



## PLAGIARISM RULES AWARENESS STATEMENT

### **Fraud and Plagiarism**

Scientific integrity is the foundation of academic life. Utrecht University considers any form of scientific deception to be an extremely serious infraction. Utrecht University therefore expects every student to be aware of, and to abide by, the norms and values regarding scientific integrity.

The most important forms of deception that affect this integrity are fraud and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the copying of another person's work without proper acknowledgement, and it is a form of fraud. The following is a detailed explanation of what is considered to be fraud and plagiarism, with a few concrete examples. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list!

If fraud or plagiarism is detected, the study programme's Examination Committee may decide to impose sanctions. The most serious sanction that the committee can impose is to submit a request to the Executive Board of the University to expel the student from the study programme.

### **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the copying of another person's documents, ideas or lines of thought and presenting it as one's own work. You must always accurately indicate from whom you obtained ideas and insights, and you must constantly be aware of the difference between citing, paraphrasing and plagiarising. Students and staff must be very careful in citing sources; this concerns not only printed sources, but also information obtained from the Internet.

The following issues will always be considered to be plagiarism:

- cutting and pasting text from digital sources, such as an encyclopaedia or digital periodicals, without quotation marks and footnotes;
- cutting and pasting text from the Internet without quotation marks and footnotes;
- copying printed materials, such as books, magazines or encyclopaedias, without quotation marks or footnotes;
- including a translation of one of the sources named above without quotation marks or footnotes;
- paraphrasing (parts of) the texts listed above without proper references: paraphrasing must be marked as such, by expressly mentioning the original author in the text or in a footnote, so that you do not give the impression that it is your own idea;
- copying sound, video or test materials from others without references, and presenting it as one's own work;
- submitting work done previously by the student without reference to the original paper, and presenting it as original work done in the context of the course, without the express permission of the course lecturer;
- copying the work of another student and presenting it as one's own work. If this is done with the consent of the other student, then he or she is also complicit in the plagiarism;
- when one of the authors of a group paper commits plagiarism, then the other co-authors are also complicit in plagiarism if they could or should have known that the person was committing plagiarism;
- submitting papers acquired from a commercial institution, such as an Internet site with summaries or papers, that were written by another person, whether or not that other person received payment for the work. The rules for plagiarism also apply to rough drafts of papers or (parts of) theses sent to a lecturer for feedback, to the extent that submitting rough drafts for feedback is mentioned in the course handbook or the thesis regulations. The Education and Examination Regulations (Article 5.15) describe the formal procedure in case of suspicion of fraud and/or plagiarism, and the sanctions that can be imposed.

Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse. Each individual is responsible for their own behaviour. Utrecht University assumes that each student or staff member knows what fraud and plagiarism entail. For its part, Utrecht University

works to ensure that students are informed of the principles of scientific practice, which are taught as early as possible in the curriculum, and that students are informed of the institution's criteria for fraud and plagiarism, so that every student knows which norms they must abide by.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the above.
Name: Amanda DOCHY  Student number: 6190537
Date and signature: 26 July 2018 X

Submit this form to your supervisor when you begin writing your Bachelor's final paper or your Master's thesis.

Failure to submit or sign this form does not mean that no sanctions can be imposed if it appears that plagiarism has been committed in the paper.

**Speaking “Transgressive Truth”:**

Assessing the political extremism of Donald Trump’s campaign discourse during the  
2015/2016 US Presidential Pre-primaries and Primaries

Amanda Dochy

6190537

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

26 JULY 2018

A thesis submitted to

The Board of Examiners

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of  
Masters of Arts in Conflict Studies and Human Rights.

Thesis Supervisor: Chris VAN DER BORGH.

Date of Submission: 26 July 2018.

Trajectory: Research Project (15 ECT) and Thesis Writing (15 ECT).

Word Count: 26,976.

“In America, ballots are bayonets.” - Francis E. Willard<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A major figure in early twentieth century alcohol prohibition campaigning, Willard was also an early feminist and progressive issue campaigner. Lars Beckerman, “Burns’ Prohibition yet another triumph of american storytelling”, Lars Beckermann, 4 October 2011, <https://larsbeckerman.wordpress.com/2011/10/04/burns-prohibition-yet-another-triumph-of-american-storytelling/>.

## **Acknowledgments**

Researching and writing this has been a long and occasionally arduous journey. I would like firstly to thank my supervisor, Chris Van Der Borgh for his insight, suggestions and our conversations on the subject matter. I would then like to thank my family and friends for their love, support, and critique - and Tree, for his support and our many long discussions trying to decipher what exactly was happening to politics in our 'day and age'.

I would also like to thank all those who are doing research on the various issues evoked in this paper. Clear, precise critique is an antidote to an age attached to extreme language and projections of future uncertainty.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	6
Table of Contents.....	7
Abstract.....	8
 Chapter 1. Prologue.....	 9
1.1. <i>Trump: an alt-right candidate?</i> .....	9
1.2. <i>How to assess this question</i> .....	11
 Chapter 2. Party Politics, ‘anti-establishment’ conservatism, and the alt-right.....	 14
2.1. <i>Early Presidential Elections Campaigning and literature on Election Communication</i> .....	14
2.2. <i>The Campaign Speech</i> .....	15
2.3. <i>Anti-establishment conservatism, the alt-right, and ‘Discourses of Transgression’</i> .....	18
 Chapter 3. Analytical Frame and Research Methods.....	 27
3.1. <i>Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Theoretical debates</i> .....	27
3.2. <i>“Discourses of Transgression”</i> .....	32
3.3. <i>CDA methods &amp; information on analytical material</i> .....	35
 Chapter 4. Analyses.....	 36
4.1. <i>Competitivy: Success and Failure as conceptual space of campaign message</i> .....	37
4.1.1. <i>Frame of Diagnosis</i> .....	38
4.1.2. <i>Frame of Prognosis</i> .....	59
4.1.3. <i>Frame of Motivation</i> .....	70
4.2. <i>Conclusion</i> .....;	78
 Chapter 5. Discussion: <i>How do Trump’s discourses and their frames compare to “transgressive discourses”?</i> .....	 81
 Chapter 6. Concluding Statements.....	 85
 Bibliography.....	 88
Primary sources for Rally Speeches.....	98
Annexe I.....	102
Annexe II.....	103
Annexe III.....	109
Annexe IV.....	122

**Abstract.** Donald Trump's use of language during the 2015-2016 US Presidential Elections sparked outpourings of commentary and analyses from media and academia alike, with many making correlations between Trump and a new radical anti-establishment, or 'alt-right', politics. Considering his uses of language during this period as *political discourse*, this study assesses whether Trump integrated this transgressive political ideology into his campaign rally speeches, from June 2015 to July 2016 during the US Presidential pre-primaries and primaries elections. Through critically analysing a corpus of speeches from these periods, this study contends that Trump used 'modular' speeches premised upon an ideological foundation of competition, success, and failure. The modules of these speeches depend upon correlated and amalgamated reasoning and image association to argue for the necessity of Trump's own candidacy as a 'remedy' to a 'failed country'. His language tapped into existing discriminatory beliefs through the use of these correlated 'spaces of projection' and appealed to audiences through the use of simple narratives of problem and solution. This study has also found that Trump shared features but diverged from alt-right discourses in several respects, and identifies major discursive features of Trump's language from this period.

**Keywords.** Political polarization, US politics, political extremism, political radicalism, Donald Trump, Alt-right



## Chapter 1. Prologue

### 1.1. Trump: an 'alt-right' candidate'?

There had been much commentary over the course of the 2016 Presidential Elections about the emergent outsider figure of Donald Trump. He was bombastic, polemical - to say the least, an 'unusual' candidate, consistently breaking taboos of conventional political speech. By August 2015, in the middle of the volatile pre-primaries period, Trump had taken on a new mantle in these depictions: he harboured some kind of connection to an emergent affiliation of right-wing radical groups known as the "alt-right". His language "electrified" this alt-right,<sup>2</sup> his rallies were "filled with just as much anti-establishment vitriol as any extremist rally"<sup>3</sup> and "his bid has also provided a tremendous boost"<sup>4</sup> to the alt-right.

In liberal media commentary and news coverage, Trump would morph into a figure embodying fringe political intolerance: "One is (...) left with the conclusion that Trump is a proto-fascist (...) he is also part of a wave of right-wing nationalist movements that is sweeping the west"<sup>5</sup>; similar words were iterated by reporters who warned that Donald Trump was part of "a movement gaining momentum among whites across the Northern Hemisphere".<sup>6</sup> The New York Times editorial page editor Andrew Rosenthal said that "Donald Trump [was] deliberately using offensive rhetoric to fan fury from the far right"<sup>7</sup>; the primarily online liberal journal Vice called him a "troll"<sup>8</sup>. Trump's election as president would further reinforce this status: "he is the first neo-nazi president" who did not just "'play footsie' with the new white-supremacists movement in America (...)" but "embodies the movement, in his rhetoric, in his actions, and in his

---

<sup>2</sup> SPLC in Abigail Hauslohner, "Southern Poverty Law Centre says American hate groups are on the rise". *The Washington Post*, 15 Feb. 2017,

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/southern-poverty-law-center-says-american-hate-groups-are-on-the-rise/2017/02/15/7e9cab02-f2d9-11e6-a9b0-ecee7ce475fc\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.7d0aOfdb2844](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/southern-poverty-law-center-says-american-hate-groups-are-on-the-rise/2017/02/15/7e9cab02-f2d9-11e6-a9b0-ecee7ce475fc_story.html?utm_term=.7d0aOfdb2844).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Rosie Grey, "How 2015 fueled the rise of the freewheeling, white nationalist 'alt-movement'", *Buzzfeed News*, Dec. 28, 2015,

[https://www.buzzfeed.com/rosiegray/how-2015-fueled-the-rise-of-the-freewheeling-white-nationali?utm\\_term=.cm32gOmpo#.tne50KlBM](https://www.buzzfeed.com/rosiegray/how-2015-fueled-the-rise-of-the-freewheeling-white-nationali?utm_term=.cm32gOmpo#.tne50KlBM).

<sup>5</sup> Peter Bergen, "Is Donald Trump a Fascist?" *CNN*, 2015.

<https://edition.cnn.com/2015/12/09/opinions/bergen-is-trump-fascist/index.html>.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Susan Lehman, "Editorial Page Editor Andrew Rosenthal on Trump Campaign". *The New York Times*, 3 Sep. 2015.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/03/insider/times-editorial-page-editor-andrew-roenthal-on-trump-campaign.html>.

<sup>8</sup> Oliver Lee, "Understanding Trump's troll army". *Vice Motherboard*, 13 Mar. 2016,

[https://motherboard.vice.com/en\\_us/article/bmvnq4/understanding-trumps-troll-army](https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/bmvnq4/understanding-trumps-troll-army).

person”<sup>9</sup>; he was the “best available vehicle” for the alt-right<sup>10</sup>; and mainstream media started raising “questions on the extent to which he’s fanned the [alt-right] movement”.<sup>11</sup> A minority of commentators retroactively criticized the amount of attention the media gave to this potential relationality,<sup>12 13</sup> maintaining that exaggerating their influence upon a figure they admired was an alt-right tactic in itself.

There is no doubt that Trump held appeal for many ‘alt-rightists’,<sup>14</sup> as he quickly became a figure emblemized in memes and articles across the internet.<sup>15</sup> But from the way media depicted Trump’s controversial statements, it is easy to infer that Trump emulated alt-right sentiments, or even was in some way part of the alt-right. How much is this based in reality, and if this is too difficult to assess then how far does alt-right ideology penetrate Trump’s own language and discourses? Was Trump just “giving space” to the alt-right, or “fanning” them or “energizing” them and how was he doing this through his campaign language? Indeed, how similar were Trump’s discourses, or his ‘ideological language’, to the alt-right’s?

The goal of this study is to investigate, through the use of a critical discourse analysis framework, the presence of alt-right language within Trump’s early campaign messages in order to assess what correlations there were between these two controversial languages, and to inform the debate about Trump’s involvement with right-wing ideas during his campaigning. I have no explicit goal of trying to understand how or why Trump may have won the presidential nomination, but rather to investigate his language and its potential affiliations - which may inform future research into his rise as a contentious political figure. I started secondary literature research attempting to investigate the alt-right as a social movement, and while reading through articles and overviews on mainstream media channels about the alt-right noticed a trend in not only depicting Trump as an influence within alt-right circles, but also as somewhat complicit in using and sympathizing with alt-right ideas and language. From here, I started preparing a discursive analysis framework to probe Trump’s campaign language, in particular speeches which function as consistent, repeatable amplifiers for campaign messages

---

<sup>9</sup> Bob Moser, “Donald Trump, Neo-Nazi recruiter-in-chief”. *The New Republic*. 14 Aug. 2017. <https://newrepublic.com/article/144312/donald-trump-neo-nazi-recruiter-in-chief>.

<sup>10</sup> Patrick Strickland, “Can the US alt-right survive divisions and backlash?” *Al Jazeera*, 17 Oct. 2017. <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/09/alt-survive-divisions-backlash-170927150529249.html>.

<sup>11</sup> C. Weaver, “America’s alt-right champion credits Trump with movement’s revival”. *Financial Times*, Date Unknown. <https://www.ft.com/content/09bca2d2-80e2-11e7-a4ce-15b2513cb3ff>.

<sup>12</sup> Matt Taibbi, “Why Trump can’t quit the Alt-Right” *Rolling Stone*, 21 Aug. 2017. <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/taibbi-why-trump-cant-quit-the-alt-right-w498515>

<sup>13</sup> Chava Gourarie, “How the ‘alt-right’ checkmated the media”. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 30 Aug. 2016. [https://www.cjr.org/analysis/alt\\_right\\_media\\_clinton\\_trump.php](https://www.cjr.org/analysis/alt_right_media_clinton_trump.php).

<sup>14</sup> Angela Nagle, *Kill all normies: Online culture wars from 4chan and Tumblr to Trump and the alt-right*. (Hants: John Hunt Publishing, 2017); Grey, Rosie, “How 2015 fueled the rise of the freewheeling”.

<sup>15</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

through their modular structure. As well, research had been done on Trump's use of social media,<sup>16 17</sup> but other discourse analyses of Trump's speeches tended to extrapolate from a few examples or focus on recurrent words alone, as opposed to broader ideological trends in his language - and so in my view there lacked a thorough assessment of Trump's 'general' discursive trends.

The choice of investigating his language seemed intuitive, as it is the most effective means of investigating similarity. Metaphor is metaphor and themes are themes, even if they do vary in their format and their modality; it is thus crucial to make allowances for interpretations and variations, albeit in an informed context. Furthermore, the alt-right is not well defined as a political phenomenon, but its messages and use of language are consistent and revolve around identifiable themes (see "Discourses of Transgression" section). Overall, this study is informed by communications studies, political science literature, political language theory, and various other sources of information about the Presidential Election cycle, forms of communication within it, and historical trends within US party politics; this research not only informed my interpretations of the material, but I hope it will also inform the reader prior to engaging with the findings.

## **1.2. How to assess this question**

This study's initial goal was to study and assess speeches and debates from the whole 2016 election cycle. However, because of time constraints, I instead focused on the first half of this cycle. Any conclusion on Trump's use of language or 'Trumpism' would also need to be extrapolated from further study of his use of social media, his later rally speeches, and his 'presidential' language.

During the pre-primaries and primaries periods candidates make their 'first impression'<sup>18</sup> with the media and any attentive electorate, and candidates must form, refine, and test their 'campaign message'<sup>19</sup> through various forms of public communication. Furthermore, they must distinguish themselves from their fellow-party members, on an individual basis as opposed to a political basis (as most policy positions on popular debates are the same among candidates of the same party).<sup>20</sup> In this sense, it is a period with less direct political antagonism and more space to

---

<sup>16</sup> Brian L. Ott, "The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 34 no.1 (2017): 59-68.

<sup>17</sup> Enli Gunn, "Twitter as arena for the authentic outsider: exploring the social media campaigns of Trump and Clinton in the 2016 US presidential election." *European Journal of Communication* 32 no.1 (2017): 50-61.

<sup>18</sup> Judith S. Trent and Robert V. Friedenberg. *Political campaign communication: Principles and practices*. (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008): 25.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Donna M. Goldstein, and Kira Hall. "Postelection surrealism and nostalgic racism in the hands of Donald Trump." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7 no.1 (2017): 397-406.

differentiate *self* as candidate. Hence, in this context how could Trump define himself and his message as different from other republicans who, policywise, may hold similar views? This is the context in which my analysed material is embedded, and this is partially the reason for why these parts of the election cycle were analysed. Furthermore, this also happened to be the period in the 2016 elections when media started focusing their attention on the alt-right as a phenomenon. As will be explained below, the alt-right's dispersed groupings are affiliated through a belief in racialized, anti-establishment political ideologies. There have been a number of attempts at defining the alt-right with little consensus - they have been called a group,<sup>21</sup> a movement,<sup>22</sup> a party to online "culture wars",<sup>23</sup> and an "ideology"<sup>24</sup> - and meanings and associated debates attached to such definitions may complicate comparison. For this reason, in this thesis discourses/discursive features have been chosen as the main indicators of 'alt-rightness', and as the common denominator for comparison.

Overall, the above constraints of the election context and the commonality of alt-right language condition this research:

How similar and how different were Donald Trump's political discourses to those of emergent transgressive alt-right discourses, during the 2016 US Presidential election pre-primary and primaries Trump campaign rally speeches from July 2015 to June 2016?

The problem statement is delimited to the pre-primaries and primaries as well as to the Republican National Convention. It focuses on Trump's use of discourse in his speeches during a critical period in the US Presidential Elections, and requires assessing whether these modules of discursive language were 'politically transgressive/radical' or not; I have also chosen to contextualize these investigations within broader trends of US political party politics and electorate polarization. This investigation is nonetheless focused on textual analysis, done through critical discourse analysis or CDA. CDA is a framework of critique deconstructing ideological language tactics in public communications.

<sup>21</sup> Matthew N. Lyons, "Ctrl-Alt-Delete: The Origins and Ideology of the Alternative Right." Somerville, MA: Political Research Associates, 2017.

<sup>22</sup> Niko Heikkilä, "Online antagonism of the alt-right in the 2016 election." *European journal of American studies* 12 (2017):12-2. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.12140>.

<sup>23</sup> Nagle "Kill all normies".

<sup>24</sup> Gabriel Emile Hine, et al.. "Kek, cucks, and god emperor trump: A measurement study of 4chan's politically incorrect forum and its effects on the web." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03452* (2016): 1-15. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1610.03452>.

This investigation's findings will be presented in several steps. First, context will be given about US presidential elections, contemporary trends in party sorting and the rise of anti-establishment politics in the US, and critical discourse analysis. An overview of this study's methods will also be given alongside the 'discourses of transgression' comparative framework, prior to moving on to the findings which are divided up, after an examination of the fundamental ideological base of 'competitiveness', into three parts: Frame of Diagnosis, Frame of Prognosis, and Frame of Motivation. A discussion and some conclusive statements will close this study.

## Chapter 2. Party Politics, ‘anti-establishment’ conservatism, and the alt-right

It is important to consider Donald Trump’s language use, alongside the alt-right’s, within a focused context of not only Presidential election political communication but alongside a wider context of emergent anti-establishment conservative politics and trends in increased political partisanship. This section provides firstly an overview of Presidential Elections Campaign communication, secondly the format of the rally speech, which is the unit of this study’s “observation”, then concludes with a brief history of US political trends, especially within conservative politics. This then introduces the emergent radical political phenomenon that has received so much attention, the alt-right.

### **2.1. Early Presidential Elections Campaigning and literature on Election Communication**

The US Presidential elections happen every 4 years. From as early as the summer prior to the election year, candidates announce their running and start to campaign in local elections called the Primaries and Caucuses. In the US, these elections run along party lines, and have for function the selection of the party’s presidential candidate.<sup>25</sup>

#### 2.1.1. Pre-primaries

The informal preparation period before these first elections is often called the ‘pre-primaries’ by analysts and commentators.<sup>26</sup> There is no defined start to this period, but it can generally be understood as encompassing the year prior to the formal election year.<sup>27</sup> Candidates at this period “must assess their visibility and credibility as well as determine their financial backing and organizational strength”.<sup>28</sup>

Speeches and debates serve not only symbolic functions,<sup>29</sup> displaying the stamina and capacity of candidates, but also publicize the candidates’ opinions and influence the development of “voters’ expectations of a candidate’s [personal] style”<sup>30</sup>; this is also a period when main campaign issues come to the fore - social, economic, and other domestic policy

---

<sup>25</sup> Bureau of International Information Programmes, “*USA in Brief: Elections*”, U.S. Department of State, Last accessed 2 June 2018, [https://static.america.gov/uploads/sites/8/2016/05/Elections-USA\\_In-Brief-Series\\_English\\_Lo-Res-1.pdf](https://static.america.gov/uploads/sites/8/2016/05/Elections-USA_In-Brief-Series_English_Lo-Res-1.pdf).

<sup>26</sup> Patterson, “Pre-primary News Coverage”.

<sup>27</sup> Trent and Friedenbergh. *Political campaign communication*.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*, 22.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid*, 22.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, 29.

issues.<sup>31</sup> It is a period that is more informal than the primaries and general elections, and a time when candidates can get in touch with their parties' voter bases.<sup>32</sup>

### 2.1.2. Primaries

The primaries are formal, state-organized elections where either party members (closed primaries) or the general voting public (open primaries) can cast their ballot for whoever they deem the most suitable candidate for their party and, alongside caucuses which are held in some states (party-member only 'conventions' and elections), they define this period of the election cycle (in practice and in name); the so-called "Primaries period" plays a much more explicit and formal function than the pre-primaries.<sup>33</sup> These elections have, in recent years, usually started around January or early February of the election year, Iowa and New Hampshire usually starting off the period with their caucuses or primary elections. Some states organize only primaries or only caucuses, and some states organize both according to the parties' preference.<sup>34</sup>

After extensive campaigning across the country,<sup>35</sup> the summer of the election year each party organizes a National Convention for their members and officially announces their respective candidates. National Conventions "have largely become ceremonial events",<sup>36</sup> as primaries and caucuses are being held earlier and earlier in the election year and so results are announced increasingly early. Conventions are, however, symbolically seen as inaugurating the start of the general election campaigns<sup>37</sup>; they inaugurate a crucial and conflictual period for all involved, requiring communicatory tactics and financial and social means of differentiating one's candidacy from others.

## 2.2. The Campaign speech

Trent et al. highlight<sup>38</sup> generic definitions and features of campaign speeches, their usual forms and their significance within campaigns. They maintain that speeches are usually the product of skilled planning and preparation, prepared usually after campaigns have thoroughly scouted out appropriate and strategic locations with amply supportive, partisan audiences.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Bureau of International Information Programmes, "*USA in Brief: Elections*".

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid:28.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Trent and Friedenbergl. *Political campaign communication*.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

'Stock speeches' within presidential campaigns are commonly modular in their form.<sup>40</sup> The modular form is useful because speeches must fulfill the function of being repeatable and adaptable to each new context<sup>41</sup>: "Typically, candidates will have a speech unit, or module, on each ten to twenty issues on which they most frequently speak."<sup>42</sup> These modules are adapted, prolonged or cut-down, and usually follow set structures similar to most rhetorical genres: an attention-grabbing introduction, moving on to an introduction of a problem or hypothesis, then a presentation of the candidate's policies as solutions.<sup>43</sup> Trent et al. maintain that these modules are usually established from the beginning of the campaign, and adjusted as the campaigning progresses<sup>44</sup> for each "specific audience and occasion".<sup>45</sup>

### 2.2.1. The Media in campaigns

The media, Trent et al. maintain, plays an important role in campaign salience and amplification,<sup>46</sup> and modern campaigns have become the domain of the media consultant, as they are increasingly professional affairs. New media and new media conditions have, since the 1970s<sup>47</sup> and the end of party leaders' election of candidates, affected the decline of political party supremacy - electoral politics in the US has shifted and continues to shift dramatically with each new potential source of public communication.

Other communications research has focused on media's influence on the electorate through medias' candidate representations. The *Shorenstein Centre on Media, Politics, and Public Policy* published two reports by Thomas Pattinson and Media Tenor<sup>48 49</sup> on the 2016 Presidential pre-primaries and primaries assessing candidate coverage by eight major news chains. The author's analysis follows from the logic that the media plays a major role in the election cycle by providing candidates with visibility, and potential voters with information. The nature of this information is, however, variable in its political capacity - as, the author maintains, the news requires stories and is far from being a neutral political advisor. "The result is that the press' version of a presidential campaign is a refracted one, shaped as much by news values as by

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid:186.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid:189.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid:316.

<sup>47</sup> Nelson W. Polsby, et al. *Presidential elections: Strategies and structures of American politics*. (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008).

<sup>48</sup> Patterson, "Pre-primary News Coverage".

<sup>49</sup> Patterson, "News Coverage of the 2016 Presidential Primaries".



political factors”,<sup>50</sup> but these versions are nonetheless highly influential and, for many observers, may even be indicators of candidates’ success, in this case during the critical primaries era.

Patterson places an especial focus on Donald Trump’s media reception as he was the perfect candidate for media: one of Trump’s major assets as a candidate, Patterson maintains, was his ability to attract any kind of attention, and his candidacy was arguably “propelled by press coverage throughout 2015 and into the first three stages of the primary period”.<sup>51</sup> Trump’s candidacy largely benefited from “the media’s fascination with the story possibilities presented” by him.<sup>52</sup> The media’s fascination was largely framed through the commonly used “race-horse” narrative - of which candidate is coming in first in the polls - that made for constant and popular news over the course of the six-month primaries. The effect this has on voters, Patterson posits, is that they may decide on a choice for nominee without having been exposed to their choice’s issue positions and policy stances, and will only be exposed to such topics once they become newsworthy: “they are greeted by news coverage that’s long on the horse race and short on substance”.<sup>53</sup> Media coverage of the 2016 primaries was very short on substance but consistent in maintaining Trump’s visibility.<sup>54</sup>

Visibility during the primaires period is crucial, but this visibility often ignores the substance of the candidates’ messages - and nonetheless does have an influence on the electorates’ vote.<sup>55</sup> Alongside this and the advent of ‘soundbite’ online news media, substance can easily be lost in representations of candidates. In this sense, Trump conformed very well to the conditions of modern elections, and his many controversial statements were easily adapted to these new media formats and his tactics of speech can be understood as ‘conventional’ for these new conditions. Furthermore, his represented affiliation with the alt-right could be interpreted as working in his advantage, as it it exacerbated his ‘visibility’.

### 2.2.2. Features of Republican Campaign language

There is surprisingly little scholarship outlining common traits of republican or democrat candidate party messages within US Presidential Elections - and this is crucial in considering just how divergent Trump was from republican electoral speech. Recent analyses of Donald Trump’s language<sup>56 57</sup> comparing it to Hillary Clinton's are interesting in that they compare

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, 3.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 25.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 25.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, 26.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Patterson, “Pre-primary News Coverage”.

<sup>56</sup> Marta Degani, "Endangered intellect: a case study of Clinton vs Trump campaign discourse." *Rivista semestrale ISSN 2281*, (2017): 4582.

language and thematic difference between parties - but expressive and communicative variation within parties is under-evaluated in research. Scholars of conservatism and the history of conservatism are more apt to consider these variations in policy positions within the Republican party, for one - but there is still little written on common textual features of these 'republicanisms'.

Nevertheless, speechwriter Barton Swaim<sup>58</sup> wrote an insightful article into how he would 'design' the perfect ('neutral') Republican stump speech. He highlights the importance of 'middle-ground' phrasing to appeal to all divergent policy positions among the republican electorate, emphasizing the importance of making reference to family, religion, patriotism, and the past success of former republican governments (nostalgia is overall a good call, he maintains, although it is "not a policy stance"<sup>59</sup>). On divisive issues like trade, he recommends making "quick rhetorical gestures in both directions",<sup>60</sup> and to make vague claims to taking a "realistic approach to spending".<sup>61</sup> Overall, he recommends maintaining the tension between keeping the party line and speaking to the electorate's opinions on what the country needs - and this tension can easily be resolved in critique of the current administration: "saying you're certain what the wrong policy is - namely, the policy of those presently in charge - is a reliable way to sound clear and confident when you have no idea what the right course is".<sup>62</sup> Overall, Barton's ample experience working with Republican policy and 'presentation' clarifies what those 'common traits' of Republican electoral speech may look like.

### **2.3. Anti-establishment conservatism, the alt-right, and 'Discourses of Transgression'**

Conservatism, as a political category of language and belief, can be understood as a dynamic and evolving collective identity, with social and political positions under constant negotiation and compromise<sup>63</sup> within the boundaries of recognizable political and moral positions.

'Anti-establishment conservatism', a self-designation and an ideological tendency under constant scrutiny among scholars, has been a feature of conservative politics since the 1960s.<sup>64</sup> I maintain that it does manifest itself in political language - in itself referencing a *world view*

---

<sup>57</sup> Yaqin Wang, and Haitao Liu. "Is Trump always rambling like a fourth-grade student? An analysis of stylistic features of Donald Trump's political discourse during the 2016 election." *Discourse & Society* 29 no.3 (2018): 299-323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926517734659>.

<sup>58</sup> Barton Swaim, "The Perfect Republican Stump Speech." FiveThirtyEight. November 23, 2015. Accessed July 02, 2018. <https://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/republican-stump-speech/>.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Adrian Wooldridge, and John Micklethwait, *The right nation: Why America is different*, (London: Penguin, 2011).

about how the “state of affairs” of America should look like, premised upon a critique of ‘normative’ politics and its distance with ‘the people’. This section considers the history of this branch of conservative politics, within the context of evolving political party trends, and also presents contemporary forms of anti-establishment conservatism and briefly considers its domineering influence upon the Republican party; the ‘alt-right’ and its use of language is then assessed as an emergent form of anti-establishment politics.

### 2.3.1. A brief history of anti-establishment conservatism

Horwitz<sup>65</sup> defines conservatism as a political ideology as well as a defining trait of the Republican party, or the GOP (“Grand Old Party”): it is “rooted in an appreciation for the importance of tradition and the social world we inherit, a theory of individual freedom and property, and a deep suspicion of the power of the state”.<sup>66</sup> It ontologically places importance on the individual as opposed to social structure, and this translates into highly principled, rigid, and often circumspect political positions. Prior to WW2, conservatism had been associated with a political “establishment elite”.<sup>67</sup> After the war, however, with the ‘liberal consensus’ of the New Deal-era becoming a norm, this old vanguard of classist traditionalism started to dissolve and there emerged a self-proclaimed ‘anti-establishment’ conservatism propelled by small business, its political associates, and some political fringe groups (Christians and ‘Western Civilization’ advocates, for instance).<sup>68</sup> These, Horwitz maintains, “‘fused’ two strains of thought: an economic libertarianism with a socially conservative christian traditionalism, forming an ideology of ‘peculiarly anti-statist statism’”.<sup>69</sup> This anti-establishment conservatism would continue to evolve in contention with traditional conservatism, and would have many offshoot political ideologies and groups.

