



ISSN: 1817-6798 (Print)

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

available online at: <http://www.jtuh.tu.edu.iq>

JTUH
مجلة جامعة تكريت للعلوم الإنسانية
Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

Prof. Lect. Mahmood Abbas Dawood

Wasan Mahmood Abbas

Department of English
College of Education for Humanities
University of Kirkuk
Tikrit, Iraq

E-mail:

wasanmahmood139@gmail.com

Keywords:

Discourse
Nationalism
Immigration
Discursive
Strategies

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 10 Dec. 2018

Accepted 22 January 2019

Available online 22 Dec 2020

E-mail

journal.of.tikrit.university.of.humanities@tu.edu.iq

E-mail : adxxxx@tu.edu.iq

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities (2020) 27 (12) 21-1

Discursive Strategies in Western Political Discourse: Nationalism and Immigration

ABSTRACT

The current study is an attempt to reveal hidden nationalist attitudes in the political discourse of the American right-wing party in the USA using critical discourse analysis. The study aims at identifying the discursive strategies used in political discourse with regards to nationalism and immigration, investigating the construction of in-groups and out-groups, clarifying the positive self-presentation and negative others presentation, showing the most common warrants used to justify nationalist rhetoric against immigrants and, setting conclusions. In order to achieve the aims of the study, it is hypothesized that (i) Discursive strategies are used to construct immigrants as out-groups and political actors and their allies as in-groups (ii) Political actors use positive self image to present themselves and negative others to present immigrants. (iii) political actors use criminalization ideologies to justify their nationalist discourse against immigrants. In order to achieve the aims of the present study, the following procedures are followed (i) Data is selected from the YouTube which is a press conference for the American right-wing president, Donald Trump (ii) The data has been analyzed linguistically to show discursive strategies used by Trump with regards to nationalism and immigration (iii) The model adapted for this study is DHA to CDA; Reisigl and Wodak (2001,2009). The study comes up with these conclusions (i) Results of the study verify all the hypotheses set forward (ii) Trump names immigrants as part of out-group and his people as in-group (iii) Trump presents immigrants with negative others image and present himself with positive self-image (iv) Nationalism in the USA is a civic nationalism.

© 2020 JTUH, College of Education for Human Sciences, Tikrit University

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.27.12.2020.23>

الاستراتيجيات الخطابية المستخدمة في الخطاب السياسي الغربي: القومية والهجرة

أ.م. محمود عباس داود/جامعة تكريت/كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

وسن محمود عباس

الخلاصة:

الدراسة الحالية هي محاولة لكشف المواقف القومية الخفية لبعض سياسيين الجناح الايمن في العالم الغربي من خلال استخدام تحليل الخطاب الناقد. الدراسة تهدف الى تحديد الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة في الخطاب السياسي فيما يتعلق بالقومية والهجرة، التحقق من انشاء من هم داخل المجموعة ومن هم خارج

المجموعة, توضيح كيفية التقديم الايجابي للنفس والتقديم السلبي للآخرين, اظهار المبررات الاكثر شيوعا لتبرير الخطاب القومي ضد المهاجرين, اظهار اوجه الشبه والاختلاف بين السياسيين في استخدام الاستراتيجيات الخطابية.

للتحقق من الاهداف اعلاه تفترض الدراسة الاتي: (1) تستخدم الاستراتيجيات الخطابية لوضع المهاجرين خارج المجموعة و السياسيين و حلفائهم داخل المجموعة (2) يستخدم السياسيون صورة النفس الايجابية لتقديم انفسهم و صورة الاخرين السلبية لتقديم المهاجرين (3) يستخدم السياسيون ايدولوجيات التجريم لتبرير خطابهم القومي ضد المهاجرين (4) يستخدم السياسيون جوانب مختلفة من القومية والتي تتوافق مع سياسة الولة و طبيعة المهاجرين.

تم اختيار البيانات من القنوات الاخبارية على اليوتيوب وهي مؤتمر صحفي لترامب الرئيس الامريكي الحالي . تم تحليل البيانات لغويا لأظهار الاستراتيجيات الخطابية المستخدمة من قبله فيما يتعلق بالقومية والهجرة من خلال استخدام نهج الخطاب التاريخي لرايسل و ودوك (2001, 2009) و ودوك (2015).

توصلت الدراسة الى هذه الاستنتاجات (1) تم تأكيد صحة كل الفرضيات التي وضعت لهذه الدراسة (2) يسمى ترامب المهاجرين على انهم خارج المجموعة و شعبهم على انهم داخل المجموعة (3) يقدم ترامب المهاجرين بصورة سلبية و يقدم نفسه بأيجابية (4) القومية في الولايات المتحدة هي قومية مدنية .

