings offshore, as
Donald Trump said? *Politifact*. http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-
meter/statements/2017/aug/03/donald-trump/are-there-over-4-trillion-untaxed-
corporate-earnin/. (25 November, 2019).

Trump, D. [realDonaldTrump]. (2012a, May 18). Let's take a closer look at that birth certificate. @BarackObama was described in 2003 as being "born in Kenya." [Tweet]. Retrieved from http://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/203568571148800001

Trump, D. [realDonaldTrump] (2012b, August 6). An 'extremely credible source' has called my office and told me that @BarackObama 's birth certificate is a fraud. [Tweet]. Retrieved from http://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/232572505238433794

Trump, D. [realDonaldTrump]. (2014, September 6). Attention all hackers: You are hacking everything else so please hack Obama's college records (destroyed?) and check "place of birth". [Tweet]. Retrieved from http://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/508194635270062080

Valverde M. (2018). Donald Trump falsely says ICE liberated towns from MS-13 control. Politifact. http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/jul/09/donald-trump/did-ice-liberate-towns-donald-trump-claimed-have-w/. (5 April 2019).

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 249-283. doi: 10.1177/0957926593004002006.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political ideologies*, 11 (2), 115-140. doi: 10.1080/13569310600687908.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, California; London: SAGE. [online] https://dx-doi-org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.4135/9781412983488

Westwood, S. (2017, April 26). Exclusive interview: Trump 'absolutely' looking at breaking up 9th circuit. *Washington Examiner*. [online] Retrieved from https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/exclusive-interview-trump-absolutely-looking-at-breaking-up-9th-circuit. (31 October, 2019)

Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics. *Comparative Politics*, 34 (1), 1-22. doi: 10.2307/422412.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE.

Wodak, R. (2013). Anything goes. The Haiderization of Europe. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik and B. Mral (eds.). *Right-Wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*, London: Bloomsbury, 23-37.

Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. London: Sage.

Wasserman, D. (2016). 2016 National Popular Vote Tracker. Cook Political Report. http://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/133Eb4qQmOxNvtesw2hdVns073R68EZx4SfC nP4IGQf8/edit#gid=19. (24 September, 2019).

WP Fact Checker - Tracking all of President Trump's misleading claims (2020a). Search: double and triple digits. (Updated 19 January 2020). http://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-claims-database/?utm_term=.a294df88d9be. (24 March, 2020).

WP Fact Checker - Tracking all of President Trump's misleading claims (2020b). Search: owned Russian companies. (Updated 19 January, 2020). http://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-claims-database/?utm_term=.a294df88d9be. (24 March, 2020).