Political issues within anti-establishment conservative language are represented as being *moral* issues, and many societal issues as political: “virtually everything to anti-establishment conservatives - facts, science, expertise - is politics: that is, unsettled, untrue, and open to contestation”<sup>70</sup> and this contestation goes beyond issues but also manifests itself in a tendency to “vilify”<sup>71</sup> political opponents (a continuation of the belief that all choice is moral, and all political expressions are expressions of one’s *morality*). This appeal to morality and principles

---

<sup>65</sup> Robert B. Horwitz, *America's right: Anti-establishment conservatism from Goldwater to the Tea Party*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2013). [http://www-communication.ucsd.edu/files/Horwitz\\_1st\\_proofs-WEB.pdf](http://www-communication.ucsd.edu/files/Horwitz_1st_proofs-WEB.pdf).

<sup>66</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid:12.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid:15.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid:14.

(and the oppositions' lack thereof) is also a means of attracting voters;<sup>72</sup> often in these politicians' language, there is a lack of specific legislative goals (except, perhaps, in the context of congressional politicians), with instead a focus on critical assessments of the current 'regime'.<sup>73</sup>

As briefly mentioned above, tendencies in political party sorting in the US have uniformized the Democratic party as the party of the 'left' and the Republican party as the party of the 'right'<sup>74 75</sup> and "conservative democrats and liberal republicans (...) are now extremely rare".<sup>76</sup> Recent scholarship shows that partisan-ideological polarization has been enforced<sup>77</sup> for both parties and their electorate.<sup>78</sup> This is premised, according to Abramowitz & Webster, upon an increase in partisan identity alignment with social and cultural 'divisions'<sup>79</sup> - like the above-mentioned political parties, but also with prejudice for "outgroup partisanship" and other forms of 'negative affect'.<sup>80</sup> There has been recent scholarship from Abrajano & Hajnal which actively investigated this hypothesis, and they identify divergent 'cultural' opinions on issues like immigration and correlations with racial identity that influence divergences in voter-identities themselves: "All other things being equal, we see that immigration has a strong and consistent effect in moving whites towards the Republican Party."<sup>81 82</sup>

In scholarship, the issue of defining the causality and dynamics of polarization has been prickly,<sup>83 84 85</sup> and the 'political polarization' concept has taken on many guises in journalism and

---

<sup>72</sup> Matt Grossmann, and David A. Hopkins. *Asymmetric politics: Ideological Republicans and group interest Democrats*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).  
<http://www.matthewg.org/AsymmetricPolitics-ProposalF.doc>.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Abramowitz and Saunders. "Is polarization a myth?."

<sup>75</sup> Adrian Wooldridge and John Micklethwait, *The right nation*, 101.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid: 1.

<sup>77</sup> Lilliana Mason, "'I disrespectfully agree": The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 no.1 (2015): 128-145 (15).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12089>.

<sup>78</sup> Alan I. Abramowitz and Steven Webster. "The Rise of Negative Partisanship and the Nationalization of U.S. Elections in the 21st Century." *Electoral Studies* 11, no.1 (2016):  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2015.11.001>.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Mason, "I disrespectfully agree".

<sup>81</sup> Marisa Abrajano and Zoltan L. Hajnal. *White backlash: immigration, race, and American politics*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

<sup>82</sup> Adam Serwer, "The Nationalist's Delusion". *The Atlantic*, 20 Nov. 2017.  
<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/11/the-nationalists-delusion/546356>.

<sup>83</sup> Daniel V.A. Olson "Dimensions of cultural tension among the American public" in *Cultural wars in American politics: Critical reviews of a popular myth* edited by Rhys H. Williams. Transaction Publishers 1997, 123-37.

<sup>84</sup> Geoffrey C. Layman and John C. Green. "Wars and rumours of wars: The contexts of cultural conflict in American political behaviour." *British Journal of Political Science* 36 no.1 (2006): 61-89.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123406000044>.

<sup>85</sup> James Davison Hunter, *Before the shooting begins: Searching for democracy in America's culture war*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994).

other non-academic commentary. A notable example is the “Culture Wars” hypothesis, originating from Libertarian fringe politician Pat Buchanan’s warning of an impending ‘ war’ for the “soul of america” at the 1992 RNC<sup>86</sup> (which became a highly influential text for many fringe political groups). ‘Political polarization’ is also used to make reference to partisan contentions over social issues, notably revolving around change (see above section). The ways in which political division manifests itself through identity in the USA and why is increasingly part of academic and journalistic discussions, and from this smoke there must be some kind of fire: some shift in the relationship between political affiliation and personal ideology or identification has occurred in US Party politics in the 21st century, and they have influenced the language, and the associated emotionality, of societal debates. Some history is needed to better consider this shift, using the example of the GOP.

The Republicans had, by the mid 1960s, become the party of conservatism, mixing elements of old establishment conservatism alongside growing anti-establishment sentiment<sup>87</sup> and a growing divergence from moderate and liberal political positions.<sup>88</sup> At this period a massive shift occurred in US politics as the Republicans co opted the formerly southern democrat electorate that was alienated by President Kennedy’s adoption of the Civil Rights act.<sup>89</sup> This new Republican electorate was defined by its anti-establishment sentiments.

A number of contextual factors<sup>90</sup> would also contribute to the growing prominence<sup>91</sup> of anti-establishment conservatism and the integration of more ‘extreme’ political identification within the Republican party in the late 20th century. The end of the Cold War and the fall of the USSR meant that the threat of internationalism was no longer a major issue, and more domestic political concerns took center stage as new domestic enemies emerged in political rhetoric, such as immigrants, terrorists, and single mothers.<sup>92</sup> Alongside this, the progressive spreading of libertarian fringe politics into the mainstream (like politician and one-time presidential candidate Barry Goldwater), the rise of Ronald Reagan (who often did not share the same anti-establishment views of his Republican contemporaries but nonetheless become an emblem of it<sup>93</sup>), and the “congressional opposition to the Clinton presidency in the mid-1990s, including

---

<sup>86</sup> Layman and Green “Wars and rumours of war”.

<sup>87</sup> Horwitz. *America’s right*.

<sup>88</sup> Alan I. Abramowitz, and Kyle L. Saunders. “Is polarization a myth?” *The Journal of Politics* 70.no.2 (2008): 542-555.

<sup>89</sup> Neil Fligstein, and Doug McAdam. *A theory of fields*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

<sup>90</sup> Kathleen Blee and Kimberly Creasap. “Conservative and Right-Wing Movements.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 36, (2010): 269–86.

<sup>91</sup> Horwitz. *America’s right*.

<sup>92</sup> Blee and Creasap, “Conservative and right-wing movements”.

<sup>93</sup> Horwitz. *America’s right*.

shutting down the government and impeaching the president”<sup>94</sup> all contributed to the republican party’s shift toward the right, with an (rhetorical) anti-establishment tendency.

This time also saw the introduction of “conservative Protestant Evangelicals into secular political”<sup>95</sup> life.<sup>96</sup> Religion became a major tactical force in American domestic politics from the 1980s, as it “mobilized new constituencies on the right”.<sup>97</sup> These factors encouraged the growth of the so-called New Right (and later the New Christian Right) movement, which regrouped an array of actors, from libertarians to white supremacists, during the 1970s and continued to grow and form into a number of different conservative groups toward the 1990s.<sup>98</sup> Their early campaigns were based on the idea that America needed to be strengthened through Christian morality, limited government intervention, and economic deregulation.<sup>99</sup> The New Right and the New Christian Right went on to become prominent forces on the forefront of many so-called american “Culture Wars”. These were highly contentious and significant partisan ‘battles’ (the 1960s and the 1990s have been defined ‘Culture Wars’ eras<sup>100</sup>) that, to simplify, framed social issues within ideologized and moralized language.<sup>101 102</sup> The New Right would influence conservative politics and political tendencies, and the critical ‘anti-mainstream’ feature of anti-establishment conservatism, alongside a concern with christian and american identity (and however these may be extrapolated), has become a feature of contemporary mainstream conservatism, manifest in socio-political groups like the Tea Party.<sup>103</sup>

It is also important to recognize the prevalence of extremist right-wing ideology (like the “Militia Movement”) within US political history and the prevalence of white supremacist groups, their ideas being at the origin of the specifically american brand of white supremacy promulgated by alt-right platforms.<sup>104</sup> These groupings, movements, think-tanks, and other kinds of affiliations have, nonetheless, always been represented as<sup>105</sup> transgressive and divergent from normative US political life.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Horwitz. *America's right*:7.

<sup>95</sup> Blee and Creasap, “Conservative and right-wing movements”.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid:5.

<sup>98</sup> William Gillis, “Say No to the Liberal Media: Conservatives and Criticism of the News Media in the 1970s.” *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences* (2014): 1-284.

<sup>99</sup> Blee and Creasap, “Conservative and right-wing movements”.

<sup>100</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

<sup>101</sup> Michael Serazio, "Encoding the paranoid style in American politics: “anti-establishment” discourse and power in contemporary spin." *Critical studies in media communication*, 33 no. 2 (2016): 181-194.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> Serazio, "Encoding the paranoid style in American politics”.

<sup>104</sup> Jessie Daniels, "The Algorithmic Rise of the “Alt-Right”," *Contexts* 17 no.1 (2018): 60-65.

<sup>105</sup> See Mulloy’s overview of ‘orthodox’ scholarship on political extremism, 2005.

<sup>106</sup> Darren Mulloy, *American extremism: History, politics and the militia movement*. (Routledge, 2004).  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203352069>.

There are many variable conservative identifications within conservatism even today, and ‘anti-establishment conservatism’ is not a defining category of either political conservatism or the Republican Party - the term ‘anti-establishment’ itself “captures the politics of opposition to those wielding power”<sup>107</sup> and is thus an unstable definition.<sup>108</sup> Anti-establishment conservatism here qualifies those conservatisms that are oppositional in their self-definition and in their tactics of political expression to ‘normative’ conservatism, and so are ideologically reactionary and policy-wise are focused on the scaling down of government and the power of all those representing it. Overall, as Gross et al. write,<sup>109</sup> it is important to de-essentialize the political categories of liberal and conservative in social scientific enquiry and to highlight the historical roots of political phenomenon.

This overview articulates several often convergent factors that may account for the growth of (legitimized) anti-establishment politics and political sentiment in the US. Party officials and the electorate are increasingly unlikely to be flexible politically, and politics has increasingly shifted into the domain of affect - politics in the US has delved into the realm of the personal, and is used increasingly as a personal identification in opposition to other politico-personal identifications. Within this context, many anti-establishment political groups or affiliations have arisen, from the organized Tea Party movement to the unorganized and dispersed online phenomenon of the alt-right, carrying conservative messages aiming to ‘transgress’ a normative conservatism that has not gone ‘far enough’ and that does not represent them. The alt-right can arguably be defined as an emergent, contemporary manifestation of a new anti-establishment politics.

### 2.3.2. The ‘Alt-right’

The ‘alt-right’ or the ‘Alternative Right’, is a loosely-associated, online (but increasingly active offline) network of extreme right-wing affiliations based in the US. It emerged in the early 2000s and gained momentum with its online presence, using chat boards and image-sharing forums such as 4chan, 8chan, and Reddit to cultivate discussions on essentialist, racialized human hierarchies, the degradation of western civilization, revisionist history, and similar such topics; it would later become a broader mantle encompassing more explicit racial supremacist ideas and movements.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Barr, "Populists, outsiders".

<sup>108</sup> George Michael, "The rise of the alt-right and the politics of polarization in America." *Skeptic (Altadena, CA)* 22.no.2 (2017): 9-18.

<sup>109</sup> Neil Gross, Thomas Medvetz, and Rupert Russell. "The contemporary American conservative movement." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 (2011): 325-354.

<sup>110</sup> Gourarie "How the ‘alt-right’ checkmated the media".

The alt-right is highly amorphous<sup>111</sup> with no core social movement structure, but has been called a ‘movement’ by many in media, especially after violent protests in Charlottesville, VA. put the alt-right in the spotlight alongside other radical far-right groups in attendance, including American Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan.<sup>112</sup> President Trump did have many acknowledged (former and ongoing) relationships with figures on the fringe and arguably part of this alt-right, notably Steve Bannon, the former editor for Breitbart news, a news station with a political affinity for alt-right worldviews and concerns. Sebastian Gorka, former Deputy Assistant to Trump, has also been involved with Breitbart and has publically critiqued ‘political correctness’ in different forms.<sup>113</sup> Furthermore, Trump quickly became a symbol within alt-right forums, associated with ironic imagery of American supremacy and masculinity, and during his campaigning Trump tweeted on several occasions images from explicitly alt-right sources, which spurred further criticism and enquiry.<sup>114 115</sup>

Overall, the alt-right can be understood as a broad catch-all term for a variety of groups and ideas, encompassing libertarianism, men’s rights advocacy, anti-semitic conspiracy theorists, cultural conservatism, populism, white nationalists and supremacists, and various different intersections of these;<sup>116</sup> what relays them together is a conservative ideology that is nostalgic for an idealized past of hierarchy and essentialized social roles and values, an insistent concern with race, eugenics, IQ, and ‘white nationalism’,<sup>117</sup> and a concern with ‘transgressing’ normative language and politics<sup>118</sup> through the perpetuation of taboo language and ideas (what is known in these online realms as ‘edge-lordism’ - using the visual metaphor of ‘being on the edge’). Discussions within alt-right forums revolve around critiques of society and politics, including critiques of moderate and establishment conservatism and the Republican party.

The alt-right’s defining features are products of a history of converging influences within these online spaces, influences like the resurrection of racialized, anti-feminist, and deterministic theories of history, eugenics and geography<sup>119</sup> all of which can be defined as

---

<sup>111</sup> Heikkilä “Online Antagonism”.

<sup>112</sup> Maggie Astor, et al., “A Guide to the Charlottesville Aftermath” *The New York Times*, 14 Aug. 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/13/us/charlottesville-virginia-overview.html>.

<sup>113</sup> David Smith, “Q&A: What are Trump and the White House’s links to the far right?” *The Guardian*, 14 Aug. 2017.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/aug/14/donald-trump-steve-bannon-breitbart-news-alt-right-charlottesville>.

<sup>114</sup> A.P. Joyce, “Navigating Trump’s Twitter: @realDonaldTrump and the alt-right meme factory” *Mic.*, 3 July 2017.

<https://mic.com/articles/181356/navigating-trumps-twitter-realdonaldtrump-and-the-alt-right-meme-factory#.waUCjOIeF>

<sup>115</sup> Heikkilä “Online Antagonism”.

<sup>116</sup> Michael “The Rise of the Alt-Right”.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>118</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

<sup>119</sup> Michael “The Rise of the Alt-Right”.



‘conspiratorialist’. The alt-right is known for its trolling and spamming ‘campaigns’ and engagements in highly oppositional, critical, and often ad hominem debates/attacks with others online.<sup>120</sup> Furthermore, the alt-right has maintained a culture of its own, with its own symbols, figures, and a visible repertoire of memes, the latter being its characteristic feature and arguably one of the factors involved in defining it as a larger politicized ‘group’, with a sort of codified ‘language’. Because of these features, the alt-right have been highly mediatized as a kind of ‘movement’. The alt-right however can best be understood as a ‘mantle’ or an affiliation.

Although this requires more inquiry, it is evident that many alt-right political positions are “reactionary” and created in opposition to not only mainstream political positions (republican, democrat, liberal, and conservative),<sup>121</sup> but also conform to the partisan-ideological polarization of contemporary ‘identity politics’.<sup>122</sup> Belief in the pre-eminence of an essentialized ‘Culture’ and ‘Culture wars’ have also become core tenants of many ‘alt-lite’ or ‘mainstream’ manifestations of the alt-right.<sup>123 124</sup>

### 2.3.3. ‘Discourses of Transgression’ and the language of the alt-right

As mentioned above, the alt-right is arguably relayed together by a shared culture<sup>125</sup> of styles and beliefs.<sup>126</sup> This encompasses references to fringe theories, certain styles and ways of phrasing, and the use of common exemplifications and imagery. Their fundamental worldview has been highlighted by many authors. I call these common articulated worldviews in language “discourses of transgression”, adapted from Nagle’s study of the alt-right as a phenomenon that is a continuation of an ‘american counterculture’ that is premised on the currency of an american cultural fixation with ‘transgression’ and its associated qualities of ‘authenticity’.<sup>127</sup> She contends that alt-right actors working with their shared culture seek to represent themselves as transgressive, and have been represented in media and by political antagonists as a force transgressing liberal political and societal norms.<sup>128</sup> They are, however, largely continuations of a fringe american white supremacy ideology, flourishing through the internet medium and its ability to create ‘echo chambers’.

These discourses of transgression are premised upon an almost total critique of establishment politics, mainstream media culture, and liberal social organization. These ideas

---

<sup>120</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Michael “The Rise of the Alt-Right”.

<sup>124</sup> Lyons “Ctrl-Alt-Delete”.

<sup>125</sup> Gary Miller, and Norman Schofield. "The transformation of the republican and democratic party coalitions in the US." *Perspectives on Politics* 6 no.3 (2008): 433-450.

<sup>126</sup> Heikkilä “Online Antagonism”.

<sup>127</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid.

and critiques diverge dramatically from normative conservative political language, and the shock-factor means used to represent their politics<sup>129</sup> - alongside the substance of this politics - can be understood as advocating political, social, and cultural ‘transgression’ from a political norm.<sup>130</sup> Some of their core themes, which will be used as comparative themes to consider continuities with Donald Trump’s campaign language, are as follows:

One of the defining features of alt-right language is a focus on race (or ‘heritage’) as an essentialized qualifier of identity<sup>131</sup> - either from the point of view of being a white ‘european’ or a black/brown ‘other’.<sup>132</sup> Furthermore, racialized ‘others’ (immigrants, refugees...) are represented as threats to a ‘white race’/ ‘western culture’.<sup>133</sup> This continues in thematic depictions of history as progressing toward an ‘end’, with races or civilizations/cultures as ‘homogenizing’ or ‘dissolving’,<sup>134</sup> this often being the ‘call to action’ feature of alt-right narratives.<sup>135</sup>

Premised upon this fixation on ‘good’ or ‘bad’ identity as a qualifier of individual ‘worth’ (and for some of the more outspoken platforms and actors, as one’s quality as part of the human species)<sup>136</sup> are narratives of societal deviance and decadence.<sup>137</sup> This coalesces around critiques of ‘PC’ culture as symbolic of a decadent and ‘liberal society’, which may be exemplified by a variety of ‘proofs’ (for instance, false correlations between being african-american and being a criminal often sourced from un-credible sources) that are repeatedly used in arguments among many figures in the alt-right.<sup>138</sup> This narrative of decadence is paralleled with a nostalgia for an indistinct ‘good ol’ days’ of essentialized values.<sup>139</sup>

The ‘establishment’ is a term that encompasses those actors perpetuating or tolerating ‘decadence’. This is the liberal media and normative politics, who veil the ‘truth’<sup>140</sup> and are actors in a larger conspiracy against the ‘homogenization’ of the culture, race, etc.<sup>141</sup> Furthermore, these thematic discourses are expressed in many different forms and on many different platforms, and vary in intensity.

---

<sup>129</sup> For instance, the alt-right’s provocative meme-culture of explicit racism and misogyny or Alex Jones’ influential InfoWars TV show where conspiracy theory is common.

<sup>130</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”, 67.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid.

<sup>132</sup> Heikkilä “Online Antagonism”.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid.

<sup>135</sup> Donna Minkowitz, “Hiding in plain sight: An American Renaissance of White Nationalism”, *The Public Eye*, 26 October 2017, <https://www.politicalresearch.org/2017/10/26/hiding-in-plain-sight-an-american-renaissance-of-white-nationalism/>.

<sup>136</sup> Donna Minkowitz, “Hiding in plain sight”.

<sup>137</sup> Michael “The Rise of the Alt-Right”.

<sup>138</sup> Donna Minkowitz, “Hiding in plain sight”.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

<sup>140</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

<sup>141</sup> Lyons “Ctrl-Alt-Delete”.

## Chapter 3. Analytical Frame and Research Methods

Critical Discourse Analysis uses ‘discourse’ as a lense through which to understand text as formatted language that is functionally mobilized with ideological intent within specific contexts. These contexts give meaning to certain uses of textual techniques, like metaphor, conceit, or enumeration, alongside the use of certain themes and narratives. CDA as a research practice uses contextual knowledge and critique to interrogate the ‘local’ significance of textual techniques. I have studied the pre-primaries and primaries campaign language of Donald Trump through an interrogation of his textual techniques and narratives as informed by background research on campaign communications and different forms of conservative political language. Furthermore, I have also studied the techniques and narratives of the alt-right through a study of secondary literature, informed by past primary research (see Annexe IV). This section provides an explanation of theoretical discussions on discourse and CDA and outlines how I have undertaken this study, alongside an explanation of how I have undertaken a comparative analysis of Trump’s discourses and those ‘transgressive’ ones.

### **3.1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and theoretical debates**

#### **3.1.1. CDA & Political language**

Critical discourse analysis, or CDA, is an analytical practice with its roots in Rhetoric and Sociolinguistics, focused on manifestations of ideology and forms of power in text.<sup>142</sup> Ideology here can be defined as those naturalized and essentialized world views that are, nonetheless, originating from history, that have shaped “why people come to feel, reason, desire, and imagine as they do”.<sup>143</sup> These world views are “shared perceptions of values” and they necessarily define “political associations”.<sup>144</sup> Different scholars from different fields have used CDA to investigate political, gendered, racist, or governmental language in “action” - that is, being used with intent.<sup>145</sup> Thus, CDA is not a discipline or a set methodology, and methods vary from study to study. Using CDA to analyze political language within presidential campaigning is useful as it is an adaptable methodology that focuses on the underlying motivating meaning and function of these highly organized and significant occasions. This study has used an adapted version of CDA integrating the approaches of Paul Chilton, Norman Fairclough, and Benford and Snow’s work. Chilton’s use of the socio-cognitive model of CDA, which sees cognition as mediating “between

---

<sup>142</sup> Ruth Wodak, "Aspects of critical discourse analysis." *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik* 36 no.10 (2002): 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9143-x>.

<sup>143</sup> Eagleton *in* Ibid:9.

<sup>144</sup> Paul Chilton, *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. (New York & London: Routledge, 2004): 19.

<sup>145</sup> Wodak "Aspects of critical discourse analysis."

'society' and 'discourse',<sup>146</sup> alongside Fairclough's methodology, have influenced my analytic method. Inspiration has also been taken from the discursive assessments of Bernard and Snow and their use of the theory of "framing", which will be discussed below.

CDA is useful in that it considers language as "socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned":<sup>147</sup> it is created within a structured context affecting individual expression, but these structures are then shaped by such expressions (contingent on the status and power of the 'expressive agents'). CDA's analytical aim is to investigate the ways in which ideological meaning becomes manifest, and how it may be understood according to the inevitably political understanding of the researcher. Language, its ways of manifesting (its forms) and its meanings are historical products of very specific contexts - analysing language from the US Presidential Elections, for instance, requires a whole different investigation compared to an analysis of contemporary advertisement language in social media. Part of this process of interpretation is also investigating the position of the speaker and the 'receiver'. Indeed, audiences' interpretations of speeches and text are variable, and various tactics of persuasion are used by announciators to maintain 'right' interpretations of texts. This work focuses on these tactics, as opposed to the audiences' interpretations.

### 3.1.2. Integrating foci - Social function of cognitive concepts

Both Chilton and Fairclough maintain the same ontological premise that is consistent among many critical theorists - that language is a tool, malleable, and subject to conditions of power in society. For both, language is necessarily a site maintained and contested by social conditions and social change. The two authors, nonetheless, focus on different qualitative features of this site. Chilton's focus is on what language does in the mind of the hearer and what its purpose may be for different actors. While Fairclough is more interested in the origins of the form of political language, he is also interested in the effect it has on the social relations it references or speaks to. For both, language is constituted by reference to social relationships and broader institutional norms - the extent to which language maintains these is dialectical for both, although Fairclough leans toward a more institutional based analysis akin to Marxist theories of culture and its usage by those in power. Chilton to a larger degree is more dialectical about the effect that societal influence may have upon cognition and language and vice versa.

Furthermore, Benford and Snow also consider meaning-creation as a site that is contested and negotiated for a functional purpose. Their approach - their 'frames' -

---

<sup>146</sup> Wodak "Aspects of critical discourse analysis." 18.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid: 8.

complements Fairclough's in this respect as they all focus on the functionality of the enunciated text, as opposed to how the text may be understood. As a theoretical tool for further analysis, Benford and Snow are useful in considering the 'rally speech' as a site of *collective action*.

No CDA study I have come across has as of yet studied election language through an integrated analytical concern with cognitive evocation and social context; nonetheless, this integration of methods has informed my own CDA analysis. Chilton's and Fairclough's works focus on complementary aspects of investigating language as discourse. Broadly speaking, while Chilton considers the evocative quality of discourse for the 'receiver', Fairclough focuses on the origins of discourse and who may be using them.

### 3.1.3. Paul Chilton and CDA

Paul Chilton's work on political discourse has its ontological bases in cognitive linguistics and critical theory. His work evokes fairly simple questions: why do people use language and how does it affect us? There is a function within political language, aiming at the reconstituting of a given specific social world.<sup>148</sup> This function is achieved through the human capacity to process information and access "representations of the world stored in the mind (...) when presumed relevant",<sup>149</sup> these representations as taking on dimensions of space, time, and modality in the mind. Chilton's theory is thus based on a very active method of mapping: discourse evokes multi-dimensional models in the hearer's mind, as informed by former understandings (or not, in the case of discourse being ineffective) of world views.<sup>150</sup> His is a method premised on the importance of implicit or explicit imagery in language.

The way that discourse may achieve these effects, and the ways in which discourse manifests itself, can be isolated in three ways, according to Chilton: through coercion, legitimization/delegitimization, and representation/misrepresentation. These functions, and manifestations, are interconnected and may be difficult to isolate in themselves. These are the "practical purposes" of language that transform language into politicized discourses. My use of a "practical purpose" understanding of language complements Fairclough's model and considers expressive, interested strategy as a key element within the context of the US presidential elections.

---

<sup>148</sup> Chilton *Analysing political discourse*.

<sup>149</sup> Chilton *Analysing political discourse*: 155.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*

### 3.1.4. Norman Fairclough and CDA

Fairclough's critical discourse analysis<sup>151</sup> is based on a concern to demonstrate the social origins of language conventions, and Fairclough uses marxist notions of cultural hegemony - or those notions of interaction and belief that are assumed and naturalized in society - to do this. These, for Fairclough, need to be critically deconstructed in order to investigate their foundations in political economy - especially in extensively ideological contexts.<sup>152</sup> Unlike Chilton, his focus is not on the more refined effects that language may have on imagery in cognition - instead, Fairclough is concerned with the social function that language plays in context, and vice versa. His methodology 'excavates' those contextual features that can be analysed *within* the text, as they evince further understanding of those "social conditions [that] determine properties of discourse"<sup>153</sup>; this method, in use, also needs to be complemented with reference to the text's context, to triangulate these 'internal' findings, as Fairclough's analysis has been critiqued for its lack of contextual triangulation.<sup>154</sup>

His model, then, incorporates three phases to better consider the social within the linguistic, or "ideological language".<sup>155</sup> The three phases, "*description* of text, *interpretation* of the relationship between text and interaction, and *explanation* of the relationship between interaction and social context"<sup>156</sup> are applicable through Fairclough's *Ten Question Model*, which has a heavy focus on grammatical features of text (see Annexe for full model).

### 3.1.5. Framing as a theoretical tool

Bernard & Snow<sup>157</sup> highlight the 'Framing' concept as key to collective action meaning-making; it is a concept that encapsulates the active meaning-making work "at the level of reality construction"<sup>158</sup> and complements CDA analysis in its theoretical insights. Framing helps "to render events or occurrences meaningful and thereby function to organize experience and guide action".<sup>159</sup> Framing gives an overarching meaning to action, in 'collective movements' through core framing tasks that involve creating and maintaining "'diagnostic framing' (problem identification and attributions), 'prognostic framing' and 'motivational framing'".<sup>160</sup> These tasks give overarching meaning to sub-discourses that require a reasoning for their enunciation

---

<sup>151</sup> Fairclough *Language and power*.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid,19.

<sup>154</sup> Philo "Can discourse analysis".

<sup>155</sup> Fairclough *Language and power*.

<sup>156</sup> Fairclough *Language and power*: 109.

<sup>157</sup> Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow. "Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment." *Annual review of sociology* 26.no.1 (2000): 611-639.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid:614.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid:614.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid:615.

within the context of a larger 'mission' or goal (in a movement or in a campaign) - indeed, in these contexts no word is misspent or misused. Furthermore, the goal of such tasks is to mobilize - that is, to move the audience to action.

Framing is a useful theoretical tool to understand meaning-creation in the inevitably interpersonal setting of the Presidential Elections, and reflects Faircloughs and Faircloughs own observation that "structures provide agents with reasons for action."<sup>161</sup> It highlights the functionality of discourses during campaigns - to diagnose, to prognose, and to make meaning interpersonally, with the audience. In this sense, campaign speeches and other forms of campaign communication are akin to collective action communication as they all function in context to be *persuasive*. Indeed, rally speeches are in themselves events. Trump's discursive framing during these parallels understandings of campaigning as highly structured and functional processes that require different techniques of "meaning control";<sup>162</sup> frames provide controlled meaning veered toward action. This trisection of ideological framing tasks (diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation) corresponds to initial findings of Trump's discourses and permits further theorization on meaning-creation within presidential elections and a structured presentation of the findings.

The 2016 US Presidential elections, from the primaries to the General Election, was a highly unstable field of *regulated* contention, and Donald Trump's language is premised upon contentious comparison and reaction. Any study of language in this field necessarily requires context and explanation of the common social and linguistic dynamics within the field, as described by Philo<sup>163</sup> and as recommended by Wang & Liu.<sup>164</sup>

This study then occupies the intersection between political science and communications research into the functions of US Presidential Election language, investigations into manifestations of extremism in political language, alongside investigations into discourse as both an expressive and creative process.<sup>165</sup>

---

<sup>161</sup> Isabela Fairclough, and Norman Fairclough, *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. (New York & London: Routledge, 2013): 23.

<https://www-taylorfrancis-com.proxy.library.uu.nl/books/9781136490279>.

<sup>162</sup> Trent and Friedenber. *Political campaign communication*.

<sup>163</sup> Philo "Can discourse analysis".

<sup>164</sup> Wang and Liu "Is Trump".

<sup>165</sup> Norman Fairclough, *New Labour, new language?*. (Psychology Press, 2000).

### **3.2. How to research Trump's language**

As mentioned above, campaign rally speeches are (primarily) modular - consisting of modules of exemplified argumentation that are easily replicable, as campaigning requires candidates to travel across the country and speak on short notice. These modules are identifiable through a consideration of whether certain arguments and examples are used across several speeches. Although Trump's speeches were quite unorganized, they did replicate arguments and examples, and the progressive refinement, or dropping, of some of these across the campaigning season became clear in analysis. Keeping this in mind, each speech was analyzed in context, and background research on the speeches' locales and any relevant recent events around the time of the speech was also undertaken (see Annexe II). This is important as stock speeches and modules are constantly adapted to different audiences, locales, and must express the candidate's own ability to react to current events.<sup>166</sup>

Furthermore, each speech available in transcripts was analysed from these and triangulated with several watchings of the speech's live performance. Transcript quality is variable, and in some cases they are released by the campaign itself, this itself being a legitimizing strategy. Analysis of transcripts focused on sentences primarily, then larger structures of the speech, as 'sub-units' of analysis to identify 'discursive features'. These 'discursive features' were then compared to other speeches at this era - part of my own comparative framework - to assess continuity in Trump's language, these discursive features and messages understood as functional and replicated speech modules. Afterwards, this process was continued by comparing these modules with the ones from the next 'period'. This process revealed those functional, replicated ideologies that were consistently used in Trump's speeches during these periods, which were then compared to 'transgressive' discourse features.