1.Introduction

American politicians especially right-wing, argue that the presence of immigrants may distort the national identity of the native population. That means that the native population opposes immigration because they fear they may lose their sense of belonging to their own nation, as represented by distinctive traditions, religion, culture, language and politics. Politicians in the USA have always tried to enhance the nationalist sense against immigrants throughout their manipulative discourse in order to change the public will, get elected and eventually get the chance to reform the constitution to suit their nationalist needs. However such manipulative strategies are hidden and need to be investigated in order to show the connections between rhetoric about immigration and the nationalist attitude behind it.

To the best of the researcher's knowledge no previous study that tackles Nationalism and Immigration in western political discourse from a critical discourse analysis point of view has been conducted. The present study is an attempt to analyze discursive strategies in political discourse from a critical discourse analysis perspective. This study aims at identifying the discursive strategies used in political discourse with regards to nationalism and immigration .Investigating the construction of in-groups and out-groups .Clarifying the positive self presentation and negative others presentation .Showing the most common warrants used to justify nationalist rhetoric against immigrants and showing the main similarities and differences of western political actors in using discursive strategies. The study hypothesizes that: American politicians who produce anti-immigration are nationalists. Thus it is best to be investigated using critical discourse analysis. Discursive strategies are used to construct immigrants as out-groups and political actors and their allies as in-groups. American political actors use positive self image to present themselves and negative

others to present immigrants. American political actors use criminalization ideologies to justify their nationalist discourse against immigrants.

2. Discourse Analysis

In order to comprehend the concept of discourse analysis; there is a need to define and explain the term of 'Discourse' at first. Discourse has two forms written and spoken, it is a unit of language that is the most complete, it is higher than a sentence or a clause with cohesion and coherence elements which has a beginning and an ending that is delivered in written or oral form(Hart & Cap,2014:). It always relies on the speaker or the writer (what he/she is talking/ writing about) and the hearer or reader (what he/she is listening/reading) (Trappes-Lomax, 2004: 136).

Discourse Analysis on the other hand, henceforth DA, is defined as the study of language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence level which takes into account the analysis of patterns of language used within the text by examining the relationship between language and socio-cultural contexts in which it is used (Paltridge, 2006: 12). Widdoson (2007: xv) states that discourse analysis is a branch of language study that is concerned with how people make meaning in texts as a social practice.

DA approach to language includes critical discourse analysis which is generally the study of how power is misused and how domination and inequality are performed into the community by using certain ideological forms (Trappes-Lomax, 2004: 136).

3- Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis, henceforth CDA, is an interdisciplinary approach which is deeply rooted in text linguistics, sociolinguistics as well as applied linguistics and pragmatics (Weiss and Wodak, 2003: 1). CDA in the broader sense can be traced back at least to the Aristotelian study or rhetoric (Hart and Lukes, 2007: iv). However, the contemporary philosophy goes to the critical theory of the Frankfurt school established before the Second World War which was essentially influenced by Marxism (Van Dijk, 2003: 352). Later, it is followed by Foucault's post-structuralist discourse analysis. Foucault's theory of power and knowledge as a form of social control led to the development of critical linguistics (CL) (Hart and Lukes, 2007: iv). Flowerdew (2008: 195) states that the movement of CL was developed in East Anglia during the 1970s by a number of scholars such as Fowler, Kress, Hodge and Trew who concerned to develop a social approach to linguistics which recognize power relationships as a central theoretical issue and text as its main unit of analysis. Wodak (2001: 4) asserts that CDA is based on CL. Thus, the terms CL and CDA are often used interchangeably. But recently the term CDA seems to be preferred (Wodak and Meyer, 2001: 1). CDA as an approach emerged in the early 1990 after a two-day workshop in Amsterdam with the contributions of some scholars such as Fairclough, Van Dijk, Wodak and others (Wodak and Meyer, 2001: 1). Van Dijk (1993: 131)

emphasizes that CDA is not a homogenous model nor a school or a paradigm; it is rather a shared perspective on "doing linguistic, semiotic or discourse analysis".

Since CDA is an interdisciplinary approach it is very difficult to set up a comprehensive definition. However, Fairclough (1995: 32-3) gives a very persuasive definition that outlines and encapsulates CDA:

[CDA is the study of] often opaque relationship of causality and determination between (a) discursive practice, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power, and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor.

Wodak and Meyer (2001: 1) define CDA as the analysis of opaque and transparent relationships of 'dominance, discrimination, power and control' are exercised through language. CDA examines social inequality critically by showing how it is expressed, constituted, and legitimized . Similarly Van Dijk (2008: 85) sees CDA as an analytical tool that studies how social power, abuse dominance and inequality are utilized, maintained and resisted by struggle of power through interaction.

Fairclough (1989: 5) states that CDA aims at revealing the hidden connections between language, power and ideology by being critical. The term 'critical' here does not only mean detecting the negative sides of social interaction. It also means dealing with complex issues and imposing self-reflection while doing the analysis (Wodak, 1999: 12).

Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-80) summarize the main tenets of CDA as follows:

- CDA addresses social problems,
- Power relations are discursive,
- Discourse constitute society and culture,
- Discourse is ideological work,
- Discourse is historical,
- The link between text and society is mediated,
- Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory,
- Discourse is a form of social action.

4- The Adopted Model of the Study

The model Adopted for this study is the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA, Ruth Wodak and Colleagues). The model adopted for this study is the DHA as an approach of CDA (Riesigl & Wodak, 2001,2009). This model is suitable for

this study which investigates the discursive strategies used in political discourse in order to reveal hidden power relations and ideologies critically. Reisigl & Wodak (2009:88) define 'power' as "the possibility of having social one's own will within a social relationship against the will or resistance of others". 'ideology' on the other hand is seen as one-sided perspective or world view composed of related mental representations, convictions, opinions, attitudes and evaluations, which are shared by members of a specific social group(ibid).

Reisigl & Wodak (2001:35) classify genres and sub-genres under fields of political actions which are defined by different functions of discursive practices. The press conference chosen for this study lay under the same field of action which is the field of formation of public attitudes, opinions and will. Riesigl & Wodak (2001:45) suggest five discursive strategies used in the analysis of any discourse, and those strategies are: nomination strategies, predication strategies, argumentation strategies, perspectivisation strategies and intensification and mitigation strategies. In order to reveal these strategies they suggest five questions to be answered:

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?
2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?
4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?
5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly; are they intensified or mitigated?(Reisigl & Wodak,2009:95-96).

DHA as an approach to CDA focuses mainly on the positive presentation of the self and the negative presentation of the others (Reisigl & Wodak,2001:30).

4.1 Nomination/Referential Strategies

It means constructing social actors, phenomena, events and actions as part of in-groups or out-groups throughout the use of membership categorization devices including metonymies, tropes, depersonalizing metaphor or synecdoche (parts standing for the whole or whole for the part)(Reisigl & Wodak,2001:45). This strategy mainly adopts Van Leeuwen's SAA with some modifications (ibid: 47)

Van Leeuwen (1996:54) states that social actors are referred to in terms of the major categories by means of which a given society or institution differentiates between classes of people. In our society these include age, gender, provenance, class, wealth, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and so on.

The simplest and most elementary form of linguistic and rhetorical discrimination is that of identifying persons or groups of persons linguistically by naming them derogatorily, debasingly or vituperatively. For example the

anthroponomical term **Niger** is sufficient to give a racist and ethnicist meanings and the person who utters such a word can be considered a racist person against African American people (Reisigl & Wodak :45). Below are the most important nomination strategies:

4.2 Predication Strategies

After constructing and identifying social actors, phenomena, events and actions linguistically; they are provided with predications which can be realized as stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive trails in the linguistic form of implicit or explicit predicates(Reisigl & Wodak,2001:45). Through the use of predication strategies speakers can present themselves positively and present the others negatively (ibid:55).

4.3 Argumentation Strategies

In these strategies justifications and legitimizations are given in order to draw positive or negative attributions of social actors, phenomena or events. Topoi are defined as part of argumentation which belong explicitly or tacitly to the obligatory premises of an argument. They are content-related warrants or conclusion rules which connect the arguments with the conclusion or the central claim and therefore provide justification (Reisigl and wodak, 2001: 102). Topoi are crucial in detecting seemingly convincing fallacious arguments in political debates and genres.

Fallacies in argumentation are also wildly used by politicians in political speeches and interviews. If one wants to analyze the persuasive, manipulative, discursive legitimation of racist, ethnicist, nationalist, sexist and other forms of discrimination and the pseudo-argumentative backing and strengthening of negative, discriminatory prejudices, one encounters many violations of the argumentation rules. In rhetoric and argumentation theory, these violations are called ‘fallacies’ (Reisigl & Wodak,2001: 71).

5- Data Analysis

The data is selected from a news channel on YouTube, CBS New York News channel, which is a press conference for Trump the current president of the USA. The press conference is held on Nov. 2018 where Trump discusses immigration and his policies regarding the caravans of migrants from Latino countries who are making their way towards the USA at the time. It is available on: <http://youtu.be/TYXJ6Syg9vU>

5.1 Nomination Strategy

Trump names only one social actor using proper names, and this social actor is **President Obama** (L221) who is the democratic former president of the United States. Trump uses Deictics and phoric expressions to refer to main social actors, those that are **we** and **I** as part of the in-group to refer to the spokesperson himself and

to the administration/ government of the spokesperson presentation, while **they** as part of out-group is used mostly to refer to **illegal immigrants, and human traffickers**. **You** is used in two ways as positively to refer to/ speaks directly to American people and negatively to refer to /speaks directly to illegal migrants. The spacial deictics are used to refer to immigrants **these migrants** (L68), **those people** (L103,89) and **these caravans** (L76) present immigrants as out-group.