#### *What can be qualified as a 'discursive feature' and why?*

Discursive features are those textual features that are meaningful in context - for the speaker, the audience, and any eventual listener; they exemplify the discourse. Metaphor, narrative techniques, performative techniques, and sentence and paragraph structures are tools for effectively expressing meaning in specific contexts - the context that they are spoken in inform their meaning, as text conformity or non-conformity to norms of speech also give meaning. Discursive features require analysis in their embedded relationality with each other.

---

<sup>166</sup> Trent and Friedenber. *Political campaign communication*.



### *What was this study's analytical process?*

A speech was analysed for every month (main speeches had transcripts - other speeches that were only available from online video were analysed, partially transcribed if needed, and served to reinforce findings from the main speeches) of the primaries season, each choice conditioned by availability of analytic material and clarity (Bibliographical sources for the speeches are listed in a separate bibliography, for clarity). These were then divided into two corpuses, one 'pre-primaries' and the other 'primaries'. Each one was analysed, first freely from transcripts (if available), through the integrated method of Fairclough's 'Ten Questions' (see annexe I) and further critical contextual analysis. Any contextual references were verified and added to the general interpretation. These individual analysis were then compared to each other and analysed again before being compared to the other period's corpus.

After "isolating" common discourses and their recurrent discursive features that conform to those "strategic functions of linguistic expression"<sup>167</sup> in the speeches, speech "modules" were established through an assessment of repetitive features (textual, such as imagery and enumeration) and themes (the substance of the textual features) - for instance, Trump's description of threat through his reference to 'agentive countries'. Each set period's repeated discursive modules, and their common sets of textual ideological features, are compared to each other, to assess conformity of discursive features (language: imagery, narrative structures, performative techniques), or divergence. These were then considered, during the last step of analysis, and compared to features of "Transgressive discourses". Overarching consistencies among modules were then analysed as ideological "framing tasks",<sup>168</sup> according to Benford and Snow's study of collective action framing; These framing tasks are interpretations of the modules as functionally mobilized ideologies. Divergences in the discourses of each period are elaborated on through occasional separations in the sections (*pre-primaries* and *primaries*).

### *Why use "modules"?*

"Modules" are those recurring arguments and exemplifications within speeches that can be understood as "discursive packages". Campaign communication literature states that modularity and the module speech format is widely used in political speech preparation (see above section on Communications literature).<sup>169</sup> Furthermore, using 'modules' as a means of presenting

---

<sup>167</sup> Chilton. *Analysing political discourse*. 45.

<sup>168</sup> Benford and Snow. "Framing processes". 615.

<sup>169</sup> Care has been taken for the individual analysis of each text or speech, although bias in analysis, as in much social scientific research, is difficult to avoid.

discourse analysis findings and as a means of comparing across different sampling periods allows for an analysis of common features among texts as opposed to those of just one text.

One issue that arises with the use of modules is the erasure of texts' contextual specificities. This is something that I have had to contend with - and so have chosen, for each speech, to give a contextualized analysis in the annexe for further reference.

*Why divide the analysed texts and subsequent discourses into two sections - pre-primaries and primaries?*

The pre-primaries and primaries periods in the US Presidential Elections have different contextual dynamics - this is why these two periods had different 'samples'. To more precisely analyse these in context, texts from these two periods were analysed in two parts, and then compared; as mentioned above, they are occasionally presented separately in each 'Analysis' chapter. This choice was also an analytical one - it was easier to analyze and consider these texts in different sections, and then to consider them in comparison (Table 1).

Table 1. List of analysed speeches.

<b>Pre-primaries</b>	<b>Pre-primaries supplemental analysis (non-transcripts)</b>	<b>Primaries</b>	<b>Primaries supplemental analysis (non-transcripts)</b>
June 16th 2015, New York, NY. Remarks announcing candidacy for president in New York City.	Sep. 14 2015, Dallas, TX. Remarks at a Rally.	20 February, 2016, Spartanburg, SC. Victory address.	3 February, 2016, Little Rock, AK. Remarks at a Rally
July 11 2015, Phoenix, AZ. Remarks at a Rally.	Oct. 24 2015, Jacksonville, FL. Remarks at a Rally.	3 June, 2016, Redding, CA. Remarks at a Rally.	12 March, 2016, Dayton, OH. Remarks at a Rally.
Aug. 21 2015, Mobile, AL. Remarks at a Rally.	Nov. 23 2015, Columbus OH. Remarks at a Rally.	21 July, 2016, Cleveland, OH. Address accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention.	18 April, 2016, Buffalo, NY. Remarks at a Rally.

Nov. 13 2015, Orlando, FL. Remarks to the Republican Party of Florida “Sunshine Summit”.			7 May, 2016, Spokane, WA. Remarks at a Rally.
Dec. 7 2015, Mt. Pleasant, SC. Remarks at a Rally aboard USS Yorktown.			
Jan 18 2016, Lynchburg, VA. Remarks at a Rally at Liberty University.			

This processual method gives allowance for each text to be interpreted alone and in the larger context of the highly regulated US Presidential Elections Primaries and Trump Campaign. This method also allows for the emergence of common features in the process of comparison, and with this in mind general claims about Trump’s textual tendencies (within in the scope of CDA interpretations and the limited material of the text corpus) can be made, as opposed to extrapolating any claims on Trump’s textual tendencies from just one text.

### **3.3. How to assess speeches in terms of transgressive content**

Those thematic features of the alt-right’s ‘discourses of transgression’ were kept in mind at each phase of analysis. These were established through secondary research descriptions and informed by my own primary research (see annexe IV); these thematic features are recurring foci within alt-right forums and spaces, and are primarily argumentative (see section on ‘Discourses of Transgression’). After establishing and defining recurring modules within Trump’s rally speeches, these were ‘formally’ compared to the above-mentioned thematic features of alt-right language, which may manifest in narratives, exemplifications, and through textual style. Commonalities and divergences between these two were then assessed, and described in the ‘Findings’ chapter.

## Chapter 4. Analyses

This chapter, organized according to Benford and Snow's three core functions of framing collective action messages (diagnosis, prognosis, and motivational framing) to remind the reader of the functionality of these textual/performative forms, presents the discursive findings of this study. Each 'Functional frame' presents modules that are used in Trump's speeches in this functional framing capacity. This section's main body, the section entitled "Competitiveness", highlights the core findings of this study: Trump's overall message, his discourses, and his language's stylistic features, alongside the ideological bases of the modules and frames.

The ideological base of "competitiveness" maintains Trump's core speech arguments' reasoning. It iterates a worldview that can be described as dichotomous, either one wins in a competition, or one loses. This dichotomization is thoroughly value-laden, hierarchical, and functions to diagnose success and failure on every scale; it parallels the semiotics of health and illness that Trump uses in assessing the "state of our nation".<sup>170</sup> Furthermore, Trump is himself his most persuasive argument: he has succeeded in his life. He presents himself as the aspirational emblem for country itself. The oppositional image/structure of 'Trump against the failure of the US' runs throughout his speeches.

Trump's overarching narrative of the cause of the US' 'failure' is as follows: All countries, as agentive, are necessarily competitive - and nations will fail if they do not stand up for their interests. It follows that the US' failure is not the fault of other actor-countries, as they are either "smart"<sup>171 172 173 174 175 176</sup> or belligerents; in either case, if a nation cannot stand up for themselves, they will be taken advantage of, especially if its leaders are not protecting these interests. The US,

---

<sup>170</sup> Ted Metcalfe, (unending)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus) (New York, NY).

<sup>171</sup> Ibid.

<sup>172</sup> Donald Trump, "FULL SPEECH: Donald Trump Speaks to 30,000 PLUS In Mobile, AL (8 21 15)", Youtube video: 1:13:22, posted by Bereneice Mariela, 12 Feb. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8wUE6eigtI>

<sup>173</sup> Donald Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville, FL 10-24-15 Full Speech", Youtube video: 1:18:20, posted by Hà Pham, 24 Oct. 2015.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NfhIbpjV\\_Cg&pbjreload=10](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NfhIbpjV_Cg&pbjreload=10)

<sup>174</sup> Ted Metcalfe, (unending)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus) (Mt. Pleasant, SC).

<sup>175</sup> Ted Metcalfe, (unending)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus) (Lynchburg, VA).

<sup>176</sup> Donald Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock Arkansas FULL SPEECH HD February 3 201", Youtube video: 3:29:27, posted by Uighta Raymond, 16 Sep. 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YjVwgpFWcNE>

Trump insists, is uncompetitive because politicians, and the political establishment either cannot keep up with the world (economics, immigration) and reality, or are corrupt and unsympathetic to protecting US interests; Trump's narratives often interweave both. This 'Establishment' further dissociates the US from criteria of success through a 'Political Correctness' culture that translates into socially-liberal policies and the non-representation of 'real' american interests. These 'real' interests and 'truths' are hidden out of the public eye, partially with the complicity of the media, and ignored by most politicians, republican or democrat. For Trump, acknowledging this 'Truth' requires a drastic shift in US foreign and domestic policy - and most politicians, Trump maintains, are interested only in their donors' opinions (implying the corruption of the electoral system). Americans are, however, interested in this truth because they have been victimized by these foreign powers through unemployment and increased national debt. Trump represents himself as the emblem that will reveal and remedy this 'persecuted and authentic truth'.

This is a narrative of single-causality, requiring a single solution, and hardly considers contextuality or multi-causality. It is, however, inconsistent: the US has failed morally as well as economically, which is a societal failure - but the US is nonetheless the 'strongest country' with much potential (Trump's USA is often personified). This failure is in itself a national security threat to the country and its future.

#### **4.1. Success and Failure, good and bad, competence and incompetence; Past, present, and future**

Success and failure are key distinctions in Trump's texts, and qualify their "object" as "good" or "bad". They are exemplified by illustrations of competence, incompetence, winning and losing, and are associated with a corresponding timeline of the US' societal and economic progress. The past is ideal, the present is encumbered and failing, and the future is hopeful with the "right" conditions - that is, with Trump as President. This diagnostic nostalgia is used throughout Trump's speeches. The pre-eminence of "success" as an ideal state can be described as one stemming from the logic of business - success and failure as determinant of status.

The frames presented below display Trump's commonly repeated discourses as argumentative, and start out with a description of Trump's diagnosis of the US' victimization and failure, through depictions of a preferential past and by identifying victimizing actors; this then follows through with a prognosis of Trump as a remedy for this victimization, by becoming the President and saving the US through his success, and his insider and outsider knowledge; and this concludes with the "motivation framing" of persuasive discursive modules advocating for action on the part of his supporters through representing them as a "movement" with a unified concern - this necessary action, of course, being to vote for Trump.

#### **4.1.1. Frame of Diagnosis: Failure and Victimization**

Failure is almost always more explicitly, and more abundantly, exemplified than ‘success’ as this ‘diagnosis’ legitimizes the prognostic quality of the speaker; indeed, providing a diagnosis is the core of most of Trump’s speeches during his early campaigning. This section considers the substance of this diagnostic framework, and then follows with sub-sections considering those actors who are represented as at fault for the country’s victimization and failure.

Most of Trump’s speeches depict a country that is failing in all possible ways, and thus victimizing its ‘normal’ citizens. A summative statement on the state of the country is often made after introductions making reference to polls or critiques Trump has received, from which he then extrapolates upon to specify who is victimizing the country. For instance, in Phoenix, AZ, Trump maintains that “We have a situation that's absolutely out of control,”<sup>177</sup> introducing at the beginning of his speech a depiction of illegal immigration as a major existential threat. In Mobile, Trump states that “We have a country not doing so well (...) What's happening to this country is disgraceful”.<sup>178</sup> In Mt. Pleasant, Trump punctuates his speech similarly: “We are so far behind the eight ball in this country”,<sup>179</sup> in reference to Obama “I don't even know if he knows what the hell is going on. I really don't”,<sup>180</sup> “We're like the stupid country in so many different ways”,<sup>181</sup> and “So, what's happened is we're out of control”,<sup>182</sup> just to quote a few. In Lynchburg, after calling for the unification of christians, he maintains that “Our country is disappearing. You look at the kind of deals we make. You look at what's happening, our country is going in the wrong direction and so wrong”<sup>183</sup> - here using a conceit of a correct direction as opposed to divergence and aberration, specifying the reason for this through the vague “what’s happening”, and vividly illustrating the consequence of this: the loss of the whole country, this itself a reference to an idealized fixed state of what the country is (that is, not making allowance for alternate images of america).

Trump continues in this kind of summative inductive reasoning. In Little Rock, AK.<sup>184</sup> for

---

<sup>177</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona-on-july-11-2015.txt”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

<https://github.com/BBischof/speaksLike/blob/master/donald-trump/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona-on-july-11-2015.txt>

<sup>178</sup> Ted Metcalfe, (unendin).”Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unendin/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unendin/Trump_Campaign_Corpus) (Mobile, AL.): 1.

<sup>179</sup> Metcalfe, ”Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.): 4.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid*: 2.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid*: 6.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid*: 6.

<sup>183</sup> Metcalfe, ”Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.): 4.

<sup>184</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”.

instance he maintains that “Our country doesn’t win” and enumerates threats from ISIS and people “jumping the border”(also replicated from pre-primaries speeches<sup>185</sup>). Trump also extrapolates from this, alongside the US’ failure in immigration and trade, its ‘cultural’ failure: Christians have also lost their status (thus, for Trump, their value) in the country: “christians have no power”, “christianity is under siege folks” - similarly iterated in other speeches,<sup>186 187</sup> especially during his speech at a christian college.<sup>188</sup> ‘Under Siege’, here, is a conceit of victimhood in conflict (the conceit of conflict and war is often used in various illustrative contexts, during Buffalo, NY.<sup>189</sup> illustrating Trump’s reaction to other candidates’ critiques, in Dayton, OH.<sup>190</sup> stating: “we gotta fight back”, and in Spartanburg, SC.<sup>191</sup>), in opposition to a Muslim “Trojan horse” - this, again conflict-derived imagery premised on opposition replicates the dichotomous language of ‘culture wars’.

During his Redding, CA. speech Trump depicts<sup>192</sup> the US through enumerative descriptors of a country floundering under “bad deals”, unemployment, and the aggression of agentive countries like China “stealing” US wealth. Here, Trump correlates all foreign agents as a threat to the US - a US that is more vulnerable than ever. The country’s weak walls are not “real”,<sup>193</sup> and “they take everything, they take everything because we allow it to happen, but we’re not going to allow it”<sup>194</sup> - the “they” here as unspecified, all agents as suspect. “We’re not going to allow it” declares a decisive statement on future intent, one implicating all those actors who have been victimized (Trump and the nation). Furthermore, the US military is “depleted”<sup>195</sup> - victimized by and vulnerable to government as well. This assessment is dependant upon his characterizations of those victimizing agents, analysed further below.

Trump shifts his focus on to Hillary Clinton toward the end of the primaries period as he emerges as the Republican nominee, and what she comes to represent: a continuation of the

---

<sup>185</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY.)

<sup>186</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>187</sup> Donald Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton, OH (3-12-16) Donald Trump Dayton Ohio Rally”, Youtube video: 54:26, posted by Trump TV Network, 12 March 2016.  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O\\_2DgkKUwr4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O_2DgkKUwr4)

<sup>188</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>189</sup> Donald Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS 20K Donald Trump Rally In Buffalo, NY (4-18-16) Rex Ryan Introduces D. Trump”, Youtube video: 2:02:13, posted by Trump TV Network, 18 Apr. 2016.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6iOane7UFIs>

<sup>190</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>191</sup> Ted Metcalfe, (unending).”Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus) (Spartanburg, SC).

<sup>192</sup> Ted Metcalfe, (unending).”Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus) (Redding, CA).

<sup>193</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Redding, CA.):11.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid:11.

<sup>195</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Redding, CA.):14.

'liberal' Obama administration. Trump uses highly emotive language and implicates the audience in his description of what the election is becoming, extrapolating his vision of competitiveness into an implied narrative of the elections as a matter of life and death: "If you chose Hillary Clinton, this country is going to die".<sup>196</sup> Here is once more a statement of forecasted fact - the zero conditional of "if (...) [statement of future fact]" places Trump in either a position of trust for the audience or ridicule and prolongs Trump's diagnostic framework: the country is a body, at the mercy of its leaders. This metaphor is proximate to the reality Trump has been constructing throughout his speeches - a nation is only a nation if successful - and death is synonymous with the failure that the election of Clinton will certainly inaugurate.

Furthermore, Trump starts his Republican National Convention (RNC) speech, in Cleveland, OH., presenting a "straightforward assessment of the state of our nation",<sup>197</sup> an explicit diagnosis of the country. His speech is both textually and audibly very structured as opposed to his 'stump' speeches, with each diagnostic section (on the economy or crime) punctuated by explicit movements to the next: "now let us consider ... let's review".<sup>198</sup> He iterates his repeated imagery and exemplifications of victimization in drastic and urgent terms and with footnotes that can be analysed as techniques of legitimization, especially as these transcripts were distributed primarily to the media and delegate audience of the convention prior to the speech. This speech is in itself a performative summation of all of Trump's rally speeches' messages, and its formality and structure further legitimize, through careful enumeration, the severity and reality of Trump's diagnosis.

Another way in which Trump introduces diagnosis<sup>199 200</sup> is through holding up papers and maintaining that they are the locales' economic statistics: "don't get scared and don't feel guilty",<sup>201</sup> he tells his audience in Buffalo, NY. Trump then narrates their experience, interpellating his audience into his narrative and implicates himself as an authoritative 'voyeur'- the locale mirroring the state of the nation:

"I always tell my people give me some current information on the economy of Buffalo. Don't get scared and don't feel guilty, 'cause it's not your fault it's politicians representing all of us

<sup>196</sup> Ibid: 14.

<sup>197</sup> Donald Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination Acceptance Speech", *Assets of Donald Trump*, accessed 5 July, 2018. [https://assets.donaldjtrump.com/DJT\\_Acceptance\\_Speech.pdf](https://assets.donaldjtrump.com/DJT_Acceptance_Speech.pdf) : 2.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid.

<sup>199</sup> Donald Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane, Washington (5-7-16) Spokane Convention Center", Youtube video: 1:45:49, posted by Trump TV Network, 7 May, 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WdkwXsUBhoQ>

<sup>200</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS".

<sup>201</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS". (Own Transcripts).



that have no clue that are totally incompetent and these are the people that represent us at the highest level including the President of the United States and look at what's happened here. Listen to this do not get discouraged I'm telling you we're bringing it back fast, you watch what happens"<sup>202</sup>

“Current” defines the present, the temporal state of failure that will be emotional to confront, Trump maintains, when he does reveal this “truth”, this fragment prolonging that suspense. The Us/Them divide of politician and american is maintained within those descriptive ideologies of incompetence, failure, and the success that Trump - with his audience, indicated by his use of “we” and his implication in the failure of the politicians that are supposed to “represent us” - will restore to the US. In Spokane, this vulnerability is drawn-out in an insistence on Political Correctness (or ‘PC’ - synonymous with normative, liberal political language from a conservative and right-wing critical perspective) as dissociated from the “real world”<sup>203</sup> - the US being undermined ideologically as well as economically by its representatives.

Temporal dimensions of history, the present, and the future also feature heavily in Trump’s discourses as points of reference for an aspirational American national identity, and as critical ‘tools’ diagnosing the ‘failed present’. The present moment, Trump maintains, is characterized by the leadership’s lack of consideration for the US. Alongside this, time takes on a defining and value-laden quality as Trump embodies the remedy of success.<sup>204</sup> Trump’s very slogan (“Make America Great Again”) is premised on the concept of national status and ‘greatness’ as temporal - belonging to the past; Trump insists he can retrieve that greatness:

“We don't put America First. We have these horrible, horrible trade negotiators. I actually think they're not as stupid as people think. I think that they actually want to help everybody else. They want to help everybody but our country. ”

Redding, CA. speech.<sup>205</sup>

“America First” here, another of Trump’s slogans, is integrated into a diagnosis of the ‘present moment’ and it implies the nations’ leaders’ lack of engagement with priorities - they are not

<sup>202</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”. (Own Transcripts).

<sup>203</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>204</sup> Nostalgic language, it must be said, is common in conservative political discourse. Swaim, "The Perfect Republican Stump Speech."

<sup>205</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.): 17.

prioritizing the nation. Undertaking ‘good negotiations’ is here tantamount (as a criteria of success, according to Trump) to prioritizing the nation, treating it the best - those who engage in “horrible, horrible trade negotiations” are here defined as intentionally neglecting the nation. Trump repeats “Our country doesn’t win anymore” during his Spartanburg, SC. speech.<sup>206</sup> The US is neglected and its leaders are responsible - incompetence with trade taken here as the highest form of neglect.

Similarly, during his RNC speech, the past parallels Trump’s projection for a future America: “safety, prosperity, peace”,<sup>207</sup> upheld by the collocation of “law and order” - significant, because it is easily quotable and easily associated with Trump and his campaign promises. “Law and order”, as opposed to an order without law (the loss of threatened constitutional amendments) or a law without order (laws that are not enforced - the present chaos) is an image of legitimate stability and authority, as opposed to the illegitimate authority of government or criminality (these last two as considerably associated in their causality of national problems, during Trump’s speeches - see next sections). The rectification of aberration will ‘straighten out’ the US’ normalized destruction. In using the image of hierarchy again, but on the domestic level, “US people will come first once again” is a future promise that will replicate an imagined past of competent governance, enforcing the law and protecting citizens’ prosperity, safety, and employment. The above-mentioned pattern enumerating three nouns continues in his parallel characterization of voters and the establishment:

“America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by a group of censors, critics, and cynics”.

RNC, Cleveland, OH.<sup>208</sup>

“Nations of believers” here defines the American people in religious terms, and this prosodic imagery continues in a parallel enumeration of those establishment figures in power and the media - although this is not explicit. He uses imagery and meaning that has been refined over the course of his campaigning and which depicts a disparaged political class in opposition to an authentic American people.

Indeed, Trump’s speeches depict the US as a victim, depleted and failing with each passing year.

<sup>206</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Spartanburg, SC): 3.

<sup>207</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”: 1.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid: 26.

The US is compared to an imagined ‘former self’ of prosperity and success, and diagnosed in this comparative light. Trump maintains that this victimization is primarily caused by several categories of agentive actors.

#### 4.1.1.2. Diagnosis: threat of Politicians / Political Establishment

Politicians are those actors named individually or generalized into the all-encompassing “establishment”, “elite”, and, less often, “Washington”. They are at the “core” of the US’ diagnosed failure, and complement later sections identifying the media and ‘other’ victimizing agents. They are associated with Political Correctness<sup>209 210 211 212 213 214</sup> in opposition to Donald Trump (He implies this in his self-characterization as the solution to the politician’s victimization of the country, but explicitly says he is not “PC” during his Mt. Pleasant, SC.<sup>215</sup> and Lynchburg, VA.<sup>216</sup> speeches - the latter making a notable six references to ‘political correctness’, displaying a shift in focus from previous speeches), weakness, and incapacity. Politicians are, because of these “character flaws”, complicit with enabling more explicit “enemy others” characterized in Trump’s speeches, such as illegal immigrants or terrorists, in causing (or incapable of preventing) the US’ failure - this often represented in terms of incapacity and incompetence, and ‘corruption’ as part of that definition of incompetence. These actors are the “stupid leaders” who engage in bad deals with “smart countries”.<sup>217 218 219 220 221 222</sup> These traits of incompetence and corruption extrapolate these political actors as threats to the nation.

Trump’s announcement speech<sup>223</sup> introduced many of the discursive techniques that would be repeated in later critiques of Politicians and the Political Establishment. In New York, Trump critiques politicians’ speeches for not focusing on the “right issues” - implicitly characterizing himself: Trump discusses the right issues and speaks in the right way about them. Many of his speeches reiterate critiques of John Kerry, Jeb Bush (alongside other primary candidates) and

---

<sup>209</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Orlando, FL.)

<sup>210</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.)

<sup>211</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>212</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>213</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>214</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>215</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>216</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>217</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY)

<sup>218</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.)

<sup>219</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>220</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>221</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>222</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”.

<sup>223</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY)

Barack Obama identifying them as the absolute sources of problems - implicitly characterizing himself in opposition to these 'establishment' figures.<sup>224 225 226</sup>

During his Dayton, OH.<sup>227</sup> rally (also replicated in others<sup>228 229 230</sup>), Trump critiques President Obama as a victimizing member of not only the political establishment, but also as a symbol of identitarian political division: "we have a divided country ... we have black, and white ... everybody hates everybody ... even in congress".<sup>231</sup> The fragmentation of the country, he contends, stems back to Obama, who had widely been symbolized as an emblem of racial progress; by arguing that Obama has left a legacy of a stark "division" on the basis of race, Trump implies a unity prior to Obama - a past unified America, again evoking the structural metaphor of temporality that is here mythologized - and critiques Obama's symbolism because of its focus on 'race', contentiously reinterpreting Obama's status as an emblem. Later on in this speech, Trump, after critiquing Jeb Bush, calls himself the "most conservative person in the world on the military" as opposed to "these so-called conservatives". Trump, here, uses "conservative" as a legitimizing emblem in opposition to other candidates who are professional politicians - and, as Trump ceaselessly maintains - are insincere in their beliefs.

During his Lynchburg, VA.<sup>232</sup> speech Trump explicitly calls politicians corrupt, maintaining that incompetent is no longer a strong enough word. This corruption is correlated with a chasing out of business with high taxes, donor contribution to campaigns and thus bias toward donor interest - and associated victimization of 'working people'. Business, for Trump brings wealth to all, and politicians should work in the interest of this 'wealth' but have not. The US is a "debtor nation, poor, we've been mismanaged"<sup>233</sup> he confirms with the audience: "is that true or what?". The phrasal noun "debtor nation" also evokes a value judgment and worldview of national hierarchy: the US is a poor nation, with no wealth - and thus no status - because of its 'mismanagement', a managerial term that evinces Trump's vision of national leadership as akin to one of a business manager.

As mentioned above, Clinton emerges during the Primaries as the new target of critique as a representative of the 'establishment'. Trump mimics her, comparing her to himself in terms of

---

<sup>224</sup> Trump, "FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus, OH 11-23-15", Youtube video: 59:53, posted by Fox 10 Phoenix, 23 Nov. 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yqk4kOCPYPg&pbjreload=10>

<sup>225</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>226</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>227</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton".

<sup>228</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Orlando, FL.)

<sup>229</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>230</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination".

<sup>231</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton", (Own transcriptions).

<sup>232</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.):13.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid: 6.

'authenticity', performing her 'robotic' use of "teleprompters" during his speech in Spokane, WA.

<sup>234</sup> Later on, during his Redding, CA. <sup>235</sup> speech Trump spends a significant portion of his introduction on Clinton and her email server scandal<sup>236</sup> and trial. Trump draws them out, and illustrates her (acquitted) criminality that could pose national security threats to the country. He enumerates a string of (often repeated) insults levelled at her character and actions: "unfit",<sup>237</sup> "so stupid",<sup>238</sup> "got no energy",<sup>239</sup> "pathetic",<sup>240</sup> "got away with it"<sup>241</sup> and weak in opposition to Trump: "we need toughness"<sup>242</sup> - and, after correlating Clinton with several problems with US' foreign policy and security ("she doesn't know what the hell is going on. It's a mess [the state of the country]"<sup>243</sup>), he counters against his iteration of her critiques toward him: "and I'm suppose to have a nice tone?"<sup>244</sup> - conveying the urgency of the threat of Clinton and the establishment class of politicians through a hypothetical question critiquing "appropriate" speech in the context of a failing country. Alongside this, he directly correlates the head of that class of politicians, President Obama, with Hillary Clinton in an argumentative buildup premised on correlation and suspicion:

"...Hillary Clinton can't stand Obama. But now Hillary will do anything he says. You know why? She doesn't want to go to jail. You noticed? The president all of a sudden, they were going to dissociate themselves from the president. All of a sudden, anything he wants, she'll do. Because it seems like they're protecting her.

Let's take the word "seems" out. OK? They are protecting her from going to jail. And she doesn't want to anger the president by saying, "I disagree with you on this." So she agrees with just about every single thing that he wants to do. "Yes, sir; No, sir." I think she should start calling him "sir." OK?"<sup>245</sup>

<sup>234</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>235</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>236</sup> Clinton's use of private email servers for herself and some close aides whilst she was the secretary of state under President Obama later prompted an FBI investigation, this happening in the middle of the primaries season. Trump would use this against her at several occasions. Anthony Zurcher, "Hillary Clinton's emails - what's it all about?", *BBC News*, 6 November 2016, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-31806907>.

<sup>237</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.):10

<sup>238</sup> Ibid:10.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid:16.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid:4.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid:7.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid:9-10.

<sup>243</sup> Ibid:10.

<sup>244</sup> Ibid:3.

<sup>245</sup> Ibid: 15.

Trump punctuates his conclusive argument here in direct speech to the public: “You know why? ... You noticed?”, and draws on repertoires of suspicion and antagonism toward the political class that is common in Republican argumentation.<sup>246</sup> Trump gives a timeline of the relationship between Obama and Clinton, and correlates her wrongdoing and her need for legitimizing amnesty with her unlikely loyalty toward Obama. It is a circumspect and conspiratorial interpretation, enforcing discursive arguments against candidates who are politicians and so will continue (by virtue of their correlated and value-laden status) in the degradation of the nation.

During his RNC speech Trump repeats these as he builds up an argument against Clinton and the ‘Establishment’ she represents by reiterating the “present state” of the country.<sup>247</sup> Americans are “ignored, neglected, abandoned”<sup>248</sup> and Trump claims first hand experience in witnessing “communities crushed”;<sup>249</sup> furthermore, Christianity’s “voice has been taken away”.<sup>250</sup> These are illustrations of passive social and cultural victimization - the US is impotent and disenfranchised, and Political Correctness has further exacted a “cost” unto the country, through “spin”, “lies” and an insincere framing of issues<sup>251</sup> Hillary Clinton, her husband, and their passing of NAFTA in the mid 1990s are also complicit in victimizing the country. Trump insists, illustrating his oppositional competence, he would have never engaged in these. Clinton is de-legitimized on the basis of her experience and her professional “legacy”<sup>252</sup> as secretary of state as well as first lady. She becomes the locus of causality, and, for Trump, the representative of all that is egregious, regardless if they had their origins in deeper historical phenomenon (like “terrorism”). Furthermore, she is consistently defined as the ‘corrupt candidate’: “rigged”,<sup>253</sup> complicit with “special interests”,<sup>254</sup> a “puppet”,<sup>255</sup> and even having engaged in treasonous relationships with foreign powers. Clinton’s campaign becomes an enumeration of all possible evils within an election - concurrent with the status quo of politics in the country.

The political establishment, as a monolithic entity or as made up of identifiable individual representatives, is a constant source of variably direct and indirect threat within Trump’s speeches. It also acts as an oppositional example with which Trump compares his own candidacy,

---

<sup>246</sup> Oscar Winberg, “Insult Politics: Donald Trump, Right-Wing Populism, and Incendiary Language.” *European Journal of American Studies*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2017, doi:10.4000/ejas.12132.

<sup>247</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>249</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid: 13.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> Ibid: 8.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid: 9.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid: 11.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid: 10.

emphasizing the persuasive force of his dichotomized worldview of good and bad, success and failure.

#### 4.1.1.3. Diagnosis: Threat of Media

The Media is another monolithic actor that is characterized as representing elite interests, and is thus correlated with PC politics. Trump's argument that the media misrepresents him and his campaign, and that they are biased toward other candidates (Republican candidates and, later, Hillary Clinton) is common in his speeches. The media is "dishonest",<sup>256 257 258 259</sup> and, because of their misrepresentation of Trump, are also victimizing the US electorate (his supporters, who are extrapolated as such) and misrepresenting them. This confers legitimacy upon Trump's narrative of persecuted Truth and authenticity, that the biased media disregards - and acts as a persuasive tactic implicating the 'targeted' audience in the argument against the mainstream media.

Trump's accusation that media solely focuses their cameras on him as opposed to the audience, and are thus hypocritical in their condemnation of him and his campaign, is repeated throughout his speeches.<sup>260 261 262 263 264</sup> This performative accusation signifies, again, that the media misrepresents the core of Trump's message, which is his audience,<sup>265 266 267</sup> it also interpellates the audience in a direct relation of antagonism with the media, confirming Trump's constant iteration of those in power ignoring 'the people's grievances'. The media is "Sleazy" and "they laugh, they laugh at us" - a 'they/us' dichotomization here that reiterates the framing of antagonism, with a well-established enemy, and includes the audience in this antagonism as they too are implicated in this ridicule,<sup>268</sup> further articulating the position of Trump as representing and speaking for his audiences. Trump uses this same technique during his Columbus, OH.<sup>269</sup> speech stating that "it's amazing, the way they treat all of us"<sup>270</sup> - "they", here, as the 'other' ('liberal media', establishment politicians) whose critiques of Trump or his audience implicates these latter parties. "They" runs parallel to "us", and is active as opposed to the passive "us". Trump and

---

<sup>256</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton".

<sup>257</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>258</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>259</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination".

<sup>260</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>261</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>262</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton".

<sup>263</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS".

<sup>264</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>265</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton".

<sup>266</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>267</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination".

<sup>268</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.):13.

<sup>269</sup> Trump, "FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus".

<sup>270</sup> Ibid.

his audience are here portrayed as passive victims of misrepresentation, victims of disdain and ridicule by the media. This represented relation runs parallel to the larger dichotomization of ‘us’ vs. ‘them’ in the text corpus, a tactic that unifies the audience *in opposition*.

The antagonizing function of Trump’s description of ‘liberal media’ as being biased against him unifies both him and his audience in arguing that their ‘authentic truth’ has been neglected and de-legitimized. This accusation of bias adds another degree of salience particularly during the primaries as more and more protesters interrupt Trump rally speeches as opposed to the pre-primary ‘era.’<sup>271</sup> Indeed, Trump accuses the media of never showing protesters’ violence or their victims. During his RNC speech Trump comes to the implied conclusion of these accusations that are also applied to the US’ leadership/political establishment. The media cannot be trusted, “plain facts”<sup>272</sup> are “edited out”<sup>273</sup> - the media, as an agent of PC culture, does not present the plain truth that Trump speaks. The monolithic media, toward the end of Trump’s speech at the RNC, are characterized as lying, and thus detrimental to the interests of the country:

“Remember: all of the people telling you that you can’t have the country you want, are the same people telling you that I wouldn’t be standing here tonight. The same people. Oh we love defeating those people, don’t we? Don’t we love defeating those people? Love it, love it, love it [applause].”<sup>274</sup>

Here, Trump implicates his audience in his advisory (“Remember”) critique of media within the explicit conceit of battle. He reiterates a “journey”, from media disdain to his emergence as the GOP’s major candidate and he interpellates his audience into the act of disproving - and thus acting on behalf of the “truth” - media projections and lies with a confirming hypothetical question: Doesn’t Trump and his audience “love defeating those people?”. Trump continues here in his use of the battle conceit, but then digresses from his script with “Oh we-” which starts a more sporadic and emotional part (“love” repeated four times). This can be understood as a display of modal sincerity, supported by the reacting audience.

The mainstream media in Trump’s discourses are represented as actively threatening Trump’s campaigning through misrepresentation and lying. Trump extrapolates from this their threat to

---

<sup>271</sup> This became apparent, although perhaps not generalizable on a full-scale study of Trump’s rally speeches, as something of trend while conducting analyses on these speeches

<sup>272</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”: 4.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid: 4.

<sup>274</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”: 26.



the unity and safety of the country itself, as they deny Trump's "true" diagnosis and thus deny a necessary prognosis that will save the country. Trump implicates the audiences' concern in this discourse.

#### 4.1.1.4. Diagnosis: Threat of Agentive Countries

Those countries that are repeatedly represented as benefiting off of and victimizing the US are as follows: China, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Iran and, occurring once in the corpus of texts, Germany. US allies are characterized as opportunistic, and as not contributing to the US:<sup>275 276 277</sup>  
<sup>278 279 280</sup> "Everyone does good deals with the US because the world is smart" (Lynchburg, VA.<sup>281</sup> speech, similarly stated in several other speeches as well<sup>282 283 284 285 286</sup>), he insists - these good deals for everyone are bad deals for the US. After stating this, he jumps to political correctness, implying that these bad deals are the fruit of this amorphous linguistic, moralistic and psychological diagnosis that is a defining characteristic of politicians and media:

"We want to be politically correct and it's just not working ... it takes too much time, and a lot of it is just wrong."

Lynchburg, VA.<sup>287</sup>

Trump implicates the audience in his use of "we", which encompasses the nation. The nation aspires to political correctness, but it does not work, in opposition to a former, ambiguously defined implied way of 'working'. Within the context of the subject of economics and trade, Trump diagnoses the economic failure of the nation through the US' leaders being 'PC' in their deals; conforming to abstract standards that "take too long" and are sometimes "wrong", as opposed to representing the interests of the nation. This stands against Trump's own self-depiction as speaking 'truth'.

<sup>275</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY).

<sup>276</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>277</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>278</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>279</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>280</sup> Trump, Donald. "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>281</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.):7.

<sup>282</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY).

<sup>283</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>284</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>285</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>286</sup> Trump, Donald. "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>287</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.):7.

One frequently cited ‘narrative of truth’ is the one illustrating Mexico as an agent of victimization. It “sends criminals” across the border<sup>288 289 290</sup> and steals jobs by ‘taking’ business; Nabisco, Pfizer, and Ford are frequently referenced examples and often used in hypothetical scenarios wherein which Trump ‘wins’ the companies back (see “Trump as insider” section). Mexico is often characterized in correlatory terms, as both an agentive country and a representative of all of its illegal immigrants - they steal jobs, send criminals (whether these criminals are characterized as criminal by nature of just being ‘illegal’ or if they are actual acting criminals is specified in only his New York, NY.<sup>291</sup> speech - the ambiguity of this characterization nonetheless bolsters his use of such illustrations through their multiplicity of evocation); these criminals find refuge in dangerous ‘sanctuary cities’ (which Trump uses in Cleveland<sup>292</sup> to comparatively and emotively diagnose Clinton’s immorality, who “wants” these cities, by saying “where was the sanctuary for all the other americans who have been so brutally murdered (...)?”) and abuse the country’s tax payers by having “anchor-babies”.<sup>293 294 295</sup> The US, for Mexico, is a “dumping ground”, implying a characterization of illegal immigrants as ‘trash’.<sup>296 297</sup> Furthermore, Trump, when speaking about Mexico, often ‘jumps’ from one or the other of these characterizations to his promise to build a “wall”. In doing so he implies the correlated threat of economic and social issues upon american national security - requiring physical limits and defense - thus extrapolating Mexico outright as a national security threat.

China is also frequently cited as an agentive ‘enemy’. China commits “the biggest theft” in world history by “stealing” US jobs (Jacksonville, FL.<sup>298</sup> speech). As with the agentive figure of Mexico, China’s threat is characterized as primarily economic and thus societal. This economic-societal threat is also represented in Trump’s numerous references to the Iran Deal<sup>299</sup> and the “Bergdahl”<sup>302</sup> deal<sup>303 304 305 306 307 308</sup> over the course of his speeches become

<sup>288</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>289</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.).

<sup>290</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.).

<sup>291</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>292</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”: 9.

<sup>293</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>294</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.).

<sup>295</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.).

<sup>296</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>297</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.): 15.

<sup>298</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>299</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”.

<sup>300</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>301</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>302</sup> Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl was a POW in Afghanistan, detained for five years by the Taliban and released after negotiations with the group, in exchange for five Taliban commanders held in Guantanamo Bay (see Fuller, 2014). This negotiation happened during the Obama Administration, and was an extremely contentious deal for several complex reasons: Obama did not follow legal procedure in engaging in the exchange, and it arose that Bergdahl had actually been a deserter (Oppel Jr, 2017).

stable-narratives of the Obama Administration's failure in their international negotiations; this all-defining diagnosis of the Obama Administration is premised on a narrative of victimization of the nation, committed through the 'enabling incompetence' of the aforementioned 'Political Establishment'.

Agentive countries are identified as taking advantage of the US' vulnerability. This is partially the fault of the political establishment, which is concurrently represented in these discourses as being at the origins of these countries' manipulation. This discourse paints a picture of Trump's conflictual and neoliberal worldview: countries are necessarily self-interested, and will take advantage of all weakness, hence why negotiators, like Trump, are needed to remedy the country.

#### 4.1.1.5. Diagnosis: Threat of Immigrants, criminals, protesters

In his overarching oppositional framing, 'others' (illegal immigrants, Muslim migrants, protesters, criminals) are represented as problems that Trump, as president, can "solve" - his solutions as singularly causal through building a wall to close the border, or through stopping Muslim and/or Syrian immigration.<sup>309 310 311</sup>

These 'others' are all agents of threat or violence in Trump's narratives, with occasional disclaimers for legal immigrants - although his division of illegal and legal immigration is often blurred. Many of these characterizations are premised on verbal and textual tactics that create correlations between many phenomena - through enumeration and by jumping from subject to subject, both implying relationality. It is reminiscent of conspiratorial logic - and the function of conspiracy theories as providing a "unified explanation or explanatory reach' [or accessible explanation]"<sup>312</sup> for those who listen to or speak them.

These forms of implied correlation occur on several occasions throughout Trump's speeches, notably during his Mt. Pleasant, SC.<sup>313</sup> speech which was heavily mediatized because of

---

<sup>303</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY).

<sup>304</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix"

<sup>305</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.)

<sup>306</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>307</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>308</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>309</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>310</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>311</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination".

<sup>312</sup> Keeley in Clare Birchall, "Conspiracy theories and academic discourses: The necessary possibility of popular (over) interpretation." *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 15.no.1 (2001): 3.

<sup>313</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

Trump's call for a ban on Muslims (here, an essentialized category) entering the country.<sup>314</sup> Trump's reaction to the then recent San Bernardino and Paris attacks was justified by a depiction of a country physically victimized ("We have no choice" "killing us": "us" as being killed by "them") by unknown and unspecified aggressors ("they"); even more, this correlated but uncertain aggressor is unacknowledged by those in power. This ignored truth is bolstered as a claim of fact that Muslims want to harm the US, based on a far-right institute's largely debunked polls which Trump cites.<sup>315</sup> The use of a poll can be analysed as a performative attempt to legitimize through evidence, even if the poll is widely denounced. Trump continues illustrating this threat in later speeches:

"Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration. This is what we have now. Communities want relief. Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness."

Cleveland, OH.<sup>316</sup>

In this extract, the trio of parallel-structured enumerations evoke a surge, correlating those seeking amnesty (refugees), with those migrating, and with either general criminality or criminals themselves; Trump here distills ("is proposing"), without direct quotation of, Clinton's policies. He portrays her as an oppositional and dangerous "opponent" who will give no relief to those communities dealing with overwhelming threat(s). These actors are directly or indirectly represented in Trump's speeches as condoned by politicians and the media, while never explicitly condemned - this, Trump claims, is the crime of those holding power.

This enemy comes from everywhere and nowhere, and because of this, these unidentifiable enemies are all the more dangerous, and serve as spaces of semiotic projection: Trump can deal with whatever enemy the US will face, because it is merely a question of

<sup>314</sup> Case exemplifications are often generalized, as representative of belligerent intentions - or occasionally given a quick, disclaiming caveat: "Some, I assume are good people", in reference to illegal immigrants (New York, NY.) or "I love legal immigration. I love it. I love it" (Phoenix, AZ).

<sup>315</sup> The poll, which originated from the right-wing "Centre for Security Policy", does not conform to Trump's claims, although it seemed veered toward demonizing Muslim survey respondents. According to Politifact, "It's also worth noting that the head of the Center for Security Policy, Frank Gaffney, has articulated a variety of theories about Muslim extremists that verge on conspiracy, such as the idea that the Muslim Brotherhood has infiltrated the United States government and the false narrative that President Barack Obama is Muslim." Lauren Carroll and Louis Jacobssen, "Trump cites shaky survey in call to ban Muslims from entering the US", *Politifact*, 9 December 2015, <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2015/dec/09/donald-trump/trump-cites-shaky-survey-call-ban-muslims-entering/>.

<sup>316</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination": 19.

“protection” and “competence”:

“But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we’re getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They’re sending us not the right people.

It’s coming from more than Mexico. It’s coming from all over South and Latin America, and it’s coming probably— probably— from the Middle East. But we don’t know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don’t know what’s happening. And it’s got to stop and it’s got to stop fast.”

New York, NY. speech.<sup>317</sup>

Here, Trump legitimizes this amalgamated fear through reference to what the Border Control have said to him - “they’re sending us”, paralleling the imagery of passive receptivity that is implied in Trump’s analogies of the US as a “dumping ground”. The US has become a space where ‘undesirables’ are sent, to the detriment of the nation - and alongside an enumeration of regions connoted for their underdevelopment and ‘potential harm’ beyond the known (“more than Mexico”)(although the threatening ‘underdevelopment’ of these enemies is unspoken, it is implied in the inclusion of the Middle East in the list - these are regions that are heavily associated with mediatized violence and instability, ‘cultural threat’, and that are often the focus of political debates on immigration and terrorism - two themes that will be heavily amalgamated in Trump’s later speeches). Trump describes the nation’s layers of vulnerability: “But we don’t know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don’t know what’s happening.” The country is vulnerable because of those in power and their lack of ability, as well as lack of knowledge - knowledge that Trump himself possesses.

The Paris Attacks, which occurred on November 13th, 2015, became recurring illustrative devices for Trump’s diagnoses. During his later speeches, he explicitly acknowledges a shift in his language and policy focus since the attacks, using these to illustrate an urgent and uncontrollable shift in the world, which he and his audience are reacting to. Trump refocuses on the unknown other, as opposed to the ‘known’ Mexican ‘other’, as a tangible threat to an already victimized nation. “If I get elected it’s totally protected” (Lynchburg, VG speech<sup>318</sup>), “it’s” here indicating the pro-gun rights advocates’ interpretation of the Second Amendment - Trump will protect fearful americans’ ‘self-defense’. Trump’s statements are further exemplified by his

<sup>317</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY): 1-2.

<sup>318</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.):19.

hypothetical scenarios in which people in Paris could have been saved if it had not been for gun-control:<sup>319 320 321</sup> the Paris attacks are here used to exemplify an explicit and universalist pro-gun message to Trump's audience (See Annexe III, 'Commonly cited scenarios').

In Lynchburg, VA,<sup>322</sup> a speech at a christian college Trump makes many references to himself as an active christian, and insists on the US' christian identity. He characterizes christianity as threatened through the representation of a dangerous religious oppositionality: "Europe" is "under siege" (Radical Islam here 'explicitly implied' through the figure of the refugee) - it is, furthermore "being absolutely swamped and destroyed" (Imagery also replicated during Trump's Little Rock, AK.<sup>323</sup> speech) by migration, another factor of threat. This can be understood as a vivid diagnosis that is premised on violent physical verbs. For Trump, Europe is an omen for what may happen to the US: Muslim immigration, he warns in implicit if violent terms<sup>324</sup>, wrecks countries - cultures, as it is a religious threat that, nonetheless, is a 'national security threat'. Syrian refugees "could be a sinister plot", a "great trojan horse"<sup>325 326 327</sup> - analogies that function through a conspiratorial logic of semblance and of foreign duplicity, and are akin to far-right depictions of refugee movement in Europe. Trump focuses on "young strong men" who are described in a language of potential threat, and very well may 'be' terrorists like the ones 'swamping' and 'destroying' Europe. Immigration and terrorism here are amalgamated in the form of the Middle Eastern refugee. These analogies are nonetheless hypothetical - but they serve a persuasive and emotive purpose nonetheless, as the lines between the hypothetical and the possible are blurred within Trump's diagnostic and urgent language.

Alongside these, one of the most recurrent illustrative devices that Trump uses is his iteration of real murders committed by illegal immigrants, giving factual, legitimate substance to an amalgamated and generalized characterization of illegal immigration and criminality. By giving that conceptual and visual space to "real experience", Trump justifies his claim that he will represent ignored real concerns. He extrapolates these murders as proof of an 'epidemic', a spatial image that combines the urgency of a 'national security threat'<sup>328</sup> with imagery of an uncontrolled illness. These stories are narrated in many of Trump's speeches in the analysed

---

<sup>319</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>320</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>321</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>322</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>323</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>324</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>325</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>326</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>327</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>328</sup> See literature on securitization - the discursive amplification of phenomena as national security threat through framing.

corpus.<sup>329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336</sup>

“ I’m talking about illegal immigration. And I brought up a subject called illegal immigration. And I just saw backstage some of the families who were decimated. Their families were decimated, their sons, their daughters killed by illegal immigrants and it’s a massive problem. We have to stop illegal immigration. We have to do it.”

Dallas, TX. speech<sup>337</sup>

“Decimated” and “Massive problem” here run parallel to the imagery of epidemic, which again evokes an uncontrollable and urgent ‘phenomenon’ with physical consequences, nonetheless abstracting all those who are not murderers into the characterization (“I’m talking about illegal immigration” makes no distinction between criminality and non-criminality, although “illegal” often takes on the meaning of criminality in Trump’s speeches); however, those families who have been affected, who Trump has spoken to and claims to represent, are real - he has just seen them “backstage” - they are present among the crowd, and implicate the concern of all those present. Illegal immigration “decimates” and is destroying american families. To “stop illegal immigration” is represented as a dutiful reaction - implicating all those listening.

“Now we are going to de-fund the sanctuary cities, because sanctuary cities are a disgrace. They are a disgrace.

(APPLAUSE)

You look at -- I have property. I have a great property in San Francisco. The Bank of America Building, I love San Francisco. When Kate was brutally killed, shot in the back by an illegal immigrant who was probably here more than five times -- they say five times -- we're not

<sup>329</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”.

<sup>330</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>331</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>332</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>333</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Orlando, FL.)

<sup>334</sup> Trump, “FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus”.

<sup>335</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>336</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>337</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.): 14.

going to let that happen again. When a wonderful veteran, 66-year-old woman was raped, sodomized, and killed in Los Angeles, we're not going to let that happen anymore.

(APPLAUSE)

We will not let it happen anymore -- by an illegal immigrant. And we are stopping with the sanctuary cities, we are going to go detention, forget it. We're not going to do the catch -- you know, catch, release. Catch, release.”

Orlando, FL. speech.<sup>338</sup>

Illegal immigration and its ‘problems’ are framed here as being caused by administrative tolerance - sanctuary cities as funded and condoned by those in power, and catch and release as a common, repeated (“catch, release. Catch, release.”) practice. “Disgrace” also connotes a value judgment of tarnished image and immorality through Trump’s diagnostic language. Trump’s illegal immigration policy shifts from stopping movement with the building of a wall to targeting spaces where ‘illegality’ is tolerated - actively moving toward domestic policy as a ‘threat’ to national security and evoking Trump’s constant critique of the political class in power.

Similarly, during his RNC speech Trump enumerates statistics of an Obama Administration that has threatened the country by the “rollback of criminal enforcement”,<sup>339</sup> citing statistic after statistic of homicides and police officer deaths during Obama’s Presidency.<sup>340</sup> During this same speech, he cites his visits with families of victims murdered by illegal immigrants, exemplifying his ‘morality’ in opposition to Hillary Clinton. He states that “my opponent will never meet with them, or share in their pain, believe me.” His and his opponent’s (Clinton’s) differences, and all the associated values of her status as ‘establishment’, are translated by Trump into differences of morality, and moral action: she is pro-immigration, she will not acknowledge the victimization of the nation by illegal immigrants.

Refugees, Trump maintains in his Spokane, WA.<sup>341</sup> speech referencing the rehousing projects in the state, are “unwanted” - the city's a “mess” - and Trump uses Spokane as a synecdoche for the US as a whole; he warns that the US “can’t be the stupid country anymore folks”.<sup>342</sup> However,

<sup>338</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Orlando, FL.): 7.

<sup>339</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”: 2-3.

<sup>340</sup> Ibid.

<sup>341</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>342</sup> Ibid. (Own Transcripts).



Trump sometimes shows nuance as in his RNC speech, when he makes an implicit disclaimer toward dehumanizing these ‘others’: “We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone. But my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens”<sup>343</sup> - but contradicts this in essentializing the threat of Syrian refugees justifying this in stating there is “no way to screen these refugees”.<sup>344</sup> He further correlates the political class with his logic of their potential criminality stating that Clinton will increase refugee intake by “550%”.<sup>345</sup> During his Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech in reference to the San Bernardino, CA. attacks by extremists and the lack of profiling of the attackers as potential criminals, Trump replicates this phrasing in reiterating a story of a neighbour’s suspicions nonetheless not being acted upon for fear of being racist: the US is “the stupid country in so many ways”.<sup>346</sup> In the context of the story and the larger argument, ‘stupidity’ is correlated with Political Correctness, and the threat it poses to national security because of people’s, and politicians’ fears of transgressing PC language.

In Dayton, OH.<sup>347</sup> Trump makes reference to a [debunked<sup>348</sup>] narrative of US General Pershing shooting Muslim soldiers in the Philippines with pig blood as something of a continuation of this conceit of war. In this speech he also makes explicit statements advocating the use of internationally banned methods of torture as interrogation tactics (this is repeated twice in his Dayton, OH.<sup>349</sup> speech): “In the Middle East if they had the capability they would kill us [cheers] so we gotta kill them” - the reasoning being that all potential hypothetical threat must be killed. It is also a statement of authenticity: Trump would do such things, because this is a framework of war, requiring tactics of war (he is not PC). He continues, after advertising his Twitter handle (in a staccato digression):

“Waterboardings [sic] fine and if we can go much further than the waterboarding then that’s ok too [applause, cheers, indistinct yells] we have to expand our laws, we wanna knock them out so fast and so furious.”

Dayton, OH.<sup>350</sup>

<sup>343</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”:

<sup>344</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”: 8.

<sup>345</sup> Ibid: 8.

<sup>346</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.):6.

<sup>347</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>348</sup> For further research done on this narrative, see Reilley’s 2017 article for Time: Reilley, “President Trump praises fake story about shooting Muslims with pig’s blood-soaked bullets”, *Time Magazine*, 2017, <http://time.com/4905420/donald-trump-pershing-pigs-blood-muslim-tweet/>

<sup>349</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>350</sup> Ibid.

“Expanding the laws” here makes reference to both legal precedent and case law that limits the use of torture and makes it an untenable source of information for confession accounts legally; it also makes reference, if imprecisely and inadvertently, to the Eighth Amendment in the US Constitution that maintains limitations on the Federal Government in their use of ‘cruel and unusual punishment’, among other things. In the same speech mentioned above, Trump makes reference to the potential threat of those in power violating his supporters’ first amendment rights - and the threat that those in power pose to the US Constitution; Trump, in one speech inconsistently defends one part of the constitution while implying the reconsideration of another, displaying his contextually inconsistent and variable campaign message. The above quotation presupposes an absolute threat from what Trump did acknowledge as a hypothetical possibility - regardless, measures to “knock them out so fast and so furious” should be taken. Trump speaks on behalf of his audience here as well, and defines their unified sentiments of action: “if we can [conditional]... we have to [imperative], we wanna”, expressing their potential, their duty, and their desire to use extreme measures.

#### Conclusion - Diagnosis

Trump’s use of a diagnostic framework explaining the US’ failure through comparison with its past greatness and through identification of its present threats provides an oppositional basis to illustrate Trump’s core message of ‘himself as solution’ which he maintains is why his audience should (needs to) vote for him. This last section identified in detail those recurrent discursive features that enforced Trump’s depiction of the US as a failed nation. His modules, in most of Trump’s speeches, are recurrent and make up the core premise of his campaign message.

#### **4.1.2. Frame of Prognosis: Trump as emblem of success and discourse of remedy**

This section considers Trump's self-representation as the central emblem of success, and thus remedy, in his speeches - He maintains he embodies all those characteristics current politicians lack. It also assess Trump's self-depiction as being outsider/insider, which further legitimizes his authority and 'knowledge'. These prognostic modules may feature anywhere in most speeches, but are usually a reacting response to a diagnosis of failure or victimization. Trump often uses oppositions to further emphasize himself and his success. Prognostic framing, in the context of political campaigning, can be understood as a means of 'selling oneself' to the audience, to frame oneself as the most suitable candidate.

Trump's authenticity/success as opposed to the political establishment's evokes his overarching diagnosis of the US' failure. Trump, in this line of argumentation, characterizes himself as representative of a shifting moment in the public's (or a select portion of supporters that represents the public) demand for truth from politics. Success is an abstract quality that is embodied in temporality, in character traits, in one's knowledge and social connections, in the above-described 'awareness' and in national wealth and prosperity. It is the second core component of Trump's frameworks, and all of these embodied traits are presented through Trump who promises to share them with the country. This section depicts all those modules illustrating Trump as an answer to his diagnoses, this 'response' being at the core of his 'prognostic' framework.

##### **4.1.2.1. Prognosis: Trump as emblem of success and authenticity**

Donald Trump represents himself as an emblem of success, the solution to the US' national failure on all fronts. His wealth, his foresight and expertise, business knowledge and connections and his book "The Art of the Deal", are all exemplified in his speeches as proof of his capacity to "stop threats" from those victimizing the US, and to bring wealth and jobs "back". These are tactics of persuasion, especially when placed alongside his 'diagnoses' - and are veered toward an emotional call to vote.

Trump's modules representing and arguing about success are thoroughly exemplified: Trump had gone to the best schools (in New York, NY.<sup>351</sup> speech and Columbus, OH.<sup>352</sup> speech, while critiquing 'the media': "they call them intellectuals. I'm much smarter than all of them, I think"), and is successful and wealthy.<sup>353 354 355 356</sup> Trump, during his New York, NY.<sup>357</sup> speech and most

---

<sup>351</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY).

<sup>352</sup> Trump, "FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus".

<sup>353</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY).

<sup>354</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>355</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

other speeches, illustrates his competence through the use of analogies from his business life. Securing and renovating “the Old Post Office”, a former public utilities building, is a narrative<sup>358</sup> repeatedly used to exemplify Trump’s achievements as a negotiator and businessman<sup>359 360 361 362</sup> - it was formerly a public utilities building, and now Trump has competently renovated it. During his Mobile, AL.<sup>363</sup> speech he compares it to those works undertaken by government: “it’s now under-budget and ahead of schedule. You ever hear that from government?” Trump’s achievements here conform to the criteria of good business practice, “under-budget” and “ahead of schedule” as opposed to the implied ‘over-budget’ and ‘delayedness’ of Government projects - and are extrapolated as examples of all of Trump’s future projects.

Authenticity as a character trait is also portrayed through many illustrative devices - Trump’s insistence on not using teleprompters. He states in Phoenix, AZ<sup>364</sup>: “So and I say it usually once during a speech, every once in a while. You know, I don't use teleprompters like the President and I speak from the heart”,<sup>365</sup> ‘speaking truth’ here as exemplified through un-preparedness; this is replicated in many other speeches,<sup>366 367 368 369 370 371</sup> alongside claims to ‘straight-talking’,<sup>372 373 374</sup> his not having Super-PACs (see below, on self-funding), and not being “PC”.<sup>375 376</sup>

In addition to this, Trump maintains that he is self-funded,<sup>377 378 379 380 381 382</sup> concurrently uncorrupted and incorruptible: he will indiscriminately represent the interests of the US,

<sup>356</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>357</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>358</sup> See Annexe with commonly repeated narratives for full fragment.

<sup>359</sup> Ibid.

<sup>360</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>361</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>362</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”.

<sup>363</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>364</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”: 16.

<sup>365</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”.

<sup>366</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>367</sup> Trump, “FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus”.

<sup>368</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>369</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>370</sup> Trump, Donald. “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>371</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Redding, CA.)

<sup>372</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”.

<sup>373</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>374</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>375</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>376</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>377</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>378</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>379</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>380</sup> Trump, “FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus”.

<sup>381</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>382</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

because he is rich while poor politicians are more susceptible to using donors. This, in Trump's constant correlatory critique of those he opposes and those he describes as having victimized the country, are automatically correlated with "special interests", bias, and corruption; all associated characteristics of "establishment politics". Furthermore, unlike other candidates, who are career politicians and have invested none of their personal life into these elections, Trump is personally sacrificing opportunities to run for president:

"But I lose a lot. Not only I don't do The Apprentice and get paid a fortune. It's also I lose opportunity, all these deals. I have a deal in China. I have deals all over the place that I could do. Boo, boo. But it's true. It's like picking up a check. It's like picking up a check. But I give up a lot.

You know, when a politician, all talk no action, politician runs, what do they give up? They give up nothing. They run. You know what, they run, they lose, they win, they don't care, all they want to do is be reelected or run again if they fail, right?

With me, it's -- it's a whole big deal. It's a whole big deal. And you know, I'm self-funding my campaign. I'm not taking all of this blood money. Not doing it."

Dallas TX. speech<sup>383</sup>

Trump here lists a variety of his professional dealings, exemplifying, precisely ("The Apprentice", "a deal in China") and generally ("I have deals all over the place") what he is sacrificing for an implied 'greater cause'. As Trump is not making money from campaigning, it is characterized in implied terms of purity and sincerity as opposed to career politicians who do not sacrifice but who take compromised "blood money". "You know what, they run, they lose, they win, they don't care, all they want to do is be re elected or run again if they fail, right?" - Politicians, here, are cyclical and insincere in their messages and beliefs, as opposed to Trump. Alongside this, Trump's refusal to retract his statements or critiques are represented by him as having consequences: he maintains that he has taken "the most heat" for his controversial comments, repeatedly quoting another legitimizing intertextual reference among the politically conservative, Rush Limbaugh to backup this statement.<sup>384 385 386 387</sup>

<sup>383</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Dallas, TX.): 8.