Trump uses professional anthroponyms to refer to some social actors, those are: **lawyers** (L93) specifically lawyers who accept migrants cases in the courts, **human smugglers** (L109) are named negatively as they are ones responsible for bringing migrants to the United States illegally, **human traffickers** (L159) are also negatively presented as their work is associated with and considered part of the flow of illegal migration. Finally, **MS-13 gang** (L33) is named as part of the migration process which is a highly criminal gang that work in smuggling drugs and people into the United States. It is also involved in killing and stealing.

Ideological anthroponyms are used to refer to some social actors ideologically as to create a certain picture about them and those are: **illegal migrants** (L76) to create a picture of migrants who come in huge numbers illegally as criminals. The xenonym **Illegal aliens** (L81,90) is employed to create a picture of migrants as strangers. **Large, well-organized caravans of migrants** (L44) to create picture that migrants come to the United States in huge numbers and their journey is previously planned. All ideological anthroponyms are given to describe immigrants as "criminals, strangers and caravans".

Trump uses collective names to name some of the main social actors and those are **Democrats** (L125,142) members of the Democratic party who prefer more open border policy, as opposite to the **Republicans** (L29) members of the Republican party who seek a restricted border policy. As Trump belongs to the Republicans, they are given in-group while the opposites the Democrats are out-group. **Americans** (L4), **the communities** (L6,23), **the American people** (L2), and **the poorest Americans** (L7) are named as the ones who bear the burden of illegal migrants/ they are the victims of the threat that illegal migrants abuse on America.

In economic anthroponyms, **the hard-working tax payers** (L169) **American taxpayers**(L4), and **American workers** (L4) are named as the ones who bear the economic burden of illegal migrants. Metaphor of water is used by Trump and those are: **influx of people** (L23), **giant flow**(L145) and **pouring up** (L278) to denote the uncontrolled, huge numbers of immigrants. Metaphor of war **invasion** (L45) is used as an alarm to the American people about the threat of immigration as invasion denotes destruction and dominance of immigrants. As well as metaphor of stranger **aliens** (L186) to present immigrants as different from the American citizens.

Objects, phenomena and events are discursively constructed by Trump into: Concrete objects/ phenomena/events, and those are **the border** (L31) **our borders**(L158), **southern border**(L205), and **southwest border**(L146). Trump names **the border** as an object to be protected then he specifies **the southern** then **the south**

west border as the most heated and dangerous border to be protected. **The wall** (L126) is the object named as means of protection from illegal migration.

Abstract objects/ phenomena/ events, on the other hand can be divided into political objects as follows: **the laws** (L27) and **the policies** (L80) of the United States regarding migration specifically **catch-and-release** (L) which states that anyone enters the United States of America will be released out. Economic objects are named by Trump such as **hottest economy** (L36) which shows how proud Trump is of the United States as having the best economy which is one of the reasons behind the flow of illegal migration. Trump's pride of his country is also seen by the use of the superlative form and many other nominations such as **the largest and most expensive immigration program** (L11) and **Greatest military anywhere in the world** (L63).

Trump uses ideological terms to construct some objects, phenomena and events and the most important is Immigration as a phenomenon which is seen as illegal, **illegal immigration** (L3). He also uses **break in** (L236) to support this vision of migrants for being out-laws. Metaphoric expression is used to refer to immigration as **an invasion**. He sees the laws and the judicial rulings in the immigration project as **Democratic-backed laws and left-wing judicial ruling** (L77) which means they are supported by loose abstraction because left-wings politicians in general and Democrats in particular are migration supporter who call for more open borders and vote for less restricted laws. He also describes them as **ridiculous** (L78), **bad** (L78), **incompetent and very, very stupid** (L125), **terrible** (L129), **laughing stock** (L126) and **a mockery** (L138) which all can make a clear picture how unhelpful the laws are in preventing illegal immigrants from entering the United States and how left-wing and Democrats do not vote for any new law that lead to more restricted borders. Trump uses two contrasted expressions to refer to the United States first as a **welcoming country** (L9) which means that the United States welcomes migrants all the time, however also describes it as **sovereign country** (L193). Trump names several countries: **The United States** (L) which is positively presented as **a welcoming country** and as **a sovereign country**. **Guatemala**(L239), **Honduras and El Salvador** (L114) are described as gates from which migrants flow. Also metonymic expressions are employed, such as **Mexico** (L70) instead of the government and **the United States** (L74) which is seen as a container. Trump describes his feelings as **sad** (L175) feelings for the huge numbers of illegal caravans which enters the United States. Processes and actions are discursively constructed into: material processors and those are **endemic abuse** (L138) to describe how illegal migrants are abusing migration laws negatively. **Threats** (L34), **affects**(L3), **hurts** (L4) and **burdens** (L4) are used to describe the negative consequences of illegal migration on America and the American communities. Verbal processes to describe claims of migrants as they are considered by Trump as **meritless claims** (L137) and **meritless asylum claims** (L91). It denotes that migrants who entered the United States legally are using illegal/meritless claims to deceive the government.