<sup>384</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>385</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>386</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Orlando, FL.)

Similar to the function of quoting Limbaugh, Trump<sup>388</sup> claims affinity with the Tea Party and later<sup>389</sup> Evangelical politics and voters - intertextual references that can be considered resonant for his audiences in their locality<sup>390</sup> and legitimizing for Trump's claims to representing the concerns of this electorate. Similarly legitimizing, during his Redding, CA. speech Trump quotes Bill O'Reilly, a popular conservative journalist, who called him "the single greatest political phenomena he's ever seen in his life".<sup>391</sup> Through O'Reilly's endorsement and characterization of Trump as extraordinary, Trump again legitimizes his characterized status as an unprecedented, confirmed conservative, and 'authentic' contender ("not your typical person", he describes himself later in the speech), from the words of an, it may be supposed, influential figure for the audience.<sup>392 393 394 395</sup>

Trump's self-characterization as speaking truth to political lies and incompetence persists throughout the primaries period.<sup>396 397 398 399</sup> The conceit of authenticity, in opposition to inauthenticity and preparation, is premised upon a fundamental critique of politics: Trump is antagonistic toward dishonesty, toward teleprompters, and toward scripts. In portraying himself as authentically successful as opposed to politically-so, Trump continues to represent himself as a 'real' yardstick for potential American success.

His use of adverbs of insistence, like "truly" and "frankly", punctuate his language with references to truth as a descriptor of absolute honesty. Trump maintains during this same speech (Redding, CA.) that he is "speaking from the heart"<sup>400</sup> without pollsters, teleprompters,

---

<sup>387</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>388</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Dallas, TX.): 15-16.

<sup>389</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.):2.

<sup>390</sup> Through an unusually thorough series of statewide polling in Texas assessing the extent of Tea Party identification, Blank & Henson of the University of Texas at Austin found that, of the "(...) 24 surveys of registered voters in the state of Texas between February 2010 and October 2017, tea party identification averaged 18.54% (sd = 2.89), with a minimum of 12% in February 2016 and maximums of 23% in May 2010 and May 2011 (...). Among Republican identifiers, tea party identification has averaged 32.62% (sd = 4.83), with a maximum of 41% in May 2011 and a minimum of 23% in February 2016 (...) in Texas, the tea party has clearly remained an important part of the political landscape." (Blank & Henson, 2018: 8;14). The relevance of reference to Evangelism is also premised on the common assumption that many conservatives are either religious or share political affinities with the religious. Reference to evangelism is topical in preparation for the primaries, as Evangelicals are generally considered to be highly politically active among religious communities.

<sup>391</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.): 4.

<sup>392</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Spartanburg, SC.)

<sup>393</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton".

<sup>394</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>395</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>396</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>397</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>398</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>399</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination".

<sup>400</sup> Ibid: 5.

“consultants”.<sup>401</sup>He then moves on to foreign policy issues - primarily trade and negotiations, and specifies many of his own foreign policy positions in a short fragment of time.

“We have to do this -- and South Korea. I mean, we're protecting South Korea from the maniac in the north, and we're protecting them.

Now, he actually said -- you know, I said this -- they said, "Would you mind having negotiations with North Korea?" No problem. Who the hell cares? You have a negotiation. I'm not going there. But you have a negotiation. They say, "We will never talk; we will never talk." How stupid are these people. They've been selling our country down the tubes. They've been spending money.

Who knows if the talks work. Maybe they will. Maybe they won't. They probably will, if you want to know the truth. Then Putin said, "Donald Trump is a genius; he's going to be the next great leader of the United States."

(APPLAUSE)

No, no. Think of it. So, they wanted me to disavow what he said. How dare you call me a genius? How dare you call me a genius, Vladimir? Never say a thing. Wouldn't it be nice if we actually got along with Russia? Wouldn't that be good? I mean, is that a bad thing?

And I'm not talking from weakness, folks. I know all about negotiating from weakness and from strength. Hillary Clinton is a weak person. Hillary Clinton is totally scripted. Hillary Clinton is a thief. And Hillary Clinton should be in jail for what she did to our national security.

(APPLAUSE)<sup>402</sup>

Trump evokes ‘candidness’ through his use of informal words like “maniac”, “stupid”, “down the tubes” - and his informal conversational cadence, speaking to his audience by punctuating his introductions and conclusions with “folks” and “think of it”, which is a common feature of Trump’s language.. His provocative quoting of Vladimir Putin, and ridicule of the critiques he received because of it, is a form of deconstructing normative wisdom and precedence: “Wouldn't it be nice if we actually got along with Russia?”, since they know what a genius looks like? As opposed to considering Putin and Russia in the language of antagonism - that is, conforming to

<sup>401</sup> Ibid: 11.

<sup>402</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.): 5.

those norms of US foreign policy wisdom and precedence. Prior to this, he gives a convoluted iteration of possible talks between North and South Korea, insistent on the US' role in protecting South Korea and in mediating for South Korea - but they themselves are incompetent, unwilling to negotiate when given the chance: "How stupid are these people. They've been selling our country down the tubes. They've been spending money." South Korea is here descriptively correlated with victimizing the US by spending its resources, and by being incompetent through its stalemate response of "we will never talk; we will never talk" to North Korea. It is a country that cannot negotiate, a major indicator of failure in Trump's repeated narratives. "These people" are actors in the unaccounted for failure of the US, taking advantage of the US' concern - and Trump is willing to 'speak truth' through such narrations.

Trump will (modal certainty) bring back 'old-school' and the "old days",<sup>403 404</sup> a descriptor premised on oppositional imagery: old-school generals as tougher,<sup>405 406 407 408 409</sup> old-school war spoils as appropriately kept (During his Lynchburg, VA. speech, in reference to US intervention in Iraq: "Take the oil. Keep the oil. You know, in the old days, to the victor belonged [sic] the spoils."<sup>410</sup>), old-school prisoners of war shot<sup>411 412</sup> - as opposed to current societal and political norms that are too 'correct'. "Old-school", the 'old days' - these carry the weight of an imagined era of greatness: one that was tough, relentless, and 'upheld the interests' of the country. Furthermore, these phrasal nouns carry a diagnosis of the present moment, and all that is associated with it, as an aberration. Trump will reverse this process - it is a promise: "you're going to be so happy, so proud", he insists during his Redding, CA. speech,<sup>413</sup> in an assurance of future sentiment.

Indeed, Trump claims representation, and the capacity to represent, all popular, 'authentic', interests. He asks his audience "Am I doing a good job as a messenger?"<sup>414 415 416</sup> and this self-characterization as the mouthpiece of the people relaying their messages is a reliant upon a metaphor of movement, of transference: Trump is a go-between, as opposed to the

---

<sup>403</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.):8.

<sup>404</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>405</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY).

<sup>406</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>407</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Orlando, FL.)

<sup>408</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>409</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>410</sup> Ibid:9.

<sup>411</sup> Trump, "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton".

<sup>412</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>413</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches"(Redding, CA.): 16.

<sup>414</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.): 4.

<sup>415</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

<sup>416</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona".



self-interested career politicians he exemplifies in most of his speeches; this campaign, he insists, is not about him. Indeed, Trump is a “trustworthy” figure, one that, when elected, will be a ‘remedy’ for the country’s ills.

#### 4.1.2.1. Legitimizing ‘speaking truth’, in conflict with inauthentic normative politics: Trump as insider and outsider

The “Political Establishment” in Trump’s speeches is characterized as a monolith, and in this spatial conceit, a candidate is either coming from “inside” or “outside” of it. Trump claims knowledge from both spatial positions: he “knows politicians”, has “dealt with them all my life” (New York, NY. speech,<sup>417</sup> also replicated in Buffalo, NY.<sup>418</sup>: “I was a member of the establishment”) - but also claims to be “not elite”,<sup>419</sup> “never debated before”,<sup>420</sup> and that he had “only been a politician for nine months”.<sup>421</sup> Trump has always held sway and influence among politicians and knows politics. Much of this section’s sub-discourse reiterates Trump’s self-representations as competent in the larger framework of ‘Prognosis’, but it will focus on those discursive techniques illustrating and referencing ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ knowledge and the status associated with possessing such knowledge within a depiction of politics and the larger political landscape as inauthentic.

During his Dallas, TX.<sup>422</sup> speech Trump does explicitly characterize himself as an “insider”. Trump asserts that he knows this “very simple business”<sup>423</sup> of publicity and visibility in media - regardless of whether that publicity is critique or not, which shows to a further degree the acknowledged complexities of candidates’ interactions with media during campaigns;<sup>424</sup> <sup>425</sup> he is here displaying his knowledge of insider tactics of self-representation.

During his Lynchburg, VA. speech, Trump characterizes himself as both insider and outsider: he has “been playing this game for a long time”,<sup>426</sup> the game metaphor signifying the wider realm of competitiveness and the dichotomy of ‘winning’ and ‘losing’ (see above analyses). The elections are akin to a popularity contest here, and Trump has ample experience in these as a celebrity. In this same speech, he also characterizes himself as being new to the formalities of politics - and this is akin to a display of morality, even a status symbol in Trump’s diagnosis of

---

<sup>417</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY): 5.

<sup>418</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>419</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>420</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.):17.

<sup>421</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>422</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.):12.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>424</sup> Patterson, “Pre-Primary News Coverage”.

<sup>425</sup> Patterson, “News coverage of the 2016 presidential primaries”.

<sup>426</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.):14.

rampant inauthenticity: before the election he “never debated before”.<sup>427 428</sup>

Another dimension of this “insider/outsider” schema is Trump’s depiction of insider knowledge regarding business - and his specific experience in infrastructure and real estate development. His severe critiques of national infrastructure, enumerated and described as “third world”,<sup>429 430</sup> are legitimized by virtue of this experience, extrapolated into a presented expertise in “building walls”, “real walls” in each of his speeches. Alongside this and Trump’s general diagnosis of trade inexpertise and countries stealing jobs, Trump references “corporate inversion”,<sup>431 432</sup> and outsourcing as US policy failures (and so politicians’ failures) at maintaining wealth in the country - and the use of this language is also a display of an “insider knowledge” into what is needed to maintain such wealth.

This is further conveyed in other ways. Trump uses the illustrative technique of evoking hypothetical scenarios wherein which he illustrates his knowledge and competence as opposed to other candidates’ lack of capacity/knowledge to ‘deal’ with the situation. The scenarios are projective, but blur the line between claim and fiction as their function is to display “real” qualities of Trump through an unreal scenario. Here is a fragment from a longer scenario, one that is duplicated in many speeches with variations in the exact corporation that is ‘called up’.<sup>433</sup>

434 435 436 437 438 439

“So, Jeb Bush, let's say he's President -- ay, ay, ay -- so let's say Jeb Bush is President. He knows it's no good to have a \$2.5 billion plant built right near our country. How does it help us, right?

So here's what happens. He knows it's no good. He'll have a little pressure. Don't let the plant be built. And he might even say, "Don't let the plant be built." Might even call the head of Ford. "The plant's not going to be built."

<sup>427</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

<sup>428</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Orlando, FL.):

<sup>429</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY)

<sup>430</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”.

<sup>431</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.):14.

<sup>432</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”.

<sup>433</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (New York, NY).

<sup>434</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”.

<sup>435</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>436</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>437</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Orlando, FL.)

<sup>438</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>439</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

And then the next day, he'll be called by special interests that supported him, his lobbyists who push him around like a piece of candy, or his donors who have stock in Ford. And they'll say, "You can't do that. I helped you. You can't hurt them. You just can't do it."

He folds in about two seconds.

So let me say Trump is President. Let me say Trump. So I don't need anybody's money. Actually, people are setting up PACs all over the place. I don't care. If they want to give it to me, I'll take it. OK?

But I don't need money. I don't want money. So I'm doing my own. You'll see that on Thursday or whatever the hell day I file [file his financial disclaimer]. You'll see I did really well. Much better than anyone ever thought. Just the opposite.

So here's the story. So Trump is President. So I get a call from the head of Ford and I'll say, "You got to build in the United States. Sorry." He'll say, "But Mr. President, really -- we don't want --" I'll say, "Here's the story. Number one, congratulations on your new plant in Mexico. And number two, we're going to charge you 35% for every car, truck, and part you send over."

And here's what would happen -- here's what would happen. Now, this isn't like 99% sure. This is 100%. In fact, you know the negotiators -- the killers that I told you about -- these bad people? I wouldn't even bother calling them because this is too easy. I can just do this like, you know, with a couple of phones.

So here's what would happen with Trump. I will get some calls. He will say "Mr. President, this is terrible. Please! Please!"

"Sorry, can't do anything. Sorry, I don't care. I want you to build here. I want jobs in the United States."

Phoenix, AZ. speech.<sup>440</sup>

Trump starts this scenario with an evocation of the future president (the often critiqued Jeb Bush) in a potentially compromised position, and uses direct speech throughout, further

---

<sup>440</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phenix-arizona":3-4.

illustrating his ‘insider knowledge’ of such scenarios: how those involved in business react and how negotiation takes place in speech. “He knows it's no good to have a \$2.5 billion plant built right near our country. How does it help us, right?” - The interest of the nation is here posed: a plant must be built in the country, not ‘near’ it (that is, in Mexico). However, the President’s own interests override the nation’s if Bush happens to be the President - Trump here makes a correlation between PACs, donors, and corruption - which manifests as a fundamental disinterest in the nation. As opposed to Jeb Bush, Trump’s self-characterization is of a negotiator unwilling to compromise in a negotiation that is more like a ruling the process itself being “too easy”. The scenario is also an amalgamated confirmation of Trump’s own financial success and - Trump does not need contributions, is, again, ‘uncorrupted’ - and he repeats this often to his many audiences.

Trump’s arguments exemplified through his reference to his own expertise are nonetheless sympathetic to business as opposed to punitive - success should not be punished, but ‘brought back’ - and it will bring back wealth, premised upon the validity-claims of a neoliberal worldview wherein which wealth ‘trickles down’. Trump indeed uses the temporal schema of value depicting past success and present failure, and a future ‘reversion’ to this past success.

During the primaries, Trump illustrated his insider/outsider knowledge through his many claims to foreign policy foresight,<sup>441 442 443</sup> his education and mindset,<sup>444 445 446</sup> and his knowledge of political interest and business interest - that is, knowledge of what really motivates politicians and businessmen alike.<sup>447 448 449</sup> Furthermore, Trump justifies his capacity to ‘speak truth’ through his outsider status, emphasizing his claims to authenticity and his insight as ‘untainted’: He has “never done a thing like” politics,<sup>450</sup> “never done this stuff before”,<sup>451</sup> has “never debated”,<sup>452 453</sup> “only been a politician for nine months”,<sup>454</sup> and is “not elite”<sup>455</sup> - all of these exclude Trump

---

<sup>441</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>442</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>443</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>444</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>445</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>446</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>447</sup> Ibid.

<sup>448</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”.

<sup>449</sup> Trump, “Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton”.

<sup>450</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>451</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”.

<sup>452</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>453</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

<sup>454</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>455</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane”.

from the realm of experience of those consistently characterized 'corrupt' establishment members.

Indeed in his self-characterization as a businessman and as a 'working-man', Trump claims to hold the tension between the outsider and insider realms. These, he insists, are also his claims to political success as they are legitimizing 'threats' to the victimizing and failed establishment.

#### Conclusion - Prognosis

Trump depicts his candidacy and eventual presidency as the solution to the country's problems, and maintains that he works on behalf of his supporters. His knowledge of all insider and outsider realms, and his personal success, are presented in opposition to the failures of the country, and as yardsticks for national success. This 'selling self' mode is persuasive and dependent upon his frames of diagnosis, and Trump's depiction of self as honest and authentic establishes the foundations for his call to action under the aegis of a unified concern for the country's current state.

### **4.1.3. Frame of Motivation: Trump, campaign and audience as a movement with a unified concern**

#### *Pre-primaries*

These discourses are the logical conclusion of Trump's diagnosis and prognosis. Unity, through the figure of Trump as remedy, will solve the US' problems, as opposed to 'conventional' politics and candidates. As noted in the above analyses, Trump implicates his audience imaginatively, emotionally, and, overall, cognitively in his discursive worldviews, and this implicating is itself a critical persuasive tool: it gives coherent, unified reasons for the audience to be involved.

This 'call to unity', within the context of presidential elections, is usually a call to vote - but Trump represents this 'unity' as a larger motivation. Throughout this campaigning period Trump calls for a reckoning with his messages, his narratives and his worldviews, and how necessary and urgent it is to act immediately in the face of an urgent crisis of US failure. Action amounts to disclaiming the legitimacy of the establishment, the elite, and the media as a means of acting against the victimizing political status quo, concurrently alongside the embrace of Trump's 'authentic truth', and so voting for him.

Trump often illustrates his popularity through reference to his crowds. They are 'in the thousands', with thousands more waiting outside, and all eager to hear his message:<sup>456 457 458 459</sup>

460

"Let me tell you, every place I go, I have 10,000 people, 5,000 people. I just told you, this room was empty on television two hours ago. Now, it is full. If I -- if you had a real 5.2 percent unemployment, this room would be empty, and I would not be drawn 25,000 people to speeches. Believe me. Believe me."

Orlando, FL. speech.<sup>461</sup>

Trump here directly identifies the reason (and provides this narrative to his audience) why people attend his rallies: many are economically victimized, affected by the 'truth' Trump speaks of a failed nation. His enumeration of crowds is taken as direct proof of the severity of the nation's failure (also explicitly iterated in Little Rock, AK.<sup>462</sup>). Trump also speaks to his audience

<sup>456</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>457</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona"

<sup>458</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Dallas, TX.).

<sup>459</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Orlando, FL.)

<sup>460</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>461</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Orlando, FL.):7.

<sup>462</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

in an interpersonal, language of intimation, as if confirming a reality (a reality of severe concern for the country): “let me tell you”, “I just told you”, “Believe me. Believe me”.

“We went to Dallas -- 20,000 people in Dallas. 25,000 people. Mobile, Alabama -- 35,000 people. Here, every time I come to South Carolina, every time I go to North Carolina, every time I go to Iowa, New Hampshire, Virginia, wherever I go -- Florida -- we have crowds that are maxed. The only problem we have is the size of the room -- thousands of people outside trying to get in. Usually I do a double. I go talk to them for a while, which I wouldn't say I exactly love doing after the first one.”

Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech.<sup>463</sup>

In this fragment, Trump cites those rallies with the largest audiences and enumerates a variety of states to illustrate his popularity everywhere - “crowds that are maxed”, him needing to “do a double” - and all the time, “every time I go...”. Trump here is using metaphorical frames of space and time which implicitly illustrate the same severity and ubiquity of the nation's failure and the concern of the nation's population, all over and unceasing. This single narrative of problems parallels a single narrative of solution.

Trump's speaking on behalf of the crowd also implies a knowledge of their unified concern, for instance during his Mobile, AL.<sup>464</sup> speech: “You people are looking for someone who knows what he's doing” - Trump, here, is speaking like a businessman, putting the words of rationality into the mouths of the people. It is a persuasive tactic - the “people” are looking for a leader who is competent, like Trump - and Trump knows this because he is in touch with the ‘authentic truth’ and ‘the people’. By implicating the audience into his speech, with his “you people”, he presents his speech as receptive, designed around the audience. He does this in his Jacksonville, FL.<sup>465</sup> speech as well, by firstly conducting the audience into a chant and including them within the success of the campaign: “my supporters (...) they're your supporters”. This parallel structuring of “my” and “yours” verbally places Trump and the audience on the same level - they support each other, they are all part of the campaign, and unified in this “authentic” representation of the people. This can also be interpreted as an attempt to distance himself from the center of the campaign message, to implicate his audience as the ‘core’ of his message.

<sup>463</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.):13.

<sup>464</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>465</sup> Trump, “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville”.

Trump's characterizations of his crowd and campaign as 'phenomenon' starts from the mid pre-primaries period. In Jacksonville, Fl.,<sup>466</sup> Trump describes a surge, with "the whole world" "talking about it": "it" as Trump's phenomenon and the 'truth' that he has refocused on. In his Columbus, OH.<sup>467</sup> speech Trump maintains that this phenomenon implicates all of America - "we're all on the same side", in opposition to those establishment figures in power. During his Mt.Pleasant, SC.<sup>468</sup> speech, Trump describes his audience and his past audiences in emotive and vivid terms, unusual as Trump, on average outside of any pre-prepared scripted material, uses very little illustrative adjectives: "Tremendous crowds", "unbelievable love" "unbelievable love of country" - the mere presence of the crowd signifies love of country, as Trump becomes the emblem of concern for the country.

During his Lynchburg, VA. speech Trump speaks about his "journey", and a "movement" - all nouns originating from dynamic verbs, signifying in their forms ideas of progression toward a goal - the securing of the nomination, or the success of the country, or something of both in the form of Trump. He uses even more of these aforementioned descriptors to characterize his audience: "We have such amazing people in this country, smart, sharp, energetic",<sup>469</sup> "incredible people in this room".<sup>470</sup> Trump also uses this language during his Jacksonville, FL.<sup>471</sup> speech: he explains his rising poll numbers through speaking on behalf of his audience: "because people want to hear the message", "it's a message and it's a movement". Furthermore, during many of his speeches<sup>472 473 474475</sup> Trump speaks directly to his audience, a sort of performative display of concern through a display of 'breaking through the performance'.

Even during his highly polemical Mt.Pleasant, SC. speech calling for a nationwide "Muslim Ban", Trump still reserves some place for this language of unifying concern.

"You know, the funny thing is I look at Democrats and liberals and conservatives and Republicans -- wouldn't it be good all of us if we can get together and really make our country great again? Is that what we want to do?"<sup>476</sup>

<sup>466</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>467</sup> Trump, "FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus".

<sup>468</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>469</sup> Ibid: 21.

<sup>470</sup> Ibid: 17.

<sup>471</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>472</sup> Time, "Trump's Presidential announcement speech".

<sup>473</sup> Trump, "Donald TRUMP YUUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville".

<sup>474</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona".

<sup>475</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>476</sup> Ibid: 5.



He states this in reaction to a protester intervening during the speech - extrapolated as illustrating Trump's wider narrative of a failed, divided nation. Trump's hypothetical conditional question excludes those politicians and victimizing agents, but is nonetheless calling for unity beyond partisan politics.<sup>477 478</sup> It also illustrates Trump's claim that he speaks truth and that this truth can appeal to all regardless of party to act for "good" and "get together" ; he asks and confirms with the audience "Is that what we want to do?" with "that" standing for unification and action, and although this action is unspecified, it is used as a space for projection. Around this space of projection involving concern, Trump claims that there is a unity and a potential to unify- that the whole nation is implicated in this concern, and that it can be acted upon under Trump.

This language was also used in Columbus, OH.: "We're all sort of on the same side, whether you're conservative or liberal ... we all just wanna see our country great again".<sup>479</sup> The call for inclusivity here is obvious in Trump's illustration of disunity: conservatives and liberals are not usually on the "same side", this spatial metaphor illustrating a political division but nothing more. Trump is not making a value judgment on 'sides', but his intention is 'purer': this 'side' is one that is concerned for the country and it is non-partisan. "Side" here is akin to "all in this together" from the last fragment, a spatial metaphor of necessary unity, in opposition to the other side of 'victimizing agents'. Trump here speaks for everyone, further enforcing his implied 'insider knowledge' of an 'authentic truth' that is resonant with most people, this truth being that this country is no longer great but needs to be. Furthermore, when speaking with his audience he is working with the larger metaphor of dispossession of the failed nation - and illustrates a unity of endeavour by telling them: "so, we've got to take our country back"<sup>480</sup> (also replicated in other speeches<sup>481 482</sup>) - that is, repossess the lost possession as an imperative, this necessarily requiring Trump.

### *Primaries*

These 'unity of concern' discourses are reinforced during the primaries, especially as Trump emerges as the inevitable Republican nominee and Bernie Sanders shows signs of losing the candidacy to Hillary Clinton.

During his speech in Little Rock, AK,<sup>483</sup> and in others,<sup>484 485 486</sup> Trump explicitly calls his

---

<sup>477</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>478</sup> Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination".

<sup>479</sup> Trump, "FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus".

<sup>480</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona": 5.

<sup>481</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>482</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.)

<sup>483</sup> Trump, "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock".

<sup>484</sup> Trump, "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane".

campaign and its supporters a “movement” and reiterates imagery of an expanding unity of concern “all over the country”; this is something Trump has observed, and can further confirm to each and every audience:

“all over the country this is happening folks, all over the country. We will be taking our country back ... that’s what it is, it’s a movement - the people are incredible.”<sup>487</sup>

Trump here uses the imagery of popular support as spatially widespread to illustrate a more ‘authentic politics’ - the people are “all over” and they will take their “country back”. He is insistent on “all over the country”, representing this movement as representative of the country itself and as unifying its expanse. “The people are incredible” uses “the people” to define “the movement”, and as it remains indistinct why the people are incredible, it can be understood as a reference to a legitimacy beyond politics speaking of his experiences across the country. After calling the rally a “lovefest” (defining the event in terms of emotive unity), he again calls his campaigning a “journey ... you know, i’ve never done this stuff before”. Trump reminds his crowd of the reason for their unity: the difference between Trump and other options, “this stuff” as an almost humorous but disdainful means of referencing the electoral process. It is also a means of emphasizing Trump’s success - an outsider, who does not know “this stuff” has nonetheless ‘unified’ the country (in his discursive framework), in opposition to President Obama.

During his Spartanburg, SC. speech, Trump also describes his campaign and audiences as “a movement” and illustrates this “movement”: “No matter where we go we’re filling up stadiums”,<sup>488</sup> “thousands”. By iterating this illustration, Trump is drawing in his audience as part of those “thousands”, a visual reference to a multitude of support; he is persuading them further into an active movement premised on unified concern.

Another technique of displaying unification is Trump’s reference to his speeches’ locality. In Buffalo, NY.<sup>489</sup> Trump uses the city as representative of the US, maintaining this unity of concern through the parallel experiences of those living in one place and the general state of the US, and subsequently the parallel remedies that Trump will bring to both: “Gonna bring Buffalo back, gonna bring USA back”.<sup>490</sup> “Bring back” in both clauses repeats this temporal imagery of Trump

<sup>485</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Spartanburg, SC.): 6.

<sup>486</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Redding, CA.): 2, 16.

<sup>487</sup> Trump, “LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock”. (Own Transcripts)

<sup>488</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Spartanburg, SC.): 6.

<sup>489</sup> Trump, “FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS”.

<sup>490</sup> Ibid (own transcriptions).

as remedy, premised on an implicit shared image of past national glory, paralleling other speeches,<sup>491 492</sup> that will be resurrected.

During his RNC speech, Trump continues to illustrate this unity of concern through inclusive language.<sup>493</sup> He qualifies “we” as a “team”, speaks of “our convention”,<sup>494</sup> and presents his diagnosis of the country’s issues within a framework of “broader appeal” to an already loyal electorate : immigration becomes an issue for minorities and recent migrants, as a factor exacerbating poverty and criminality concerning all - he may be diffusing those representations of him only appealing to a white electorate, and he may be speaking to his audiences’ own concern about this. His movement’s focus, he insists, is on “our own struggling citizens”,<sup>495</sup> “forgotten men and women”.<sup>496</sup> The imagery of abandoned people conveys urgency to his call: “I AM your voice”<sup>497</sup> he repeats (Trump’s claim to represent a unified ‘voice’ functions to dissociate his running from his own personal interests - embodying the absolute representative of the people). He further states, in a projective statement of fact, that “Millions of democrats will join our movement, because we are going to fix the system so it works fairly, and justly, for each and every American”<sup>498</sup> - again, reiterating his non-partisan claim to a unity of concern.

The “Noisy majority”, a republican intertextual reference to Nixon’s “Silent Majority” (a mythologized depiction of voters who were regarded as politically ‘inactive’) is used by Trump to characterize his audience, and to illustrate the amorphous wider american populace that is concerned with his message, during many speeches.<sup>499 500 501 502</sup> Trump defines his supporters, and potential supporters as a new phenomenon - the ‘silent majority’ of the Nixon era is abandoned and is now showing its presence through “noisy” and loud advocacy for Trump. The “Noisy Majority” is a metaphor for all those voters characterized as erased from the attention and language of US establishment politics. It is a term that appears in the mid pre primaries, a period when Trump starts making reference to a “movement”. “Noisy Majority” is usually used in a temporal or processual modal metaphor - it has come “back”, or the “silent” majority has “become” “noisy”. In qualifying them as “noisy” as opposed to “silent”, Trump characterizes his

---

<sup>491</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Redding, CA.)

<sup>492</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Spartanburg, SC.)

<sup>493</sup> Trump, “Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination”.

<sup>494</sup> Ibid: 1, 2.

<sup>495</sup> Ibid: 19.

<sup>496</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>497</sup> Ibid: 10, 27.

<sup>498</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>499</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”

<sup>500</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.)

<sup>501</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.)

<sup>502</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.).

audience and his supporters as concurrently agentive, dynamic, and “fed up” as opposed to those normative unchanging political actors - the ‘minority’.

“You know, it's a term I haven't heard for years but I was thinking about it... It's a term that I haven't heard for years but I really think it applies now more than maybe ever before and that's the term "the silent majority". Have you all heard that?

(...)

But when you see the kind of power that the silent majority has and the silent majority is a problem. They want to go out. They want to lead a good life. They want to work hard. They want to have their family. They don't want to be involved in coming here and waiting on a line for hours and hours and coming in and listening to Trump.

But the silent majority is back, and we're going to take the country back. And we are going to make America great again!”

Phoenix, AZ. <sup>503</sup>

Trump here performs an encounter with the term “silent majority (performing spontaneity) and maintains that it is something his audience “don’t hear”. It is the forgotten, latent truth - the political expression of the ‘common man’ who does not want to be involved in politics, or even engage with Trump. Trump, here, characterizes his message as nonetheless speaking to these ‘impenetrable’ (silent, unknowable) spaces of voters and these voters speaking to Trump; indeed in many references to his audiences in other speeches, they are characterized as actively and enthusiastically engaging in Trump’s politics, as opposed to needing to engage in these politics, which diverges from the characterization of the above fragment. In the next fragment, the “silent majority” has not yet become “noisy”, but it has “come back” - it has repossessed its dynamic and active political quality.

“They mentioned a little while ago ... about the silent majority, it's back. And it's not silent. I think we should call it, maybe we should call it the noisy, the aggressive, the wanting to win, wanting to win majority. That's what it is.”

<sup>503</sup> Bryanbischof. “Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona”: 10.

Dallas, TX.<sup>504</sup>

Again, Trump performs an encounter with the concept as “noisy majority” - and it is no longer describing the ‘common man’ but a majority encompassing a dynamic, “aggressive” and politically driven majority. In doing this, Trump claims representation of this majority - the majority of the country.

“(…) Because you know, we have a noisy majority. They used to call it the quiet majority. People are fed up. They're fed up with incompetence. They're fed up with stupid leaders. They're fed up with stupid people.” (Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech)<sup>505</sup>

Trump here extrapolates critiques of his campaign as critiques of the “noisy majority” - paralleling his campaign’s message and his supporters’ beliefs, and thus their exacerbated antagonization by outside criticism. These supporters are also characterized as the “majority” - Trump claims representation of the majority’s interests here, a majority “fed up with incompetence” and “stupid leaders” and “stupid people” - this majority is thus characterized as discerning, and Trump as the opposite of these leaders: competent and smart.

In his correction of “silent” with “noisy”, Trump performs an ‘endowment of agency’ to the formerly silent, passive majority. Trump assumes the majority are now on “his side”, and that he represents their authentic and repressed concerns that they are noisily expressing, as opposed to those inauthentic concerns that the political establishment minority represents.

### Conclusion - Motivation

This frame concludes Trump’s discursive campaign message. It is an assurance of the unity of his and his audiences’ concern, and an assurance of Trump’s representation of a previously unacknowledged “noisy majority”. Trump represents himself as ‘endowing agency’ upon the audience - speaking a confirming ‘truth’ of not only what the country is but what it needs. This is confirmed by his former framings of self as trustworthy, competent, and as all other options as just continuations in the US’ failure.

<sup>504</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.): 3.

<sup>505</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mt. Pleasant, SC.): 8.

## **4.2. Conclusion**

Trump's discourses are framed in three ways. He uses his modular speeches to diagnose the state of affairs in the country, to provide a prognosis of what is needed for the nation (himself), and then proposes a call to action. The country is victimized, losing, and incompetent because of those enabling its victimization, the Political Establishment and those hiding it, the Media. Moreover, 'the country' and its people (Trump's audience) are passive to the antagonism of this establishment, the media, other countries, and 'others' (criminals, immigrants, terrorists) - essentialized agentive threats.

Trump provides a prognosis through his own self-characterization as remedy and as absolute necessity. He is an emblem conforming to all of his own standards of success. In his argumentative logic, his life is an example for the country, and he will thus bring back wealth and jobs, and will securitize all of the country's diagnosed vulnerabilities (criminality, the political establishments' corruption, trade deals). He is supported by many figures - Palin, Limbaugh, the Tea Party - who are legitimizing advocates for his diagnosis and prognosis. Another way in which he establishes his legitimacy is by reference to his 'insider' and 'outsider' statuses - he has knowledge from both sides of the monolithic structure that is the 'establishment'.

Trump then uses a motivational framing. His monistic solution to the country's problems works on the basis of a mobilized argumentative premise of "Trump as remedy". He implicates his audience in this action, as they know a repressed and denied truth that will inevitably be targeted, even by other conservative republicans. Their 'movement' he maintains is beyond electoral politics, and is concerned with the good of the country - the moral and the social good, referencing an unspecified mythological 'past'. Trump speaks on behalf of his audiences, expressing their 'authentic' concern for the country which converges with his candidacy. Trump insists on his own person in these frameworks, against a background of failure and threat (very often verging on the fictional through amalgamation and undetailed factual exemplification) calling for change - indeed, all of these framings are complementary and interdependent, as they are spread in unorganized fashion in speeches and act as premises for each argument to build upon. The audience is aware of and receptive toward Trump's worldview of competitiveness - hence, his framing of self as an emblem of success and the absolute necessity, concluding from his arguments, of voting for him. These are the logical answers to the problems evoked by his arguments and his worldview.

Furthermore, the overarching speech structures, diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation frames, are similar to the framing tactics of a *social movement* and collective action communication - and from the middle of the pre-primaries, Trump starts using "movement" to depict him and his audience as more than a campaign.

#### 4.2.1. Notable discursive techniques

Trump uses many techniques to structure his modules. Trump's use of oppositional structures is premised upon the function of comparison that is based on dichotomization ("I am not like them"), which is in itself premised on the functional quality of diagnosis and prognosis. Furthermore, Trump's performative 'un-preparedness' and use of different module organization from speech to speech, and his staccato rhythm and jumping from subject to subject are techniques of creating correlation, amalgamation and relationality between themes or illustrations that may already share relationality for the audience (with their conservative, republican culture) but are also built up throughout the analyzed corpus (for instance, the amalgamation of illegal immigration with criminality). This correlation is akin to *conspiracy theorization* as it implies invisible narratives - that compliment Trump's claims to speaking an 'unspoken truth'.

There is an elasticity of meaning and structure in Trump's speeches - his arguments are all-encompassing and complement each other in an implied coherence: All evils converge and all that is good also converges. Trump's self-characterization in speech relays these structures of opposition together, as he represents himself as an emblem of good confronting these converging evils. His legitimizing tactics, and his use of these movement frames, are premised on his *confidence* and his claims to reflect and empathize with the audience - that is, on this good, this 'authenticity'.

Indeed, Trump's sentences' modality are almost always 'certain'. This is an unstable certainty however, as lack of doubt merges on the ridiculous. He also uses hypothetical scenarios of future situations to illustrate his expert knowledge and his expert ways of speaking in potentially trying times (see Annexe III). This illustrates his legitimacy without making direct reference to reality, nor any explicit reference to past experience; these hypothetical scenarios blur the line between reality and falsehood. Alongside this Trump uses many imprecise characterizations that may act as spaces for projection and that conform to the audiences' polyvalent understandings (although this is a common feature of electoral language). The most common 'space' is the 'enemy other' that is also frequently amalgamated.

Trump's language references an ideology of economic neoliberalism. Not only is his worldview premised upon extreme competition and ruthlessness, but all actors act in their rational interest - agentive countries take resources from the US and politicians are politically correct as an insincere career tactic. Trump's prognosis is also based in self-interest, but not financial self-interest he assures his audience - but rather because he wants to display his success,

represent the US, and solve problems that can easily be solved. This ideology is further complemented by conceits of temporality - the past, the present and the future as either spaces of overarching competence, incompetence, or potential competence/incompetence. The country's past was 'successful' and 'agentive', a time when the country 'stood up for itself'. It is the opposite of the diagnosis of the present as 'failed' and 'passive'. Trump calls for a future restoration of this past success, and illustrates himself as the vehicle for achieving this - time itself is not an obstacle for Trump's represented ability to "solve" and "change", in this simplifying worldview. Trump also frequently uses single-causal explanations in his diagnoses. They are formulations that are easily replicable and can be complemented by more elaborate and striking examples. They also allow for Trump to claim the status of 'solution'.

There are many contextual factors that may draw light on Trump's use of these coherent, essentialist and controversial discourses. This can be understood in the context of the extreme competitiveness of the US presidential campaigns, and the crucial importance of media coverage for candidates to gain an upper-hand. As Patterson writes, the republican pre-primaries and primaries received much more media coverage than the democratic ones, with republican in-fighting spurred by Donald Trump's celebrity status, his many antics, and 'spectacular' and controversial policy positions.<sup>506 507</sup> However, Trump was, at the beginning of the pre-primaries, lower in the national popularity polls than many other challengers but nonetheless received more media attention. Journalists seeking out the "unusual" story,<sup>508</sup> the authors continue, launched what was "arguably the first bona fide media-created presidential nominee"<sup>509</sup> that "fit that [journalistic need] as no other candidate in recent memory".<sup>510</sup> The authors call the substance of Trump's attention-seeking tactics a "politics of outrage", but maintain that in the framing of this period in the "race-horse" analogy of which candidate is topping the polls, the media inadvertently gave Trump more positive coverage than anything else - "roughly two to one favorable".<sup>511</sup> For the media, Trump's outsider status "gaining ground" was the biggest story to cover, and one that garnered attention among the electorate - alongside his more controversial statements. In this sense Trump won the game of media depictions through the use of contentious language and the media's own fascinations with him, even if some of these depicted Trump as a political extremist.

---

<sup>506</sup> Patterson "Pre-Primary News Coverage".

<sup>507</sup> Patterson "News coverage of the 2016 presidential primaries".

<sup>508</sup> Patterson "Pre-Primary News Coverage". 5.

<sup>509</sup> Ibid. 5.

<sup>510</sup> Ibid. 5.

<sup>511</sup> Patterson "Pre-Primary News Coverage". 7.



## Chapter 5. Discussion

*How do Trump's discourses and their frames compare to "transgressive discourses"?*

Transgressive discourses are those discourses that are prevalent and identifiable within alt-right narratives and spaces. As mentioned in 2.4.1, these discourses are labelled as transgressive in line with Nagle's argument that they are intentionally countercultural, and characterize their 'anti-establishment' conservative worldviews as transgressive in a socially and politically 'liberal world'. These discourses are concerned with an almost total critique of establishment politics, mainstream media, and liberal social mores. They are critical of what they call 'political correctness', racial identification, and projections of a necessary historical progression toward cultural, civilizational, and/or racial decline.

Trump's language does parallel these DOTs (Discourses of Transgression) in several respects. Firstly, Trump makes ample reference to a Political Correctness 'culture' in his depictions of the Political Establishment. This is their defining quality and their defining trait of incompetence, ignorance, and active rejection of truth. Political correctness, as a quality and as a noun, is also used throughout Trump's speeches. It is also exemplified indirectly when Trump critiques politicians' policies and actions.

Trump's reference to the US' historical progress, in terms of growth or decline is also a feature shared with alt-right historical narratives of necessary progression or decline. The 'necessary direction' of a country is a narrative of necessity, essentializing the 'state' of the nation as a living entity, without regard for internal cultural or social discontinuity from this narrative. However, the extent to which this is extremist politically is questionable.

From this premise, however, Trump's slogans maintain the possibility of resurrecting an idealized past society, and associated morality and culture. The past is the realm of success that needs to be replicated. This is Trump's diagnostic frame from which he critiques current trade deals and criminality, and it shares with DOTs an unspecified reverence for an idealized past with implications of not only a former moral superiority but some kind of cultural or societal purity - which evokes DOT narratives of race and culture. The past is the 'legitimate society' for both Trump and the alt-right. Iterations and illustrations of the past in Trump's speeches evoke capacity, competence, success; the US has diverged from this necessary course, and in future needs to emulate this past. This narrative of 'divergence' is also part of alt-right language.

Indeed, the US, for Trump, is failing economically (because of free trade), culturally (because of liberalization and immigration), and politically (because of the political establishment which is the enabler of all victimization). This constant characterization of the US as drastically failing parallels alt-right diagnoses of a "failing civilization", premised on the belief

that culture is the defining feature of a nation. Trump's characterization is ubiquitous and severe; he calls americans 'dispossessed' of their country when he tells his audience "we've got to take our country back".

Trump's narrative of necessary victory to save the country also runs parallel to alt-right narratives of the necessity of victory to save 'western civilization'. These are frequently expressed in conceits of war or battle: victory to 'save' the nation or civilization is necessarily antagonistic and violent, requiring tactics of war (Trump's controversial statements, for instance or his use of the conceit of battle and war) against victimizing agents and invasive others. However, as these are common metaphors within the competitive scheme of the US Presidential Elections they are not necessarily related.

Trump makes reference in his speeches to 'culture wars' - the summation of anti-establishment (i.e. not only alt-right ones) narratives of historical necessity - through the extrapolation of controversies as general diagnoses of the state of the country. "Merry Christmas" being replaced with "Happy Holidays", generals on TV as opposed to taking action, Obama "dividing the country" as a figure of diversity by his representation of racial difference - Trump relies on an implicit image of a unified and culturally coherent past in opposition to an imperfect present. Political correctness, as used by politicians and media, is, again, an aberration and is the origin of the country's moral and societal decline.

Trump's depiction of 'others' parallels transgressive discursive depictions of threat in the form of (essentialist and racialized) categories of people. Illegal, as well as Muslim, immigrants, terrorists, and criminals are often amalgamated and encompassed in the unspecified category of 'they'. 'They' are characterized as threatening the US physically and 'culturally' - these categories are national security threats, as '*potential dangers*' that are extrapolated, in the wake of each terrorist attack, as '*certain dangers*' (this narrative exacerbated by Trump's use of dubious sources). These include: 'Radical islamists', Mexico as a country and as a source of immigrants, and refugees. 'Refugees' are represented as a frequently amalgamated threat, associated with the Middle East and potential criminality - the figure of the refugee emerging in Trump's speeches after the Paris Attacks. Europe is depicted as "under siege", "absolutely swamped and destroyed" - the refugee crisis is furthermore represented on several occasions as a potential "sinister plot" and a "great trojan horse", Trump conspiratorially critiquing the validity of dispossession and movement in times of war. The all-encompassing summation of these depictions can be understood as stating that 'outside burdens' upon the US are themselves national security threats - and this summation also implies that all agents of these amalgamated categories are criminal. This narrative, compared to alt-right ones, is not as explicit in Trump's discourses but are still strongly repeated and insisted upon.

These depictions had been at the core of many commentators' critiques of his language. Trump used these critiques in his arguments as a tactic of legitimization within modules depicting 'persecuted truth' and 'authenticity' - and these are premised upon oppositionality: the Media is continuously biased against this truth and complicit with those in power. Indeed, this representation of an 'ignoring of truth' is also an active rejection of it, and so an active victimization of those who speak it (Trump and his supporters). Transgressive discourses claim expression of repressed 'truths', rejected from normative mainstream history, language, and politics; indeed, Trump's language thoroughly parallels alt-right depictions of a rejected "truth" of revised history and racial essentialism. Trump and alt-right discourses converge in this qualitative definition of worldviews - that is, that what they say is a repressed truth. These are both conspiratorial as they claim there is a larger narrative to this repression. The 'elite' are rejected by both Trump and transgressive discourses as parties to this repression, and the capacity and necessity of unifying around repressed 'Truth' are represented as crucial for both.

Trump's discourses and the discourses of transgression both share a fundamental ontology of inequality: the world is unequal and inevitably competitive with winners and losers. It is not a 'PC' world. Furthermore, both Trump and the 'alt-right' claim the absolute legitimacy of this worldview, as well as the need to manifest policy and politics conforming to this worldview in US politics to maintain the very survival of the country.

However, Trump's discourses and these narratives act primarily as a backdrop to his depiction of himself as the most legitimate candidate. He claims representation of all Americans, maintaining that he expresses a 'national concern' as opposed to an 'identitarian', explicitly racialized one. Trump diverges from TODs in his call for unity, non-partisan and all-encompassing, and claims that the US' failure is a national and not an identitarian concern.

This national concern nonetheless encompasses a rejection of 'others' who are not 'part of the nation' and who are implicitly racialized through amalgamated representations. These representations shift, from concern with the Mexican immigrant (and Mexico itself) in his early speeches to concern with the refugee/terrorist from Mt. Pleasant, SC. onwards. These representations, framed as security threats, are part and parcel of a larger narrative of the nations' failure. However, these discourses are functional in that they bolster Trump's heavy focus on himself as 'solution' to these 'problems', and activate his image of oppositionality to those in 'enabling' 'political establishment' actors. Thus, Trump melds elements of resonant discourses of transgression, without explicitly extremist political language, within the frameworks of his speeches to better emphasize his own legitimacy and his own representation

of himself as 'speaking truth' and being a 'solution' for the US' failure. These frameworks are conspiratorial, and focus on Trump as absolute representative of his audiences' (extrapolated as the 'american people's') concerns, this truth, and as an absolute, unprecedented remedy for the country.

Trump is himself the core of the "Trumpist" ideology, and this is largely inconsistent with the ideological and purely identitarian language of the alt-right which emphasizes the supremacy of essentialist racial characteristics. Although Trump exploits this kind of language in implicit ways, I maintain that he speaks to already existing amalgamated discriminatory associations,<sup>512</sup> rather than using new narratives or ideologies to characterize 'crisis'. Trump persuades his audience (an audience receptive to this kind of anti-establishment discourse) through muddled logic and associated imagery, giving way to facile explanations and proposals for easy solutions. Most importantly, this emphasizes himself as someone who can 'resolve' these explained problems - he sells himself as opposed to selling an 'ideological revolution' - and this is arguably more dangerous for its implicit and interpellatory influence upon the audience, with little more ideology than the ones they are already familiar with, than an explicit white supremacist one.

---

<sup>512</sup> Andrew Dugan and Frank Newport, "How Policies discussed in the GOP debate fare with the public", *Gallup News*, 3 November 2015, <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/186464/policies-discussed-gop-debate-fare-public.aspx>.

## Chapter 6. Concluding Statements

Trump, contrary to many depictions, was not an explicitly alt-right candidate, although he shared discursive features with the alt-right in his framing of threat in the form of essentialized ‘others’, the US’ failure, and in his worldview of competitiveness, essentializing neoliberal qualities of success and failure and using this to critique the establishment political order. They both share this ontology of necessary competition and the inequality of individuals. They also share a discursive worldview of an ‘authentic and repressed truth’ - and share the expressive premise that this ‘authentic message’ needs to be spread.

Trump, like other candidates, was using discourse to persuade, to act, and to unify around a goal - overall, to build momentum for a vote as opposed to building momentum for the ideological goals of “transgressive discourses”. At the core of the country’s problems, Trump maintained, was the elite political class, which is itself a common feature of conservative discourse as well as the electoral discourse of most other candidates representing an election’s ‘challenger party’ (although he did use this discourse extensively)<sup>513</sup> - this ‘political class’ was the inverse of Trump’s legitimized self-image of success. Trump did use distasteful and discriminatory imagery and narratives, as in much of his other language outside of the rally speech format - but I contend these narratives were not his message but backed *himself* up as his core message. Trump mobilized existing correlated, racialized imagery of essentialized identities and criminality, as well as fear of a “dysfunctional government”,<sup>514</sup> to emphasize his own self-image as a hero that needs a battle - if this battle had not already made sense to the electorate, then he would not have received the amount of support he did. In his use of an ambiguously extremist and imprecisely conspiratorial language as “backing up” the legitimacy of this image, Trump appealed to certain sentiments that no doubt held resonance for his audience - fear of disenfranchisement, fear of criminal (and racialized) ‘otherness’ from anywhere and everywhere, and anger toward a government that is frequently represented as complicit in the intentional targeting of this fearful audience. This is often language that is at once familiar but unfounded - and blurs the lines of future hypothetical scenarios and possible future reality; these were nonetheless presented as factually exemplifying statements of reality - ‘what the problem is’ and ‘what the solution is’.

Trump went beyond the alt-right and interpellated *normalized* sentiments of “othering”, already legitimized single-causality narratives of problem and solution, and essentialized

---

<sup>513</sup> Nelson Polsby, et al. *Presidential elections*.

<sup>514</sup> Andrew Dugan and Frank Newport, “How Policies discussed in the GOP debate fare with the public”.

neoliberal traits of character (as ‘successful’ or as a ‘failure’), similar to Lamont et al.’s findings.<sup>515</sup> Contrary to early depictions of Trump as a medium for extremists, Trump, I contend alongside Serwer,<sup>516</sup> used plausibly deniable language, implication, correlation and conspiratorial, imprecise reasoning as spaces for the projection of already existing racist and discriminatory beliefs, activating his audiences’ belief in what he maintained was ‘authentic’ and valid concern, and from here proposing himself as the ‘solution’ (the ‘win’).

Although it was not an ‘alt-right’, extremist ideology, Trump’s message was ideological as it legitimized itself through claims to an imprecise ‘authenticity’. Indeed, Trump expressed this in conventional and accessible language - speaking in narratives of success and failure, providing solutions to answers, overall conforming to his own call for ‘authenticity’. Trump spoke in a language of anti-establishment neoliberalism to bolster his own figure, and justified his candidacy on this basis regardless of his political inexperience. This language evidently resonated with and was understood by many in many extreme ways; his textual techniques give leeway to ambiguity, imprecision, and a melding of statements on reality and not-quite-reality. This potential extremism was in itself plausibly deniable in his discourses, but may not have been in his audiences’ understandings of his language. This, I maintain, is the defining feature of ‘Trumpism’ and unlike many commentators’ characterizations of Trump’s language, I believe he was not ideologically motivated so much as motivated to ‘win’ these competitive campaigns through appealing to emergent polarized political and cultural sentiment. Trump’s use of the premise of the country’s failure at the hands of politicians and his reactive heroism was tactical in 2015/2016 as these were highly resonate message for many americans.

The media’s depiction of Trump as using alt-right messages fails to reckon with his approach toward his audiences - his language is not the sole product of a decentralized, extremist ‘fringe’ politics, but is a (strategic) product of the competitive conditions of contemporary presidential campaigns and of historic mainstream trends in party sorting and polarization among the US electorate; Trump was first and foremost strategic in his use of language. By critiquing this language in blanket terms (“fascist” “racist”) without precision and without refuting the bases of his arguments and the falsehoods often used to justify them, many journalists committed the error of confirming Trump’s own arguments: that the media was out to get him, and was not representing the interests of his electorate and the ‘truth’ of his message. I believe that this is the advantage of a critical discourse analysis framework in investigating political language: it

---

<sup>515</sup> Michèle Lamont, et al., "Trump's electoral speeches".

<sup>516</sup> Adam Serwer, "The Nationalist's Delusion". *The Atlantic*, 20 Nov. 2017.

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/11/the-nationalists-delusion/546356>.

provides an understanding of the ideological *presumptions* of language to better investigate what is being appealed to and thus to better refute this language.

There is unpacking to do for researchers and journalists, and ethical considerations faced by all investigators in a time when buzzwords and search-engine sources inform opinion more than debate, careful reasoning, and careful consideration of sources - and when these buzzwords, these 'plausibly deny-ables' may very well inform policy affecting real lives.

More refined research on Trump's use of plausibly deniable discourse and his interpellation of normalized discrimination, as well as research into his language's technical features and the significance of these during his presidency, is highly recommended. Furthermore, there is a crucial lack of anthropological and discursive analytical work on the prevalence of neoliberal language, and its effects on cultural and political standards of personal value and status, in US society. Theoretical work into framing practices of presidential campaigns would also be informative in the domain of election communications, especially considering the proximity of collective action movement structures to the structures and features of electoral campaigns.<sup>517</sup> Finally, the use of a larger text corpus and a regard for the contextuality and preparedness of transcripts is recommended for future research and analysis into Trump's use of language.

---

<sup>517</sup> This has been interestingly assessed in Doug McAdam, and Sidney Tarrow. "Ballots and barricades: On the reciprocal relationship between elections and social movements." *Perspectives on Politics*, 8.no.2 (2010): 529-542.

## Bibliography

270 to Win. "2016 Presidential Elections." *270 to Win*. accessed March 10, 2018.

[https://www.270towin.com/2016\\_Election/](https://www.270towin.com/2016_Election/).

Abrajano, Marisa, and Zoltan L. Hajnal. *White backlash: immigration, race, and American politics*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

Abramowitz, Alan I., and Kyle L. Saunders. "Is polarization a myth?" *The Journal of Politics* 70.no.2 (2008): 542-555.

Abramowitz, Alan I., and Steven Webster. "The Rise of Negative Partisanship and the Nationalization of U.S. Elections in the 21st Century." *Electoral Studies* 11, no.1 (2016): <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2015.11.001>.

Antaki, Charles, Michael Billig, Derek Edwards, and Jonathan Potter. "Discourse Analysis Means Doing Analysis: A Critique of Six Analytic Shortcomings." *Analysis*. (2003): <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenead/v1n3.64>.

Armistead, Josephine. "The Silicon Ideology." Archive.org. 18 (2016).

Astor, Maggie, Christian Caron, and Daniel Victor. "A Guide to the Charlottesville Aftermath". *The New York Times*. 14 Aug. 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/13/us/charlottesville-virginia-overview.html>.

Barr, Robert R. "Populists, outsiders and anti-establishment politics." *Party Politics*. 15.1 (2009): 29-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068808097890>.

Beckerman, Lars. "Burns' Prohibition yet another triumph of american storytelling." Lars Beckermann. 4 October 2011, <https://larsbeckerman.wordpress.com/2011/10/04/burns-prohibition-yet-another-triumph-of-american-storytelling/>.

Bergen, Peter. "Is Donald Trump a Fascist?" *CNN*. 2015. <https://edition.cnn.com/2015/12/09/opinions/bergen-is-trump-fascist/index.html>.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. "Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment." *Annual review of sociology*. 26.no.1 (2000): 611-639.



- Birchall, Clare. "Conspiracy theories and academic discourses: The necessary possibility of popular (over) interpretation." *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*. 15.no.1 (2001): 67-76.
- Blee, Kathleen, and Kimberly Creasap. "Conservative and Right-Wing Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 36 (2010): 269–86.
- Boykoff, Jules, and Eulalie Laschever. "The tea party movement, framing, and the US media." *Social Movement Studies* 10.4 (2011): 341-366, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2011.614104>.
- Bureau of International Information Programmes, "USA in Brief: Elections". U.S. Department of State, Last accessed 2 June 2018, [https://static.america.gov/uploads/sites/8/2016/05/Elections-USA\\_In-Brief-Series\\_English\\_Lo-Res-1.pdf](https://static.america.gov/uploads/sites/8/2016/05/Elections-USA_In-Brief-Series_English_Lo-Res-1.pdf).
- Burman, Erica. "Discourse analysis means analysing discourse: Some comments on Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter 'Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings'" *Discourse analysis online*. 1 no.2 (2004).
- Carter, Dan T. "The Rise of Conservatism Since World War II." *OAH Magazine of History*. 17.2 (2003): 11-16.
- Carroll, Lauren and Louis Jacobssen. "Trump cites shaky survey in call to ban Muslims from entering the US". *Politifact*. 9 December 2015. <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2015/dec/09/donald-trump/trump-cites-shaky-survey-call-ban-muslims-entering/>.
- Chilton, Paul. *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. (New York & London: Routledge, 2004): 1-226.
- Chilton, Paul. "Toward a Neuro-Cognitive Model of Socio-Political Discourse, and an Application to the Populist Discourse of Donald Trump." *Langage et Société*. 2, (2017): 237–49.
- Daniels, Jessie. "The Algorithmic Rise of the "Alt-Right"" *Contexts*. 17 no.1 (2018): 60-65.
- Degani, Marta. "Endangered intellect: a case study of Clinton vs Trump campaign discourse." *Rivista semestrale ISSN. 2281*, (2017): 4582.

- Demmers, Jolle. *Theories of violent conflict: An introduction*. (New York & London: Routledge, 2016).
- Domonoske, Camilla. & Gonzales, Richard. "Immigrant Children separated from parents at the border: this is what we know". *NPR*. 19 June 2018.  
<https://www.npr.org/2018/06/19/621065383/what-we-know-family-separation-and-zero-tolerance-at-the-border?t=1530445674564>.
- Dugan, Andrew & Frank Newport, "How Policies discussed in the GOP debate fare with the public". *Gallup News*. 3 November 2015.  
<https://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/186464/policies-discussed-gop-debate-fare-public.aspx>.
- Edsall, Thomas. B. "What Donald Trump understands about Republicans". *The New York Times*. 2 Sep. 2015.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/02/opinion/what-donald-trump-understands-about-republicans.html>.
- Enli, Gunn. "Twitter as arena for the authentic outsider: exploring the social media campaigns of Trump and Clinton in the 2016 US presidential election." *European Journal of Communication*. 32 no.1 (2017): 50-61.
- Fain, T. & Briefing. "Here's a complete timeline of Donald J. Trump's run for the US presidency". *Elections: Gatehouse Media*. N.d. 2016  
<http://elections.gatehousemedia.com/zz/elections/20161107/heres-complete-timeline-of-donald-j-trumps-run-for-us-presidency/1>.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and power*. (London & New York: Longman, 1989).
- Fairclough, Norman. *New Labour, new language?* (Psychology Press, 2000).
- Fairclough, Norman. "Political correctness': The politics of culture and language." *Discourse & Society*. 14 no.1 (2003): 17-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926503014001927>.
- Fairclough, Isabela, and Fairclough, Norman. *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. (New York & London: Routledge, 2013).  
<https://www-taylorfrancis-com.proxy.library.uu.nl/books/9781136490279>.

- Fligstein, Neil, and Doug McAdam. *A theory of fields*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Fuller, Jaime. "The Timeline you need to understand the Bowe Bergdahl story". *The Washington Post*. 5 June 2014.  
[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2014/06/05/the-timeline-you-need-to-understand-the-bowe-bergdahl-story/?utm\\_term=.eb7d7e43aa10](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2014/06/05/the-timeline-you-need-to-understand-the-bowe-bergdahl-story/?utm_term=.eb7d7e43aa10).
- Gillis, William. "Say No to the Liberal Media: Conservatives and Criticism of the News Media in the 1970s." *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. (2014): 1-284.
- Goldstein, Donna M., and Kira Hall. "Postelection surrealism and nostalgic racism in the hands of Donald Trump." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. 7 no.1 (2017): 397-406.
- Gourarie, Chava. "How the 'alt-right' checkmated the media". *Columbia Journalism Review*. 30 Aug. 2016. [https://www.cjr.org/analysis/alt\\_right\\_media\\_clinton\\_trump.php](https://www.cjr.org/analysis/alt_right_media_clinton_trump.php).
- Grey, Rosie. "How 2015 fueled the rise of the freewheeling, white nationalist 'alt-movement'". *Buzzfeed News*. 28 Dec. 2015.  
[https://www.buzzfeed.com/rosiegray/how-2015-fueled-the-rise-of-the-freewheeling-white-nationali?utm\\_term=.cm32gQmpo#.tne50KlBM](https://www.buzzfeed.com/rosiegray/how-2015-fueled-the-rise-of-the-freewheeling-white-nationali?utm_term=.cm32gQmpo#.tne50KlBM).
- Greenberg, David. "The idea of "the liberal media" and its roots in the civil rights movement." *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture*. 1 no. 2 (2008): 167-186.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17541320802457111>.
- Gross, Neil, Thomas Medvetz, and Rupert Russell. "The contemporary American conservative movement." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 37 (2011): 325-354.
- Grossmann, Matt, and David A. Hopkins. *Asymmetric politics: Ideological Republicans and group interest Democrats*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).  
<http://www.matthewg.org/AsymmetricPolitics-ProposalF.doc>.
- Guttman, Robert. "2016 Primary Timeline". *Transatlantic Magazine*. 4 Oct. 2016 .  
<http://transatlantic-magazine.com/2016-primary-timeline/>.
- Hall, Kira, Donna M. Goldstein, and Matthew Bruce Ingram. "The hands of Donald Trump: Entertainment, gesture, spectacle." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. 6 no.2 (2016): 71-100.  
<https://doi.org/10.14318/hau6.2.009>.

Hart, Roderick P. "Why do they talk that way? A research agenda for the presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 32 no.4 (2002): 693-709.

Hauslohner, Abigail. "Southern Poverty Law Centre says American hate groups are on the rise". *The Washington Post*. 15 Feb. 2017.  
[https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/southern-poverty-law-center-says-american-hate-groups-are-on-the-rise/2017/02/15/7e9cab02-f2d9-11e6-a9b0-ecee7ce475fc\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.7d0aOfdb2844](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/southern-poverty-law-center-says-american-hate-groups-are-on-the-rise/2017/02/15/7e9cab02-f2d9-11e6-a9b0-ecee7ce475fc_story.html?utm_term=.7d0aOfdb2844).

Heikkilä, Niko. "Online antagonism of the alt-right in the 2016 election." *European journal of American studies*. 12 (2017):12-2. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.12140>.

Hine, Gabriel Emile, Jeremiah Onalapo, Emiliano De Cristofaro, Nicolas Kourtellis, Ilias Leontiadis, Riginos Samaras, Gianluca Stringhini, and Jeremy Blackburn. "Kek, cucks, and god emperor trump: A measurement study of 4chan's politically incorrect forum and its effects on the web." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03452*. (2016): 1-15. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1610.03452>.