5.2 Predication strategy

I	- would like to provide an update to the American people regarding the crisis on our southern borders. - appreciate what Mexico is trying to do - will say that under Obama plan children were separated - hope there won't be any firing upon migrants by the military - take the same law (separation) and then softened it - don't want them (illegal migrants) in our country - told them (the military) to consider it (through rocks) a rife.
American Government We	- lead the world in humanitarian protection and assistance - have the largest and most expensive immigration programs anywhere on the planet. - have issued 40 million green cards since 1970 - won't allow our generosity to be abused by illegal migrants - can't allow that (communities to be left to bear the cost and the influx of people). - have done a great job with the laws that we have. - we are moving in tremendous numbers of people to get out the gangs that cone in illegally. - have more workers that any time in the history of the country. - have more people working and people want to come in. - we don't want (caravans of migrants) in our country. - will find that (keeping caravans out of the United States) through the legal process - want them (migrants) to come into our country very much. - need people to help us with all the companies coming in. - have already dispatched for the border - hope nothing happens (at the border between the migrants and the military) - are totally prepared (for the attacks of the migrants) - are getting rulings that are so ridiculous - have to put up with it (the ridiculous laws) - are not releasing anymore - are going to catch - are not releasing them (illegal migrants) into the community. - have millions of people that have been released into the community.

	- are putting up massive cities of tents. - have no idea how (most of illegal migrants) got there into the United States. - have witnessed a staggering 1,700 percent increase in asylum claims since 2010. - are not doing any of the things that were done for so many years (allowing/releasing immigrants) into the United States. - have gotten a lot of them (aliens) - are moving them (aliens) out. - are so foolish with our laws that we allow this (immigrants bringing drugs with them) to happen. - have to have our borders. - we have already started (building the wall) - want to build it (the wall) at one time. - will hold them (illegal aliens) - will end catch-and-release. - are not releasing [illegal immigrants] any longer - must finish the job that we started by being strong at the border - have no choice but to defend our country - actually put it (separating children from parents) so that didn't happen (huge number of illegal migrants) - are not going to continue and try to continue what we are doing (separation) - will consider that (migrants throwing rocks at the military) a firearm - are looking at not doing that (paying Salvador and Honduras) to keep illegal migrants away from the United States. - don't have the facilities to hold people. - are building the tents. - will hold them (illegal migrants) in tents. - will be doing an executing order sometime next week. - are holding so many people that our facilities are being overrun. - will be holding the family and the children together. - have no idea why they are (illegal migrants) - will be deporting those people (illegal migrants) - will consider that (migrants throwing rocks at the military) the maximum
Migration	- crisis - illegal - affects the lives of all Americans

	- hurts American workers - burdens American tax payers. - undermines public safety - places enormous strain on local schools, hospitals and communities in general - taking precious resources away from the poorest Americans - costs our country billions and billions of dollars every year. - mass, uncontrolled - unfair to the many wonderful, law-abiding migrants - threatens to become even more hazardous - is a problem - is an invasion - a giant flow that contained illicit and deadly narcotics on the southwest border. - an influx that threatens to overwhelm the immigration system and the communities - poses unacceptable dangers to the entire nation -uncontrolled masses of people - is not political
immigrants	-are illegal -are forming caravans - are aliens - are influx of people - want to take advantage of that (the good economic situation in the USA) - have to come in through merit - have to come in legally - large well-organized caravans are marching towards the southern border - are tough people - have violently overrun the Mexican border - are a lot of young, strong men. - have overrun and hurt badly Mexican Soldiers - have injured, have attacked - will not be allowed into the United States - should turn back now because they are wasting their time. - should apply to come into the country - have to be wonderful people that are going to love our country and work hard. - have refused the offers of Mexican asylum - are not looking for protection - are not legitimate asylum-seekers because they would be able to get it from Mexico