Horwitz, Robert B. *America's right: Anti-establishment conservatism from Goldwater to the Tea Party*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2013).  
[http://www-communication.ucsd.edu/files/Horwitz\\_1st\\_proofs-WEB.pdf](http://www-communication.ucsd.edu/files/Horwitz_1st_proofs-WEB.pdf).

Hunter, James Davison. *Before the shooting begins: Searching for democracy in America's culture war*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994).

Joyce, A.P. "Navigating Trump's Twitter: @realDonaldTrump and the alt-right meme factory". *Mic*. 3 July 2017.  
<https://mic.com/articles/181356/navigating-trumps-twitter-realdonaldtrump-and-the-alt-right-meme-factory#.waUCjOIeF>

Kimble, Lindsay. "How Donald Trump Went from Political Joke to President-Elect". *People Magazine online*, 8 Nov. 2016.  
<http://people.com/politics/donald-trump-timeline-to-presidential-nomination/>.

Kutner, Max. "A Brief History of the word 'thug'". *Newsweek*, 29 April 2015.  
<http://www.newsweek.com/brief-history-word-thug-326595>.

Lamont, Michèle, Bo Yun Park, and Elena Ayala-Hurtado. "Trump's electoral speeches and his appeal to

the American white working class." *The British journal of sociology*. 68 (2017): 153-180.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12315>.

Layman, Geoffrey C., and John C. Green. "Wars and rumours of wars: The contexts of cultural conflict in American political behaviour." *British Journal of Political Science*. 36 no.1 (2006): 61-89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123406000044>.

Lee, Oliver. "Understanding Trump's troll army". *Vice Motherboard*, 13 Mar. 2016.  
[https://motherboard.vice.com/en\\_us/article/bmvnq4/understanding-trumps-troll-army](https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/bmvnq4/understanding-trumps-troll-army).

Lehman, Susan. "Editorial Page Editor Andrew Rosenthal on Trump Campaign". *The New York Times*. 3 Sep. 2015.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/03/insider/times-editorial-page-editor-andrew-roenthal-on-trump-campaign.html>.

Lieberman M. "Trump's eloquence". *Language Log*. last accessed 02 July 2018  
<http://languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=2049>.

Liptak, Adam. & Shear, Michael. D. "Supreme Court Upholds Trump's Travel Ban". *The New York Times*. 26 June 2018.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/26/us/politics/supreme-court-trump-travel-ban.html>.

Lyons, Matthew N. "Ctrl-Alt-Delete: The Origins and Ideology of the Alternative Right." Somerville, MA: Political Research Associates, 2017.

Maskovsky, Jeff. "Toward the anthropology of white nationalist postracialism: Comments inspired by Hall, Goldstein, and Ingram's "The hands of Donald Trump"" *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7 no.1 (2017): 433-440. <https://doi.org/10.14318/hau7.1.030>.

Mason, Lilliana. "I disrespectfully agree": The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization." *American Journal of Political Science*. 59 no.1 (2015): 128-145.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12089>.

McAdam, Doug, and Sidney Tarrow. "Ballots and barricades: On the reciprocal relationship between elections and social movements." *Perspectives on Politics*. 8. no.2 (2010): 529-542.

McBain, Sophie. "The alt-right, and how the paranoia of white identity politics fuelled Trump's rise".

*New Statesman*. 27 Nov. 2017.

<https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/books/2017/11/alt-right-and-how-paranoia-white-identity-politics-fuelled-trump-s-rise>.

Michael, George. "The rise of the alt-right and the politics of polarization in America." *Skeptic (Altadena, CA)*. 22.no.2 (2017): 9-18.

Miller, Gary, and Norman Schofield. "The transformation of the republican and democratic party coalitions in the US." *Perspectives on Politics*. 6.3 (2008): 433-450.

Minkowitz, Donna. "Hiding in plain sight: An American Renaissance of White Nationalism". *The Public Eye*. 26 October 2017.

<https://www.politicalresearch.org/2017/10/26/hiding-in-plain-sight-an-american-renaissance-of-white-nationalism/>.

Moser, Bob. "Donald Trump, Neo-Nazi recruiter-in-chief". *The New Republic*. 14 Aug. 2017.

<https://newrepublic.com/article/144312/donald-trump-neo-nazi-recruiter-in-chief>.

Mulloy, Darren. *American extremism: History, politics and the militia movement*. (Routledge, 2004).

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203352069>.

Nagle, Angela. *Kill all normies: Online culture wars from 4chan and Tumblr to Trump and the alt-right*. (Hants: John Hunt Publishing, 2017).

Neiwert, David. "How Trump mainstreamed the "alt-right"". *Crosscut*. 16 Oct. 2017.

<https://crosscut.com/2017/10/trump-mainstreamed-alt-right-david-neiwert>.

Neiwert, David. *Alt-America: The Rise of the Radical Right in the Age of Trump*. (London: Verso Books, 2017).

New York Times, The. "Who Is Running For President?". *The New York Times*. 26 July 2016.

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/2016-presidential-candidates.html>.

O'Hara, Kieron, and David Stevens. "Echo chambers and online radicalism: Assessing the Internet's complicity in violent extremism." *Policy & Internet* 7 no.4 (2015): 401-422.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.88>.

Olson, Daniel VA. "Dimensions of cultural tension among the American public" in *Cultural wars in*

*American politics: Critical reviews of a popular myth* edited by Rhys H. Williams. Transaction Publishers 1997, 123-37.

Oppel Jr., Richard A. "Bowe Bergdahl Avoids prison for desertion; Trump calls sentence a "Disgrace"". *The New York Times*, 3 Nov. 2017.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/03/us/bowe-bergdahl-sentence.html>.

Ott, Brian L. "The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 34.no.1 (2017): 59-68.

Patterson, Thomas E. "Pre-Primary News Coverage of the 2016 Presidential Race: Trump's Rise, Sanders' Emergence, Clinton's Struggle." *Shorenstein Center*. 13 June 2016.

<https://shorensteincenter.org/pre-primary-news-coverage-2016-trump-clinton-sanders/>.

Patterson, Thomas E. "News coverage of the 2016 presidential primaries: Horse race reporting has consequences." *Shorenstein Centre*. 11 July 2016.

<https://shorensteincenter.org/news-coverage-2016-presidential-primaries/>.

Perrin, Andrew J., J. Micah Roos, and Gordon W. Gauchat. "From coalition to constraint: modes of thought in contemporary American conservatism." *Sociological Forum*. 29 No. 2 (2014).

<https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12084>.

Philo, Greg. "Can discourse analysis successfully explain the content of media and journalistic practice?" *Journalism studies*. 8 no.2 (2007). 175-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700601148804>.

Polsby, Nelson W., Aaron B. Wildavsky, Steven E. Schier, and David A. Hopkins. *Presidential elections: Strategies and structures of American politics*. (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008).

Reuters Staff. "Timeline: Pivotal moments in Trump's presidential campaign". *Reuters*, 9 Nov. 2016.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-timeline-factbox/timeline-pivotal-moments-in-trumps-presidential-campaign-idUSKBN1341FJ>.

Serazio, Michael. "Encoding the paranoid style in American politics: "anti-establishment" discourse and power in contemporary spin." *Critical studies in media communication*. 33 no. 2 (2016): 181-194.

Serwer, Adam. "The Nationalist's Delusion". *The Atlantic*, 20 Nov. 2017.

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/11/the-nationalists-delusion/546356>.

- Shreckinger, Ben. "The Alt-Right comes to Washington". *Politico*. Jan./Feb. 2017.  
<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/01/alt-right-trump-washington-dc-power-milo-214629>.
- Skocpol, Theda, and Vanessa Williamson. *The Tea Party and the remaking of Republican conservatism*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759271000407X>.
- Smith, David. "Q&A: What are Trump and the White House's links to the far right?" *The Guardian*, 14 Aug. 2017.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/aug/14/donald-trump-steve-bannon-breitbart-news-alt-right-charlottesville>.
- Strickland, Patrick. "Can the US alt-right survive divisions and backlash?" *Al Jazeera*. 17 Oct. 2017.  
<https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/09/alt-survive-divisions-backlash-170927150529249.html>.
- Swaim, Barton. "The Perfect Republican Stump Speech". *FiveThirtyEight*. 23 Nov. 2015.  
<https://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/republican-stump-speech/>.
- Taibbi, Matt. "Why Trump can't quit the Alt-Right" *Rolling Stone*. 21 Aug. 2017.  
<https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/taibbi-why-trump-cant-quit-the-alt-right-w498515>.
- Trent, Judith S., and Robert V. Friedenberg. *Political campaign communication: Principles and practices*. (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008).
- Wang, Yaqin, and Haitao Liu. "Is Trump always rambling like a fourth-grade student? An analysis of stylistic features of Donald Trump's political discourse during the 2016 election." *Discourse & Society*. 29 no.3 (2018): 299-323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926517734659>.
- Weaver, C. "America's alt-right champion credits Trump with movement's revival". *Financial Times*, Date Unknown. <https://www.ft.com/content/09bca2d2-80e2-11e7-a4ce-15b2513cb3ff>.
- Wells, Chris, Dhavan V. Shah, Jon C. Pevehouse, Jung Hwan Yang, Ayellet Pelled, Frederick Boehm, Josephine Lukito, Shreenita Ghosh, and Jessica L. Schmidt. "How Trump Drove Coverage to the Nomination: Hybrid Media Campaigning." *Political Communication*. 33 (2016): 669-676.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1224416>.



Willyard, Jennifer, and Kurt Ritter. "Election 2004 concession and victory speeches: The influence of genre, context, and speaker on addresses by presidential and vice presidential candidates." *American Behavioral Scientist*. 49 no.3 (2005): 488-509.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764205279439>.

Wodak, Ruth. "Aspects of critical discourse analysis." *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik*. 36 no.10 (2002): 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9143-x>.

Wooldridge, Adrian, and John Micklethwait. *The Right Nation: Why America is different*. (London: Penguin, 2011).

Zurcher, Anthony. "Hillary Clinton's emails - what's it all about?" *BBC News*. 6 November 2016, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-31806907>.

## Primary Sources for rally speeches

### June 16th 2015, New York, NY.

Annotated with live speeches, from transcriptions.

Metcalfe, Ted. (unending)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. "Donald Trump (2015-06-16) NYC, Presidential Announcement", Youtube video:

51:14, posted by Luckdod73, 23 Sep. 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XXbmjioQX1k>.

### July 11 2015 Phoenix, AZ.

[Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona-on-july-11-2015.txt",

*GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

<https://github.com/BBischof/speaksLike/blob/master/donald-trump/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona-on-july-11-2015.txt>

Trump, Donald. "Donald Trump Wows Thousands at Phoenix Rally -- Full Speech", Youtube video: 1:08:47, posted by Westernfreepress, 11 July 2015.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bD4ykVmlFAc>

### Aug. 21 2015, Mobile, AL.

[Mobile, AL. rally speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unending)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. "FULL SPEECH: Donald Trump Speaks to 30,000 PLUS In Mobile, AL (8 21 15)", Youtube video: 1:13:22, posted by Bereneice Mariela, 12 Feb. 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8wUE6eirgtI>

### Sep. 14 2015, Dallas, TX.

[Dallas, TX. rally speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unending)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and

tweets by Donald Trump”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unendin/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unendin/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. “FNN: Donald Trump Dallas Rally”, Youtube Video: 1:10:42, posted by Fox 10 Phoenix, 14 Sep. 2015. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W71Sg7\\_Zp-4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W71Sg7_Zp-4)

**Oct. 24 2015 Jacksonville, FL.**

Trump, Donald. “Donald TRUMP YUUUUGE Rally in Jacksonville, FL 10-24-15 Full Speech”, Youtube video: 1:18:20, posted by Hà Pham, 24 Oct. 2015.  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NfhIbpjV\\_Cg&pbjreload=10](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NfhIbpjV_Cg&pbjreload=10)

**Nov. 13 2015. Orlando, FL. GOP Sunshine Summit (non-rally).**

[Orlando, FL. Rally transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unendin).”Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:  
[https://github.com/unendin/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unendin/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. “Full Speech: Donald Trump at the 2015 Sunshine Summit (11 13 15)”, Youtube video: 29:01, posted by Berenice Mariela, 10 Feb. 2016.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2mAq4XlSSQ>

**Nov. 23 2015. Columbus OH.**

Trump, Donald. “FNN: FULL Donald Trump Rally in Columbus, OH 11-23-15”, Youtube video: 59:53, posted by Fox 10 Phoenix, 23 Nov. 2015.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yqk4kOCPYPg&pbjreload=10>

**Dec. 7 2015 Mt. Pleasant, SC.**

[Mt. Pleasant, SC. rally speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unendin).”Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump”, *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:  
[https://github.com/unendin/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unendin/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)>

Trump, Donald. “Presidential Candidate Donald Trump Rally in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina”, Youtube video: 57:30, posted by DC Rapsheet, 17 Dec. 2015.  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-3WBVBO\\_Tw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-3WBVBO_Tw)

**Jan 18 2016 Lynchburg, VA.**

[Lynchburg, VA. rally speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unendin)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unendin/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unendin/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. "Donald Trump addresses Liberty University students", Youtube video: 2:03:15, posted by *Washington Post*, 18 Jan. 2016. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vB6\\_5Bs-QEk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vB6_5Bs-QEk)

**3 February, 2016 - Little Rock, AK.**

Trump, Donald. "LIVE Donald Trump Rally Barton Coliseum Little Rock Arkansas FULL SPEECH HD February 3 201", Youtube video: 3:29:27, posted by Uigha Raymond, 16 Sep. 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YjVwgpFWcNE>

**20 February, 2016 - Victory speech, Spartanburg, SC.**

[Spartanburg, SC. speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unendin)."Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unendin/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unendin/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. "Donald Trump's Victory Speech in South Carolina", Youtube video: 14:10, posted by *ABC News*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eQpi9OjsOuk>

**12 March, 2016 - Dayton, OH.**

Trump, Donald. "Full Speech: Donald Trump EXPLOSIVE Rally in Dayton, OH (3-12-16) Donald Trump Dayton Ohio Rally", Youtube video: 54:26, posted by Trump TV Network, 12 March 2016. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O\\_2DgkKUwr4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O_2DgkKUwr4)

**18 April, 2016 - Buffalo, NY.**

Trump, Donald. "FULL EVENT: ENORMOUS 20K Donald Trump Rally In Buffalo, NY (4-18-16) Rex Ryan Introduces D. Trump", Youtube video: 2:02:13, posted by Trump TV Network, 18 Apr. 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6iOane7UFIs>

**7 May, 2016 - Spokane, WA.**

Trump, Donald. "FULL EVENT: Donald Trump Rally in Spokane, Washington (5-7-16) Spokane Convention Center", Youtube video: 1:45:49, posted by Trump TV Network, 7 May, 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WdkwXsUBhoQ>

**3 June, 2016 - Redding, CA**

[Redding, CA. rally speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Metcalfe, Ted. (unending). "Corpus of campaign speeches, interviews, debates, statements and tweets by Donald Trump", *GitHub*, last accessed 16/06/2018:

[https://github.com/unending/Trump\\_Campaign\\_Corpus](https://github.com/unending/Trump_Campaign_Corpus)

Trump, Donald. "FULL SPEECH: Donald Trump in Redding, CA," Youtube video: 47:46, posted by Fox 10 Phoenix, 3 June, 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LLgeROJHCTk>

**21 July, 2016 - RNC Speech, Cleveland, OH**

[Cleveland, OH. convention speech transcripts. Re-embedded text (into word document) with added annotations from speeches.]

Trump, Donald. "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination Acceptance Speech", *Assets of Donald Trump*, accessed 5 July, 2018. [https://assets.donaldjtrump.com/DJT\\_Acceptance\\_Speech.pdf](https://assets.donaldjtrump.com/DJT_Acceptance_Speech.pdf)

Trump, Donald. "FULL SPEECH: Donald Trump - Republican National Convention - THE NEXT PRESIDENT OF THE USA?", Youtube video: 1:16:41, posted by ABC15 Arizona, 21 July, 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4CVTuOyZDIO>.

## Annexe I - Norman Fairclough's Ten Questions for Critical Discourse Analysis

### A. Vocabulary

1. What experiential values do words have?  
What classification schemes are drawn upon?  
Are there words which are ideologically contested?  
Is there rewording or overwording?  
What ideologically significant meaning relations (*synonymy*, *hyponymy*, *antonymy*) are there between words?
2. What *relational* values do words have?  
Are there euphemistic expressions?  
Are there markedly formal or informal words?
3. What *expressive* values do words have?
4. What metaphors are used?

### B. Grammar

5. What experiential values do grammatical features have?  
What types of *process* and *participant* predominate?  
Is agency unclear?  
Are processes what they seem?  
Are *nominalizations* used?  
Are sentences active or passive?  
Are sentences positive or negative?
6. What relational values do grammatical features have?  
What *modes* (*declarative*, *grammatical question*, *imperative*) are used?  
Are there important features of *relational modality*?  
Are the pronouns *we* and *you* used, and if so, how?
7. What expressive values do grammatical features have?  
Are there important features of *expressive modality*?
8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?  
What logical connectors are used?  
Are complex sentences characterized by *coordination* or *subordination*?  
What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

### C. Textual structures

9. What interactional conventions are used?  
Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?  
What larger-scale structures does the text have?<sup>518</sup>

---

<sup>518</sup> Norman Fairclough, *Language and power*, (London & New York: Longman, 1989): 110-111.

## **Annexe II - Contextual background for each rally speech**

Contextual information for each speech, originating from most relevant news items from “Memeorandum” News Compilation website<sup>519</sup> and from most relevant polls and election trends according to a number of different sources and commentators (see footnotes).

### **Pre-primaries**

#### **June 16th 2015, New York, NY.**

Donald Trump announced his candidacy for the presidency at a period when 11 other candidates had already declared their candidacies. There had been wide speculation from commentators and media about whether Trump would run, and Trump’s announcement at his Fifth Avenue Trump Tower in Manhattan confirmed it. During this speech he made essentialist and polemical comments about Mexico and mexican illegal immigrants, and pitched his emblematic call for a wall along the US-Mexico border. The speech spurred many critical ridicules and fact checks from media, as well as commendation from figures like Sarah Palin - while some platforms revealed that the Trump Campaign had hired actors as part of the audience of his speech. Trump was trending at a polling average of 7.9 % as of June 18th, behind five other candidates with Jeb Bush in the lead.<sup>520</sup>

#### **July 11 2015 Phoenix, AZ.**

It is during this speech that Trump coins his slogan “Make America Great Again”. Here, Trump also claims that he is self-funded, and also he critiques John McCain, an Arizona Senator and outspoken Trump critic. Trump’s popularity in the polls has grown at this point, and he contends with Jeb Bush for the top place although he leads with a polling average of 17.2% which will never fall below 20% for the rest of the race,<sup>521</sup> on the other ‘side’, Bernie Sanders is increasingly represented in the same ‘outsider’ terms as Trump and is seen by many as a viable threat to Hillary Clinton’s lead. In US politics during this era, there is contention over deliberations on whether Obamacare is constitutional, ongoing debates about the visibility of confederate flags in southern states, increasing cases of black killings at the hands of police officers, and media focus on the Benghazi Trials.

According to information from the Arizona secretary of state, a slight majority of residents voted for Trump in the later general elections,<sup>522</sup> with a large contingent of independent voters, and it is a historically (bar the Election of Bill Clinton) Republican state.

#### **Aug. 21 2015, Mobile, AL.**

This day sees an attempted terrorist attack in the north of France on a high-speed train, and the intervention of two US marines on the train. It is also a dramatic day for commentators, who start writing about Trump as a more serious social phenomenon, notably taking aim at his use of the term “anchor-babies” in his speeches. This Mobile, AL. speech according to Trump Campaign sources sees more than 20 000 visitors, and Trump cites a wide-range of relevant intertextual

<sup>519</sup> Memeoradum, “memeoradum: Political Web page A1”, <https://www.memeorandum.com/>.

<sup>520</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary”, *Huffington Post*, No date, last update two years ago, <https://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2016-national-gop-primary>.

<sup>521</sup> Ibid.

<sup>522</sup> Michele Reagan, “Voter Registration and Historical Election Data”, *Michele Reagan Arizona Secretary of State website*, No date, <https://azsos.gov/elections/voter-registration-historical-election-data>.

figures for his audience, including Billy Graham and Rush Limbaugh and many commentators later describe it as a “southern spectacle” and draw parallels with southern populist and segregationist George Wallace’s 1968 run for the presidency. At this time, average poll numbers show display Trump’s massive lead of 28.4% compared to the second-ranked, Ben Carson who is at 11.1%.<sup>523</sup> A state that up to the 1950s was historically democrat, Alabama has voted overwhelmingly republican in the last few elections.<sup>524</sup>

#### **Sep. 14 2015, Dallas, TX.**

During this speech Trump makes appeals to the audience through advocating for investment in the oil industry, a historical industry in Texas. Media at this time depicts the GOP (Republican or ‘Grand Old Party’) as divided, particularly over the figure of Trump and the semblance of his nomination at the Republican candidate. In early september he signed a ‘loyalty pledge’ with head of the GOP Reince Priebus to support the GOP as opposed to joining a 3rd party in the event he was voted out, which had become an ongoing crisis.<sup>525</sup> Just a few days earlier Trump also made a rude comment about fellow contender Carly Fiorina’s face. Trump’s popularity, although still the leading candidate in an average of polls at 30.8% for GOP candidates, is slowing down.<sup>526</sup> Projected to be a future battleground state, Texas has only been reliably Republican since George H.W. Bush started running as President - however, it’s republican identity has been reinforced since then. It is second to California in the number of electors it has, and so is a strategic state for campaigns.<sup>527</sup>

#### **Oct. 24 2015 Jacksonville, FL.**

In this speech, with an estimated 20 000 audience members according to Trump campaign figures, Trump starts to iterate his campaign and supporters as a ‘movement’. Just a few days earlier, Ben Carson started to lead in some polls, briefly overtaking Trump - this being highly publicized, Trump subsequently made a comment critical of Carson’s religious practices. Other media coverage focused on how Trump mocked both Jeb Bush and Marco Rubio while he campaigned in their home state of Florida. Bush at this point also undertakes severe criticism for his cuts in campaign spending and what commentators call a crisis within his campaign. Although losing several points, on average Trump is leading in polls at 29.2%.<sup>528</sup>

#### **Nov. 13 2015. Orlando, FL. GOP Sunshine Summit (non-rally).**

The GOP Sunshine Summit is an event organized by the Florida Republican party, and in 2015 had speeches from most presidential hopefuls. Trump gave a short speech to Florida republicans, in which he iterated most of his common policy points and examples. He gave this speech two days before the fourth GOP debate; this speech also occurred on the day the Paris Attacks took place, which would become a running theme in many republican candidates’

---

<sup>523</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary”.

<sup>524</sup> 270 to Win, “Voting History and Trends by State: Alabama”, 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/Alabama>.

<sup>525</sup> Lindsay Kimble, “How Trump went from Political Joke to President Elect”, *People magazine*, 8 November 2016, <https://people.com/politics/donald-trump-timeline-to-presidential-nomination/>.

<sup>526</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary”.

<sup>527</sup> 270 to Win, “Voting History and Trends by State: Texas”, 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/Texas>.

<sup>528</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary”.



campaigns, often extrapolated as an example of the ‘threat’ of immigration and refugees. At this point Trump is still leading in average poll numbers with 29.3%.<sup>529</sup>

### **Nov. 23 2015. Columbus OH.**

During this speech Trump insistently critiques media and ‘pundits’ as well as other candidates, and iterates a claim that he saw Muslims celebrating the fall of the Twin Towers on 9/11, a claim that has largely been refuted and was also disavowed by Ben Carson. Trump rises in average poll numbers, with a leading 32.9%.<sup>530</sup> Ohio is a ‘battleground state’, with a voting population split between democrat and republican allegiances. It also has many electors, and so is strategic in campaigns.<sup>531</sup>

### **Dec. 7 2015 Mt. Pleasant, SC.**

This was a highly publicized speech, in which Trump called for a total ban on Muslim entrance into the US, and in which Trump expressed a number of anti-immigrant opinions to the cheers of his audience. His campaign also published an official statement on this. Two protesters disrupted the speech as well. Trump’s public statements on a Muslim Ban comes after the San Bernardino attacks in California, which also become anti-immigrant and anti-refugee examples for conservative candidates. Early projections for the Iowa caucus (the first much anticipated primary election) place Ted Cruz at an advantage, but Trump still leads in average polls with 34.9%.<sup>532</sup> Trump would win the state with a solid margin in a solidly republican state that, like Alabama, shifted its allegiance to the republicans because of the Civil Rights Movement.

### **Jan 18 2016 Lynchburg, VA**

Following from an unofficial endorsement by Putin and just before an official one from Sarah Palin, Trump speaks for an audience primarily made up of students and media, at the christian Liberty University, Although he gives some advice to the students, he notably reiterates his common examples and policy positions; as well as this, he gives this speech on Martin Luther King Jr. day, a national holiday, but makes little reference to the legacy of the civil rights activist. The GOP candidates at this period were anticipating the first primaries and caucuses, starting with Iowa on February 2nd. Trump will not participate, in protest against critiques of him, in the last debate of the pre-primaries period on January 28th. He nonetheless leads and rises in the polls with an average of 37.4%. Virginia has shifted between democrat and republican allegiance for the last few elections, and polling projections varied between which party would have a majority this time around. However, it did vote Trump in 2016 with a 5.5% majority.<sup>533</sup>

## **Primaries**

### **3 February, 2016 - Little Rock, AK.**

The first caucus in Iowa early in February sees Rand Paul, Mike Huckabee, and Rick Santorum suspend their campaigns. Cruz wins this caucus thanks to his appeal to a large evangelical voter base in the state, but Trump maintains it was a fraudulent win and threatens to sue if he does not

<sup>529</sup> Ibid.

<sup>530</sup> Ibid.

<sup>531</sup> 270 to Win, “Voting History and Trends by State: Ohio”, 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/Ohio>.

<sup>532</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary”

<sup>533</sup> 270 to Win, “Voting History and Trends by State: Virginia”, 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/Virginia>.

win the nomination. Carly Fiorina and Chris Christie later suspend their campaigns, and Conservative Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia passed away making the choice of a new president all the more contentious, as presidents nominate new supreme court justices. President Obama at this period decides to visit a mosque as a symbolic display against much of the anti-islam rhetoric of the Republican primaries.<sup>534</sup> Trump has a slight depression in his poll averages, with 36.7%.<sup>535</sup> Arkansas is a solidly republican state, like many other southern states, but was also projected to have by many polls a solid independent vote as well.<sup>536</sup> Arkansians voted with a large majority for Trump.<sup>537</sup>

### **20 February, 2016 - Victory speech, Spartanburg, SC.**

With the results of South Carolina and Nevada being revealed on this same day, Jeb Bush suspends his campaign and Trump comes out as the clear forerunner in the GOP Primaries. He gives this prepared victory speech to media and a small group of supporters, just five days away from the 10th GOP Presidential Debate in Houston, TX, and just a few days away from the major 'Super Tuesday' primary elections, when several elections take place on the same day. Trump leads with 39.1% in an average of poll numbers.<sup>538</sup>

### **12 March, 2016 - Dayton, OH.**

On March 1st, or 'Super Tuesday' when many states undertake their primary elections or caucuses, Trump and Clinton respectively win the majority of states (Trump wins 7). Mitt Romney at this period comes out and condemns Trump, and simultaneously calls for a unification of the GOP. Around the time Trump makes this speech in Dayton, Rubio suspends his campaign, and Cruz, Trump, and Kasich are the last remaining contenders for the Republican nomination. Media describe this rally as 'tense', as protesters continuously interrupted the speech, and one attempted to rush the stage. Trump leads with an average of 41.8% in polls, and Cruz follows at 28.4%.<sup>539</sup>

### **18 April, 2016 - Buffalo, NY.**

During this speech, Trump references Cruz' critique of New York 'values', but continues in his reiteration of common themes and imagery. At this period in US domestic politics, there is ample controversy around President Obama's immigration policy. As well as this, Senate Majority Leader ( R) Mitch McConnell maintains that there is an increased likelihood that there will be a contested GOP convention - that is, a convention that acts outside of primary and caucus outcomes, and where the choice of candidate is made onsite. Cruz warns that this could fracture the GOP. Nonetheless Trump leads with 46.7% in average polling, Cruz following at 27.7%.<sup>540</sup> New York is a solidly democratic state, that has a large contingent of electors. It is Trump's home state, and some appearance was warranted despite his lack of success in later securing it in the General Elections.

---

<sup>534</sup> Kevin Liptak, "Obama rebuts GOP muslim rhetoric in first U.S. mosque visit", *CNN*, 4 February 2016, <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/02/03/politics/obama-mosque-visit-muslim-rhetoric/>.

<sup>535</sup> Huffpost Pollster, "Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary"

<sup>536</sup> 270 to Win, "Voting History and Trends by State: Arkansas", 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/Arkansas>.

<sup>537</sup> Ibid.

<sup>538</sup> Huffpost Pollster, "Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary"

<sup>539</sup> Huffpost Pollster, "Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary"

<sup>540</sup> Ibid.

### **7 May, 2016 - Spokane, WA.**

At this point in time, Trump is the last candidate in the GOP primaries. Cruz dropped out on May 3rd, and Kasich followed him just a day later after winning only his home primaries. President Obama and Elizabeth Warren both critique Republicans and Trump, and U.S. Sen. Gordon Humphrey (R-N.H.) calls him a “sociopath”.<sup>541</sup> There is also much coverage of Clinton’s exoneration on her email scandal, and how this may affect her campaign. Trump’s speeches shift their critical focus onto Clinton. The last polls of the season average out with 54.7% for Trump and 24.2% for Cruz.<sup>542</sup> Washington has been a reliably blue state for some time, and has a growing population with more potential electors in future.<sup>543</sup> Although a majority did vote for Clinton in the General Elections, four electors were “faithless” and did not cast the vote that their populace had cast (something akin to a ‘protest vote’).<sup>544</sup>

### **3 June, 2016 - Redding, CA.**

Primary elections continue, even as Trump has emerged as the GOP nominee. He rallies in California, and, as mentioned above, shifts his critical focus onto Clinton, in anticipation of the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, Ohio. In late May Trump attacked a Judge of Mexican heritage, claiming that his precedence over a case involving Trump University would constitute ‘bias’. This display of racism is amply covered by media, and Trump does not apologize for this comment even as he claims that he represents minority, including Latino, interests. In San José, NM. an anti-Trump protest turned violent as some protesters started harassing Trump supporters after a rally. This is a continuation of a number of clashes that had occurred through the Primaries season instigated by both sides, and this continues throughout the elections. California is a state that accumulates electoral votes, and has a solid allegiance with the democrats - but this was not the case from the 1950s to the 1980s, when California largely voted republican.<sup>545</sup>

### **21 July, 2016 - RNC Speech, Cleveland, OH.**

The Republican National Convention was described by many commentators as emotional and fraught with contention. Just a few days prior to the RNC Trump officially nominated Mike Pence as his vice president running mate, and he was introduced during Trump’s speech. Ted Cruz gave the opening speech, critiquing Trump, refusing to endorse him despite his pledge to party leaders, and plead with delegates to ‘vote with their conscience’. Nonetheless, it was confirmed that Trump received over 14 million votes in the primaries and caucuses, more than any other Republican contender in US electoral history. The transcripts for his speech were released to press prior to the official speech, and these were uploaded to media websites and further spurred forth numerous amounts of commentaries on Trump as the new, unofficial

---

<sup>541</sup> Jessie Hellmann, “Former GOP Senator: Trump is a Sociopath”, *The Hill*, 5 July 2016, <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/279125-former-gop-senator-trump-is-a-sociopath>.