	- don't want to stay in Mexico they want to come into the United States - are drawn by the country by Democrats backed laws and left-wing judicial rulings - are going to stay until the deportation heavily or the asylum hearing takes place. - use fraudulent or meritless asylum claims to gain entry into our great country. - are given a phrase to read which they never heard before and don't believe in it. - are given a little statement to read then they are supposed to be qualified. - will wait for long periods of time. - come of huge numbers as the size of Vermont or bigger. - are becoming professionalists in migration law. - disappear into the country and never get to see a judge. - don't care because they are in the country and nobody knows where they are. - who abuse or defraud the system - have got some big medical problem before getting into the United States. - are rushing the border - will no longer get a free pass into the country by lodging meritless claims in seeking asylum - have to present themselves lawfully at a point of entry - who choose to break the laws and enter illegally - broke into Mexico - throw stones, rocks at the Mexican military and Mexican police - badly hurt police and soldiers of Mexico - are deported once they go to court - are told to come to the court but they disappear into the United States and never to be seen again. - are throwing rocks viciously and violently
The Democrats	- have terrible policy with regards to migration - are the reasons behind laws that give illegal migrants the right to stay in America - are terrible politicians - don't want to vote to change the migration laws - who are largely responsible - have a vision to offer illegal migrants free health care, free welfare, free education and even the right to vote
The Republicans	- are in union to change the migration laws - want to make strong borders

	- want to get rid of any crime because of the borders
The migration laws	- are so bad - are incompetent - are democrat backed - are activated by left-wing judicial rulings - read to the release of illegal aliens into the community - are incompetent, very, very stupid laws - are the laughing stock all over the world - are terrible for the country - are endemically mockery - are a mockery
President Obama	- had a plan to separate children from the parents - separated the children from the parents - separated children from families

5.3 Argumentation Strategy

Line number	Claim	Topoi or fallacy
1-22	Claim 1: Illegal migration is crisis that hurts American workers; burdens tax payers and costs America a lot of money. Illegal migrants are breaking the laws, defying the rules and violate the borders and their entrance is unfair for wonderful, law-abiding immigrants.	Topos of definition: Illegal migration is defined as a crisis then it has the qualities of a crisis. Topos of burden: Illegal migration is a burden upon American workers and tax payers. Topos of threat: Illegal migrants are a threat to the security as well as a threat to take the place of law-abiding immigrants.
23-35	Claim 2: The American communities are left to bear the cost of illegal migration. Huge numbers of people are trying to cross the borders illegally. The Republicans are trying to charge migration laws. However, the Democrats are not voting which leads to the rise of gangs who come with illegal migrants.	Topos of burden: Illegal migration is a burden that costs the American communities a lot. Topos of numbers: Huge numbers roughly 1.500 to 2.000 illegal migrants are trying to cross the American borders which is more than any nation can bear. Fallacy of blame shifting: Democrats should be blamed because they don't want to vote on changing the migration laws.
39-52	Claim 3: The economy of the country is at its best condition	Topos of cause: illegal migrants in the caravans are coming to American

	which is the cause behind the large, well-organized caravans of migrants. These caravans are similar to an invasion. Illegal migrants have violently overrun the Mexican border. They are strong young men.	due to its good economy. They are economical migrants no asylum seekers. Topos of threat: illegal migration are violent and they come in huge numbers like an invasion. They are a threat to the security of the country. Topos of History Illegal migrant have violently overrun the Mexican border so they will do the same thing at the American border.
53-60	Claim 4: illegal caravans are not going to enter the USA unless they apply to enter legally. There is a need for workers but only those who would behave in a good way, love the country and work hard are going to be taken as legal migrants.	Fallacy of Argumentum ad baculum (argument to the cudgel): Trying to frighten illegal caravans by telling them to turn back because they are just wasting their time. They are not going to enter the USA. Fallacy of legitimization: only legal migrants are going to enter and they should apply to legally, be good, love the country and work hard.
61-65	Claim 5: The military of the United States are going to protect the borders. They are prepared to defend the country from any attack by illegal migrants.	Fallacy of Argumentum ad baculum (argument to the cudgel): trying to frighten the illegal immigrants who are given orders to fight back. Topos of threat: illegal migrants are threat because they violent.
65-72	Claim 6: Mexico offered asylum to the caravans. However, they refused the offer, which means they are not looking for the protection, they want to come to the United States. So they do not deserve asylum in the USA.	Fallacy of legitimization: illegal migrants are not legal asylum seekers because they are offered asylum in Mexico but they refused it. They are economic migrants.
73-85	Claim 7: Asylum is not for people who live in poverty. It is for people who need protection and the people in the caravans are looking for better life standards. They can enter the USA only because of the Democrats and their bad ridiculous laws and judicial	Topos of definition: asylum is only for protection. It is not for economic immigrants and the people in the caravans are economic immigrants and not asylum seekers. Fallacy of blame shifting: Illegal immigrants can only enter the USA because the Democrats had laws. Topos of saviour: Trump is going to

	rulings. But under Trump's administration there will be no release for illegal migration: they are going to be caught.	save the USA by holding illegal immigrants and not releasing them in the society.
	Claim 8: Millions of illegal migrants have been released over the years. But they have disappeared in America and never come back for court cases. However, they will be deported soon.	Topos of numbers: millions of illegal migrants is a huge number which causes a lot of problems in America. Topos of saviour: Trump's administration will deport illegal migrants and save the country.
	Claim 9: Illegal aliens are using fraudulent or meritless asylum claims to enter the country due to the loopholes in the migration laws. They cannot be qualified for asylum only because they read a statement given to them by lawyers and others. They do not even believe in the statement. However, this will change because Trump is not going to release any longer.	Topos of legitimization: illegal aliens are not legal and they don't even believe in the statement they read in their asylum claim. Fallacy of blame shifting: lawyers and others are the cause behind abusing the migration laws. Topos of saviour: Trump will save the country by holding illegal migrants and not releasing them in the security.
	Claim 10: Under Trump's administration there are really 700,000 aliens waiting adjudication of their claims and their numbers are increasing. The total number could be 10 million it could be 12 or even 20 million since the past administration doesn't have exact records.	Topos of numbers: Huge numbers of illegal aliens are burdening the judicial system as well as the American community. Fallacy of blame shifting: past administration is to be blamed for these huge numbers because they didn't act to decrease it.
	Claim 11: Human smugglers and human traffickers are using migration laws to enter the United States as migrants. They are abusing asylum programs. Asylum claims have increased to 1,700 percent since 2010.	Fallacy of post hoc, ergo propter hoc: If immigration happened before human smugglers and human traffickers then it happened because of immigration. Topos of numbers: numbers show that asylum claims have increased hugely then asylum laws must be changed.

	Claim 12: Illegal migrants have become professionals is setting the caravans. Honduras and Salvador's governments are involved in pushing these caravans to the United States. Money is passed by unknown people to set the caravans.	Topos of threat of illegal caravans to the security of the United States since there are people trying to harm the security of the USA by pushing the caravans.
	Claim 13: Any illegal migrant who is released into the USA gets a three and a half year court case which is a very stupid Democrat law.	Topos of burden: illegal migrants are burdening the a judicial system. Fallacy of blame shifting: The burden is happening because of the Democrats.

130-137	Claim 14: most of the claims of illegal aliens are rejected. However once illegal alien enter the USA they disappear because they don't care to have legal status. Now there is more than million alien who received final orders of removal but they are still in the country. Again Trump's administration will remove them out of the country.	Topos of legitimization: Illegal aliens are staying in the USA illegally. Topos of numbers: million alien are still in the country after having final orders of removal. This causes a lot of problems. Topos of savior: Trump will remove illegal aliens who received final orders and save the country.
138-144	Claim 15: The immigration system in the USA is very bad because of the Democrats who refuse to vote in order to change it. And now illegal migrants are abusing these laws taking the place of legitimate asylum seekers. Those illegal migrants are law-breakers who should not be allowed into the country.	Topos of definition: The immigration system is bad then it must be changed. Fallacy of blame shifting: shifting the blame to the Democrats as a reason for the immigration crisis. Topos of threat of illegal migrants who are considered as criminals.
145-155	Claim 16: The giant flow of illegal migrants on the southern border is bringing all kind of drugs with 100% of heroin and 90% of cocaine as well as meth and ultra-fentanyl. These drugs are killing the youth. It destroys the lives and kill more than 70, 000 Americans every year. All this happens because of the foolish immigration laws.	Topos of cause: because of the giant flow of illegal immigration which makes it impossible to control the border. Drugs are entering the USA. Topos of numbers: 100% of heroin and 90% of cocaine enter the USA every year which shows how dangerous the southern border is and now allowing illegal migrants to the USA can lead to the death of the youth. Fallacy of blame shifting: Shifting the blame to the immigration laws.
156-164	Claim 17: The influx of illegal migrants threatens to overwhelm the immigration system and the communities in the USA. It poses unacceptable dangers to	Topos of burden: The influx of illegal migrants is burdening the immigration system and the community in the USA.