<sup>542</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 National Republican Primary”

<sup>543</sup> 270 to Win, “Voting History and Trends by State: Washington”, 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/Washington>.

<sup>544</sup> Ibid.

<sup>545</sup> 270 to Win, “Voting History and Trends by State: California”, 2004 - 2018, *270 to Win*, <https://www.270towin.com/states/California>.

leader of the GOP. Trump was welcomed on stage by loud chanting from crowd of “USA, USA”, and read his prepared speech decidedly more calmly than during his rally speeches.

At this point, polls averaged Clinton’s lead at 51.3%, with Trump at 34.5%.<sup>546</sup> Throughout the General Elections campaign, he would nonetheless never overtake Clinton in the averaging of polls, and would infrequently do so on individual polls.

---

<sup>546</sup> Huffpost Pollster, “Poll Chart: 2016 General Election: Trump vs. Clinton”, Huffington Post, No date, update over one year ago, <https://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2016-general-election-trump-vs-clinton>.

### Annexe III - Commonly repeated narrative examples and hypothetical situations

#### Narrative: Old Post Office

##### Dallas, TX. speech.

“As a real estate guy, the thing I do best is build. Hey, wouldn't it be good to have the president that knows how to build? Like I'm so good at it. Infrastructures, roads, airports, highways, I could do it for a fraction. You know, I'm building the old post office on Pennsylvania Avenue under budget ahead schedule, can you believe that?

(CHEERS AND APPLAUSE)

And I got it from the Obama administration and everyone else wanted it, which I still haven't figured out but it's going to be a great hotel.”<sup>547</sup>

##### Mobile, AL. speech.

“The reason people like what I'm saying is because I want to put that energy -- whatever the hell kind of energy it is -- I don't know if it's screwed up, if it's good, if it's genius, if it's whatever it is -- I know how to do things.

And I'm not going to do -- I don't care about -- you know, we're building a great building on Pennsylvania Avenue, right opposite, between, as you know, the White House and the Old Post Office.

You know in real estate business slogan -- "Always get the post office because they were there first." I got the old post office in Washington, D.C. And I got it from the Obama administration. Can you believe that? Now, that's call dealmaking.

One of the most sought after buildings in the history of the General Services Administration and I got it. And you know what? They did the right thing because we're doing a great job and we had a great statement. They wanted to make sure it gets done.

And it will be opening -- and here's a little story. It's now under budget and ahead of schedule. Do you ever hear that from government?”<sup>548</sup>

##### Orlando, FL. speech.

“You know something I never talk about, OPO, the old post office, a great building in Washington D.C. In between -- exactly in between the White House and the Capitol, on Pennsylvania Avenue. I am building it. Everybody wanted that building. I got it.

---

<sup>547</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Dallas, TX.):15-16.

<sup>548</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.): 10.

In the Obama administration, can you believe it? The most sought after property probably in the history of GSA, everybody. Every hotel company wanted it, Waldorf Astoria, everybody, all the hotel companies. Hyatt wanted it. Pritzker is the biggest backer of Obama. They wanted it.

And I got it. And I got it for a specific reason.

We have the greatest plan, the best plan. We had the best, or among the best financial statements. Because they want to make sure that it was done and done right. The GSA folks are fantastic and great professionals, I have to tell you. But in the Obama administration, I got it, and now it is a head of schedule. It was going to open in '17. Now we think we're going to get it open in November or before November of '16, so, we're almost a year ahead of schedule.

So we are ahead of schedule, under budget. Aren't they nice words when you hear about these projects that this country builds where they are 1,000 times over budget?

So, I am under budget, ahead of schedule. It's going to be, I think the greatest hotel in America. I already have the greatest hotel in America. It is in Chicago.

But the greatest hotel in America, it's going to be something that's going to make a lot of people proud. But I know how to build. And that wall is going to be a real wall. And that is going to be a really powerful wall. And it's going to be a beautiful wall, because someday they will probably name it after Trump.”<sup>549</sup>

*Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech.*

“I'm building on Pennsylvania Avenue an incredible hotel. One of the great hotels of the world. The Old Post Office site. Think of it. I got it in the Obama administration. Everybody was bidding. Everybody wanted it. One of the most sought after projects in the history of the GSA -- general services. And I got it. Can you imagine me getting it from the Obama administration? Because the GSA, who are really professionals, they want to make sure number one that it got built. So they wanted strong financials. And they also wanted a great plan. So we came up with Ivanka and my kids we came up with this incredible plan. The job is under budget, ahead of schedule. It was going to open up in '17 -- sometime during the year '17. Now, it's going to open probably in September of '16 right before the election on Pennsylvania Avenue.

And this is the kind of mindset you need.”<sup>550</sup>

**Direct speech narrative: Friend who cannot trade in China**

*New York, NY. speech.*

“So, here's a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again.

---

<sup>549</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Orlando, FL.): 3-4.

<sup>550</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.): 17.

But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything -- everything, they got away with it again. And it's impossible for our people here to compete.

So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago. He's very upset. I said, "What's your problem?"

He said, "You know, I make great product."

And I said, "I know. I know that because I buy the product."

He said, "I can't get it into China. They won't accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it."

I said, "Oh, wait a minute, that's terrible. Does anyone know this?"

He said, "Yeah, they do it all the time with other people."

I said, "They send it back?"

"Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They're not supposed to be doing that. I told them."

Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there."<sup>551</sup>

Mobile, AL. speech.

"A friend of mine is a manufacturer, and he's trying to do business with China. And what he's going -- and he's a great manufacturer. Makes great products. Better than what they did. They don't want him sending his stuff.

And he calls me and he goes, "You know, it's impossible to do business. I can't get my product -- they're dumping stuff over here, comes in by the ship load."

He said, "It's impossible. I can't get my product -- "

Finally gets a product in there and they charge him a massive tax which they call a tariff because it sounds a little more sophisticated, right? And he calls me. And he goes, "It's impossible to do business with China."

Boeing does business with China. And they want all of their intel. They want all of their copyrights. They want everything. Otherwise, we're not buying planes.

And they're now building big factories -- I don't blame China. I mean, I respect them. Not angry at them. I'm angry at our leaders for being so stupid. I'm not angry at China.

---

<sup>551</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY): 8.

And Mexico is the same thing.

You know, Mexico is the new China.”<sup>552</sup>

**Hypothetical scenario: Negotiating with Ford or other company**

New York, NY. speech.

“But I have another one, Ford.

So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, rips it out. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the Wall Street Journal recently. Everybody thought it was a done deal. It's going in and that's going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people. All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign, announces they're not going to Tennessee. They're gonna spend their \$1 billion in Mexico instead. Not good.

Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. \$2.5 billion, it's going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company.

So I announced that I'm running for president. I would...

(APPLAUSE)

... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in -- and I wouldn't even use -- you know, I have -- I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.

You get a lot of them that are overrated. They're not good. They think they are. They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffaloed. But they're not good.

But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well, very, very well.

But I wouldn't even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know. If I was president, I'd say, "Congratulations. I understand that you're building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you're going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flow them across the border."

And you say to yourself, "How does that help us," right? "How does that help us? Where is that good"? It's not.

So I would say, "Congratulations. That's the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we're

---

<sup>552</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.): 14.



going to charge you a 35 percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that's it.

Now, here's what is going to happen. If it's not me in the position, it's one of these politicians that we're running against, you know, the 400 people that we're (INAUDIBLE). And here's what's going to happen. They're not so stupid. They know it's not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford and say, "You can't do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I take care of you, and you can't do that to Ford."

And guess what? No problem. They're going to build in Mexico. They're going to take away thousands of jobs. It's very bad for us.

So under President Trump, here's what would happen:

(APPLAUSE)

The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news. But it could be he'd want to be cool, and he'll wait until the next day. You know, they want to be a little cool.

And he'll say, "Please, please, please." He'll beg for a little while, and I'll say, "No interest." Then he'll call all sorts of political people, and I'll say, "Sorry, fellas. No interest," because I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need anybody's money.

I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich. I (INAUDIBLE).

(APPLAUSE)<sup>553</sup>

*Phoenix, AZ. speech.*

"So, Jeb Bush, let's say he's President -- ay, ay, ay -- so let's say Jeb Bush is President. He knows it's no good to have a \$2.5 billion plant built right near our country. How does it help us, right?"

So here's what happens. He knows it's no good. He'll have a little pressure. Don't let the plant be built. And he might even say, "Don't let the plant be built." Might even call the head of Ford. "The plant's not going to be built."

And then the next day, he'll be called by special interests that supported him, his lobbyists who push him around like a piece of candy, or his donors who have stock in Ford. And they'll say, "You can't do that. I helped you. You can't hurt them. You just can't do it."

He folds in about two seconds.

---

<sup>553</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (New York, NY): 8-11.

So let me say Trump is President. Let me say Trump. So I don't need anybody's money. Actually, people are setting up PACs all over the place. I don't care. If they want to give it to me, I'll take it. OK?

But I don't need money. I don't want money. So I'm doing my own. You'll see that on Thursday or whatever the hell day I file. You'll see I did really well. Much better than anyone ever thought. Just the opposite.

So here's the story. So Trump is President. So I get a call from the head of Ford and I'll say, "You got to build in the United States. Sorry." He'll say, "But Mr. President, really -- we don't want -- " I'll say, "Here's the story. Number one, congratulations on your new plant in Mexico. And number two, we're going to charge you 35% for every car, truck, and part you send over."

And here's what would happen -- here's what would happen. Now, this isn't like 99% sure. This is 100%. In fact, you know the negotiators -- the killers that I told you about -- these bad people? I wouldn't even bother calling them because this is too easy. I can just do this like, you know, with a couple of phones.

So here's what would happen with Trump. I will get some calls. He will say "Mr. President, this is terrible. Please! Please!"

"Sorry, can't do anything. Sorry, I don't care. I want you to build here. I want jobs in the United States."

So, they would go and they'd call up the lobbyists... Hey, I hire lobbyists. I have lobbyists all over the place. They're great. I want something -- go do this. I know the system better than anybody.

I'm a donor. Somebody said, "Oh, you gave to the Democrats." Of course, I give to them. I give to everybody. I want to get everything done. Everybody loves me. Everybody loves -- I give to everybody.

Now, in a lot of ways, that's very bad because you know what? That's bad for the country. You know it's bad. But that's the way it works.

But I give to everybody; they all love me. They don't love me so much anymore by the way, I have to tell you.

But here's what happens. He'll call. I'd say he folds sometimes prior to 5 p.m. in the evening. But he could be tough and he may last 'till 12 p.m. the following day.

And he'll say "Please" and five guys will call me that are friends of mine and, you know, who I couldn't care less. I'd say, "No, you don't understand. I want that plant built in the United States. I want jobs in the United States."

Now, this is just one of many deals. And here's what happens. I would probably get a call the first day but maybe the second day because they're tough negotiators. And he'll say, "Mr. President,

would you reconsider?" I'd say "No." He'll say, "Mr. President, we've decided to build the plant in Phoenix." OK?

It's so simple. It's so simple. We have totally incompetent people. Now, some people say they're bad people. I don't think they're that smart to be bad people.

Honestly, I mean, a lot of people get angry when I say I don't think they're bad; I think they're stupid; I think they're incompetent.

So we've got to take our country back."<sup>554</sup>

Mobile, AL.

"One of them is the Ford deal. Right?"

Israel -- I love Israel.

... The bottom line on Ford -- I love this story because -- so when I get the call, I say, "No, no, no. You're going to build in the United States." They're going to say "No, we don't want to do that." I say, "Let me tell you, sir, you're going to build in the United States."

And I will be called by people but I will not have any of their money so I don't care.

And they're going say -- and I'll call them in and I'll say, "Listen, here's the story. You're building \$2.5 billion in Mexico. We're going to charge you a tremendous little 35% tax."

35%.

And that tax is going to be for every car and every part and every truck that comes into the United States.

And here's what's going to happen -- as sure as you're standing or sitting -- they're going to come back to me the following day. I would say the following afternoon. Let's say 12... And I don't need Carl Icahn. This one is too easy. And they're going to come back and they're going say, "Mr. President, what you're doing to us is terrible. We will build in the United States. We will build the plant in the United States."

100%.

And I'll say the same thing to Nabisco. It doesn't help us. It doesn't help us.

When you look at what's going where Nabisco is closing and so many places are closing, when you look at the kind of money that these countries are making and I'm naming a few -- I mean, so many countries -- we don't have anything left. We're running on fumes. We're running on fumes.

---

<sup>554</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona": 18-19.

There's nothing here.”<sup>555</sup>

Dallas, TX. speech.

“What would president Trump do? President trump? Trump, trump, trump. [sic] What would president Trump do? So I'd call the head of Ford or whatever company. But I'd call the head of Ford. I'd say congratulations. I understand you're building a massive plant in Mexico and you're taking a lot of jobs away from us in Michigan and other places. I don't like that. I don't like it. I just don't like it. And he will say, well, Mr. President, it's wonderful, wonderful for the economy. It's great. It's wonderful. Whose economy? Not for our economy. We lose on everything. We lose on jobs. We lose on money. We lose on everything.

So what I'd say is the following, I don't want you to do that. And if you do it, you're not going to have any cars coming across the border unless you pay 35 percent tax. That's it. No, that's it. And they are going to say, they are going to say to me, Mr. President, please, please, please. Now, I guarantee you, let's say I make this call at 9:00 in the morning. By 5:00 in the afternoon I think the deal is done, they move back to the United States. It may take a half a day longer. May be 12:00 the following day, but I guarantee you, so they will -- what will happen is I'll be called by lobbyists but not giving me money. I won't take it.

So I turned down \$5 million last week, \$5 million. So I said I can't take it. You know, I go like this. I just close my eyes. You know, it's really sort of not natural to me to turn down money. Does that make -- but I turn it down because once I know the game. Once they give you, you sort of owe them, right? You know. How can you tell a guy, you know, you gave me \$5 million and helped me get elected and I'm going to hurt you with client (PH).

So, what happens, I would say, is that I will get a call from the head of Ford, and he'll say Mr. Trump, you're doing the wrong thing. I'd say, no, no, that's fine. Just do it. Just do what I say. Do what I say. And I guarantee you after I tell all the lobbyists, special interest and people that donate to everybody else but me because I won't take their money, after I tell them all no within a short period of time they will call up and they'll say, Mr. President we decided to move our plant back to the United States, sir.

(APPLAUSE)

This is going to happen. That's what is going to happen.”<sup>556</sup>

**Hypothetical Scenario: Paris Attacks**

Lynchburg, VA. speech.

“They went in, they killed 14 people. If we had somebody, a couple of guys like him, or him -- or definitely him, with the white hat on -- with a gun strapped in here, and the bullets could go the other way, you wouldn't have had the same -- you would have had problems. You wouldn't have had it to the same extent at all.”<sup>557</sup>

<sup>555</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Mobile, AL.): 18-19.

<sup>556</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches” (Dallas, TX.): 17-18.

<sup>557</sup> Metcalfe, “Corpus of campaign speeches”. (Lynchburg, VA.): 19.

Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech:

"(INTERRUPTED BY PROTESTER) ... So prior to Paris, which was a disaster, which by the way if some of the people in those places where it was slaughter, absolute slaughter, had guns, you wouldn't have had the carnage that you had in Paris. You wouldn't had that carnage. If they had guns, you wouldn't had that carnage.

So important the Second Amendment. We have to preserve it and cherish it. And we can't let these weak leaders diminish it.

If they had guns in Paris, if five people in that room, Paris and France has probably the toughest gun laws anywhere in the world and it was like target practice. "Come over here. Boom! Come over here. Boom!" People are sitting by the hundreds and many others are going to be dying. They're sitting in the hospital in many cases waiting to die."<sup>558</sup>

**Example of 'bad deal': Sgt. Bergdahl**Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech.

"They are fed up with stupid people, where our president makes a deal for Sergeant Bergdahl, a dirty, rotten, no good traitor who -- think of it. They knew he was a traitor because a general and a colonel went to see his group. Six people were killed looking for him. OK? Six people were killed. Young. Unbelievable. I watched the parents on television. I've seen the parents. But I watched the parents on television devastated, will never be the same. They left to try to bring them back. He left. He deserted.

You know, in the old days when we were strong country it would be boom, gone. It was called desertion. Now I heard the other day they won't even do anything to him. Can you believe it? They think he's going to get away with nothing. He's going to have nothing.

So he left. Oh, they treated him pretty rough though. He got in there, he said, "I shouldn't have done this. This isn't working out the way I thought."

Anyways, so we get him back and here's the deal we made. We get a dirty, no good traitor. Six people killed... They get five of their greatest killers that they've been after -- after -- think of it for six years. In fact, I hear nine years.

So they get these -- right now have gone -- they're out in the battlefield, trying to kill everybody in front of them including you folks, I'd hate to tell you.

So we get Bergdahl and they get five of the killers that they've wanted for many years. That's the way we do it."<sup>559</sup>

Mobile, AL. speech.

"That's sort of like Sgt. Bergdahl. Has anybody heard of Sgt. Bergdahl? The traitor. No, no, the traitor.

I call President Obama the five-for-one President.

---

<sup>558</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.): 11.

<sup>559</sup> Ibid:8-9.

We get Sgt. Bergdahl, a traitor, who by the way six people at least that we know of, six people were killed trying to get this guy back. Six people -- they went after him. They wanted to get him back.

So we get Sgt. Bergdahl and they get five people that they desperately wanted for years that are right now back on the battlefield trying to kill everybody including us.

How stupid are we? How stupid are we?"<sup>560</sup>

Phoenix, AZ. speech.

"We have Sergeant Bergdahl, a traitor.

So we negotiate for Sergeant Bergdahl, a no-good traitor. Six people were killed trying to find him. Six young in this case men went out to try to get him; six of them never came back. Six people died and we have Sergeant Bergdahl.

And here's our deal. This is just like the stupid deal that we're making with Iran on nuclear. This is just like everything else we do -- the deals we make with China, the deals we make with Mexico. We don't know what we're doing.

So we get Bergdahl, a no-good traitor. Frankly, I'd re-negotiate deals every once in a while. Not too often but I'd send him back, and if they don't want him, send him back anyways. I want to re-negotiate that.

They get five killers that are right now back on the battlefield, trying to kill everybody, including the people in this room. And these were the five people that they most wanted.

So I call Obama the five-for-one President. Who would make that deal? Now, I don't think it's because he's a bad person... Who would make a deal like this?

But these are the same deals that we make with all of these countries."<sup>561</sup>

Redding, CA. speech.

"That's our deal. Sergeant Bergdahl, we get Bergdahl, they get five of the greatest killers that they have. They've been after them for nine years. I call them him the five-for-one president."<sup>562</sup>

**Example of 'bad deal': The Iran Deal.**

Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech.

"The Iran deal. We gave them \$150 billion. It's called amateur night. We gave them \$150 billion. 24 days -- 24 days -- we think there's something wrong, 24 days we have to wait but it's much

<sup>560</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.): 7.

<sup>561</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona": 23.

<sup>562</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.):15.

longer than that because there's a whole process before the clock starts ticking. So it could be forever.

But the best is where they have the right to self-inspect. "Are you doing nuclear weapons over there?" "Oh, we'll inspect tomorrow." "Oh no, we're not doing nuclear weapons."<sup>563</sup>

Orlando, FL. speech.

"And I say maybe Kerry will go down as being a worse secretary of State than even Hillary. Because he made a deal with Iran that could be one of the most incompetent transactions I have ever witnessed in my life of any kind, of any kind, of any kind."<sup>564</sup>

Phoenix, AZ. speech.

"We need the right messenger. The Iran deal is a disaster. The Iran deal is a disaster. They are begging. Our chief negotiator at 73 is in a bicycle race. He falls and breaks his leg. This is the mentality we have."<sup>565</sup>

Mt. Pleasant, SC. speech.

"The Iran deal. We gave them \$150 billion. It's called amateur night. We gave them \$150 billion. 24 days -- 24 days -- we think there's something wrong, 24 days we have to wait but it's much longer than that because there's a whole process before the clock starts ticking. So it could be forever.

But the best is where they have the right to self-inspect. "Are you doing nuclear weapons over there?" "Oh, we'll inspect tomorrow." "Oh no, we're not doing nuclear weapons."

You know, the Persians are great negotiators. Always have been. And somebody would say that's profiling. Trust me, they're great negotiators.

And Kerry is a horrible negotiator and Obama is a horrible negotiator. Horrible. He's a horrible negotiator. These people are horrible."<sup>566</sup>

Mobile, AL. speech.

"So what happens is these guys come up and I'm lucky. You know, everybody said he's never going to run. OK? You know that. Right?"

And my wife actually said, "You know, if you" -- she knows me pretty well and she also sees the reaction and for a long time whether it's Trump -- The Art of the Deal, which Obama and Kerry obviously did not read when they did this crazy deal with Iran.

---

<sup>563</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.): 8-9.

<sup>564</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Orlando, FL.): 4.

<sup>565</sup> Bryanbischof. "Transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-phoenix-arizona": 17.

<sup>566</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mt. Pleasant, SC.): 9.

Oh, look, the Art of the Deal. Give me that book. I love that book."<sup>567</sup>

Dallas, TX. speech.

"This is going to happen. That's what is going to happen. So, just a couple of more points and you know, it's depressing, isn't it depressing? You know, we're together, we love each other, but it's like depressing if you think about it. Because it doesn't end. I could stand up here all night long, I could tell you stories, they are all depressing. But the good news is, they can all be remedied. Every one of them. They can be remedied. So, Iran deal, Iran deal.

AUDIENCE: Booo.

DONALD TRUMP: They did not read that great book, where is that book? "The Art of the Deal." They did not read it. Secretary of State Kerry, he actually may go down as worst than -- because he made this deal. He may be the worst. He may top her because this deal is the all-time worst. We're giving them 1.5, think of this, we're actually giving them \$150 billion. Now think of it. Think of it. We don't have the right to inspect. We have to wait 24 days but before the clock starts ticking, we have to go through this whole process. I mean they could build their nuclear whatever, distribute and then have plenty of time leftover to clean the place up. So, you have a 24-day period, not anytime, anywhere, which is what it should be.

Think of another thing. They have one instance where in a very major area, they self-inspect. Now, can you believe this? They do their own inspections. They do their own inspections. And another thing, look, having a good deal, we should have doubled the sanctions, let -- wait for another month or two. They would have come and we would have a deal like you've ever seen. We have our chief negotiators, Secretary Kerry at 73 years old goes into a bicycle race. Think of it. He's wearing the whole gear of helmet, he's like -- he thinks he's in a bicycle race. He's actually in a race. It wasn't just casual, I could understand that. This is a guy that's in a bicycle race. 73 years old, all the gear, falls, breaks his leg in the middle of our thing. Takes two weeks off, goes back with crutches. The people from Iran say, what a shmuck. Can you believe this?

(LAUGHTER)

But this is who we negotiate with. Now, think of this, it's embarrassing. Isn't it like embarrassing? How do you -- I swear to you if I'm elected as president, I will never go into a bicycle race, I swear."<sup>568</sup>

Redding, CA. speech

"That's our deal. Sergeant Bergdahl, we get Bergdahl, they get five of the greatest killers that they have. They've been after them for nine years. I call them him the five-for-one president.

And that's the same thing with the Iran deal. We gave them \$150 billion and that's the only time we got our prisoners back. We shouldn't have even started a negotiation until we got those

<sup>567</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Mobile, AL.).

<sup>568</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches" (Dallas, TX.): 18.



prisoners back. And not once did this stiff -- he's a total stiff. John Kerry, not once did he get up from the bargaining table and say, "Sorry, folks, you take care of yourselves." Leave the room. Double up the sanctions. They would have called you within 24 hours. He gave up every single point.

And by the way, the biggest loser in that deal aside from us is Israel. Israel is beside themselves over that deal. That deal is a disaster for Israel and a disaster for the Middle East, because you're going to have countries now start to arm up and arm up big. It's a disaster."<sup>569</sup>

*RNC, Cleveland, OH. speech.*

"Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint. 67 This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran 150 billion dollars and gave us nothing – it will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever negotiated."<sup>570</sup>

---

<sup>569</sup> Metcalfe, "Corpus of campaign speeches". (Redding, CA.): 15-16.

<sup>570</sup> Donald Trump, "Donald J. Trump Republican Nomination Acceptance Speech": 6.

#### Annexe IV - Primary research informing “Discourses of Transgression” comparative framework

The “Discourses of Transgression” political worldview is one that is premised upon an almost total critique of establishment politics, mainstream media culture, and liberal social organization. Although discourses manifest themselves in varied and nuance ways, I am here identifying ‘fundamental worldviews’ of an emergent and influential anti-establishment conservatism, based on preliminary investigations and some secondary literature investigations into their discursive language and they manifest in many different ways on many different platforms online and off.

Discursive themes	Substance of themes	‘Textual’ [expressive] tactics
<i>Race/Other/Immigrant as essentialized qualifier</i>	The “other” represented as uncontrollable, unknowable threat to American values/families/institutions/racial purity. Government’s lack of action/strength to control these others’ mass-movement into the country. Outsiders as parasitic. This discourse is usually overtly racialized in language. Race is taken as an essentialized quality.	Use of essentialized imagery, metaphor of immigrants or populations of other countries and associating them with distinct qualities: criminality, poverty, being uncivilized.  “They/Us” narratives as paralleling racial narratives. Lack of context to these narratives and imagery, or use of questionable, revisionist sources.
<i>History as progressing toward an end.</i>	History and societies are depicted as progressing toward some state of dissolution or ‘homogenization’ <sup>571</sup> , racial or cultural. Dissolution is a conspiracy of the globalist neoliberal elite. Usually associated with a critique of US “global hegemony” <sup>572</sup> . Narratives of the inevitability of such ‘ends’. Western civilization as a monolith threatened by Islamic civilization, etc.	Focus on historical narratives. Use of terms like “culture”, “degeneracy”, “civilization” and “civilized”, “uncivilized”. In articles, usually focus on isolated events of minority-on-white violence, or violence occurring in other countries, such examples are extrapolated and serve as examples of societal degeneracy, culture war, etc.
<i>Fixation, amalgamation: Morals/Values/Foundations/Heritage</i>	This is something implied in the definition of what it means to be a “good american” or a good national citizen. Often reference to a “structural foundation” of “values”	Use of abstract adjectives like values, morals, heritage to qualify. These are taken as “truth”, “true” standards of intellectual integrity, honesty,

<sup>571</sup> Michael, “The rise of the alt-right”.

<sup>572</sup> Ibid.

	that are inherent to the nation; these are often hierarchical and take an essentialist view of human traits (IQ for instance <sup>573</sup> ). There is a “proper” way to live. Morality is often correlated with being a good american/staying true to heritage/being a real man/being a true white. “True”, essential qualities are insisted upon.	morality etc in opposition to PC “lies”, insincerity, immorality. Focus on defining these abstract qualities in essentialized ways, with reference to race, IQ, gender/sex, ‘nationality’.
<i>Fixation on deviancy/“the world today”/immorality</i>	Critique of “PC” (politically correct) contemporary societal norms and political language; PC interpreted as country-wide decadence and “civilizational” decline (it may not often be termed as such). These norms include advocacy for LGBT visibility, decline in the adoption of traditional gender-roles, increased advocacy for minorities’ visibility and equality, increased presence of technology in everyday life, falling rates of religious affiliation, and political ‘radicalism’ (leftist, progressive norms). Values of free-speech are often purported to be violated by PC norms. <sup>574</sup>	Similar to the above. Usually PC is defined in oppositional terms, and essentialized in exaggerated, derogatory caricatures of essentialized “liberals”, “feminists”, “SJWs” (“social justice warriors”) etc. Polarized and dichotomous presentation of debates. Propensity to cite monist, all-encompassing theories and fringe philosophies.
<i>Comparative frame of the present to the past: Nostalgia/ “Good ol days”/ US mythologies</i>	The critique above is often informed by a nostalgia for an America of the past. <sup>575</sup> This may be implied in the use of all-american imagery, references to the ‘Founding Fathers’ and the Constitution. This imagery may be heavily gendered, with women occupying the domestic sphere. It may also be racially exclusive.	(Similar to fixation on ‘history progressing to an end’) Imagery (in memes, video and article commentaries) of a past nation often used comparatively to critique the “degeneracy” of the present nation. This imagery is usually decontextualized, and used as a symbol of projected values.
<i>Narratives of Government intervention / dependency</i>	Independence as a defining feature of America. As mentioned several times above, government intervention in private life or state life is un-american,	Usually used in debates on immigration and welfare dependency, private property, and gun-ownership. The big

<sup>573</sup> Nagle “Kill all normies”.

<sup>574</sup> Maskovsky “Toward the anthropology”.

<sup>575</sup> Ibid.

	a threat to freedom; associated with imagery of weakness.	entity of the government, complicit with liberal media and other liberal forces, is often depicted as belligerent toward the individual.
<i>Critical narratives of the “establishment”, standing for the Political realm, mainstream media. They are in opposition to “normal people”</i>	This presents an explanation of why government cannot be trusted - this sort of discourse may take on conspiratorial tones. The Government (correlated with mainstream media, and the intelligentsia) is an elitist institution, disconnected from the nation, and biased toward liberal PC culture and its stewards.	Correlatory explanations of phenomenon. Propensity to make reference to a repertoire of enemies: the Liberal elite, jews, immigrants, “SJWs” etc. Propensity to represent self, others sympathetic to self as victimized by liberal culture, media.
<i>“Truth” and conspiracy to hide truth</i>	Conspiratorial leanings, use of taboo language/positions/references. This may be used for a variety of reasons. The conspiratorial tone in the terms/imagery used are often “counter-cultural”, again premised upon an idea that what is being said are unspoken truths <sup>576</sup> .	Representation of knowledge, of reference to these worldviews as “woke”, having taken “the red pill”. They “know”, the mainstream hides the truth, and there are those who are ignorant, need to be “converted” (framing of this knowledge as needing to be spread, as covert and thus <i>legitimate</i> , this knowledge as transgressive.

These beliefs, use of language, behaviours, and positions are, I argue, used by an emergent, influential anti-establishment conservatism to make reference to a certain vision of the US and a certain vision of what the US should be. These are almost always very critical ideological fixations<sup>577</sup>, primarily critical of the current state of the US. These ideological fixations, because of their openly critical positions, when enacted, become *transgressive discourses*.

<sup>576</sup> Hall et al. "The hands of Donald Trump".

<sup>577</sup> Blee and Creasap, "Conservative and right-wing movements". 3.