	the entire nation. Thus the borders must be controlled to stop the caravans which bring not only people but drugs and criminals (human traffickers) who steal children and woman.	Topos of threat: The caravans are a threat to the security of the USA because it is not only bringing people but drugs and criminals.
165-171	Claim 18: If these caravans are allowed to enter the country more caravans will follow. However; once they arrive the Democrats starts offering them free health care, free welfare, free education and even the right to vote. And the hard working tax payers are going to pay for that. Illegal immigrants are also bringing diseases to the USA.	Topos of threat: accepting this caravan is a threat to the country because more caravans will come in the future. Fallacy of blame shifting: the democrats are to blame for the flow of caravans because they help immigrants rather than stopping them. They are doing so only for the votes. Topos of threat: Illegal migrants are a threat to the health of the Americans.
179-185	Claim 20: Trump's administration is finishing a plan to stop the abuse of the asylum system to eventually stop the dangerous influx of illegal migrants and to control America's sovereign border. Once the borders are made strong by building a wall illegal migrants will not be able to enter the USA.	Topos of svaieur: Trump is saving the country by finishing a plan to stop the abuse of the asylum system as well as building a wall to protect USA. Topos of threat: the influx of illegal migrants is a danger to the American lives.
186-204	Claim 21: Illegal aliens are no longer going to get free pass into the country by exploiting meritless claims in seeking asylum. They are going to be hold for a long time and only lawful migrants are allowed to enter. This is the only solution to the crisis. Thus the congress has to overcome open borders obstruction. However, any great immigration plan is not going to be accepted by the Democrats who don't only have terrible open border policy but they are bad politicians as well.	Fallacy of legitimization: only lawful migrants are allowed. Illegal immigrants will not enter the country by exploiting meritless claims. Topos of urgency: The congress must act once to vote for a law to overcome open border policy. Fallacy of blame shifting: The blame is shifted to the Democrats who refuse to change the migration laws. Fallacy of Argumentation and hominem: verbally attacking the Democrat's personality by calling them bad politicians.
205-213	Claim 22: The number of illegal immigrants will be decreased when the USA becomes strong at the border. Specially the southern border which is a big problem that brings criminals who are drug smugglers. The drugs are destroying the fabric of the country. Thus Trump is obliged to work at once to defend the country by being strong at the border.	Topos of threat of illegal migrants crossing the southern borders bringing drugs with them. Drugs are destroying the fabric of the country. Topos of savoiur: Trump is going to save the country by controlling the southern border. Topos of urgency: Trump is working at once.
218-229	Claim 23: separating children from their	Topos of authority: The separation is

	parents is a must to stop the huge flow of people. However; the separation was started by president Obama and Trump's administration will continue to do so to make it difficult for people to come to the USA.	legitimate since president Obama legitimated it.
233-234	Claim 24: Illegal migrants in the caravans are violent. Trump gave an order to the military to interfere in case they try to forcedly cross the border or throw rocks at them like they did in Mexico. All the caravans have been formed because of Guatemala along with Salvador and Honduras. They have not stopped it before it started.	Topos of threat: illegal migrants are violent thus they are a threat to the security of the USA. Fallacy of Argumentation ad baculum (argument to the cudgel) Trump is trying to frighten illegal migrants by the military. Topos of history: illegal migrants throw rocks at the Mexican police. Thus they will do the same to the American military. Fallacy of blame shifting: the blame is shifted to the countries where the caravans formed.
246-247	Claim 25: stopping illegal migrants on the border and detainee those who try to enter forcedly is totally legal because it is not merely immigration, it is an invasion.	Topos of legitimization: stopping illegal migrants and detaining them is totally illegal. Topos of definition: immigration is defined as an invasion. As huge numbers of people violate the borders of a country forcedly.

5.3 Qualitative Analysis

This study is concerned with the way Trump is dealing with immigration with regard to his nationalist attitude and awareness of his identity as opposite to the identity of immigrants approaching the USA. He has used discursive strategies in order to pursue his audience and maintain dominance of power of an imagined self of his nations the 'Us' concept vs. the alienation of the others 'Them' which is clearly seen through the construction of nomination strategies of the in-groups and the out-groups. Trump sets the in-group by people who are legal citizens in the USA, through victimization as they are seen as victims of the open border policy. Trump, his government and the Republicans are seen as Saviors of the nation and its people who live within a sovereign border. Immigrants on the other hand are out-groups, they are criminalized through criminalization utterances such as : illegal, frauds, smugglers, human traffickers, and gang members. Democrats along with the former president Obama who are supporters of open borders are seen as out-group since they are to blame for the negative consequences of illegal immigrant as they set the laws and they refused to vote for any change in them. Thus Trump is a civic nationalist who put the interest of his people and nation first as he identifies his nation with its diversity. However his implicit reference to the southwest border and the need for building a wall to stop Hispanic immigrants can show the other face of nationalism which is

White nationalism as Trump is aware of the demographic change of the population in the USA which predicts that Hispanics are going to be a majority within ten to twenty years.

5.4 Qualitative Analysis

Throughout this analysis a vivid account about frequencies and percentage of the used strategies will be drawn in order to show how Trump applies discursive strategies in his rhetoric. Starting with nomination strategy: Trump names only one proper name, (3) diectics, (4) professional anthroponym, (4) negative ideologies, zero religious anthroponym, (6) collective names, (2) economic anthroponym. (2) metonymies, (4) metaphors, zero synecdoche, (1) concrete object, (4) political objects, (1) economic object, zero religious objects, (11) negative ideological objects, (5) spatialisations, (5) material processes, (2) mental processes and (2) verbal processes. Thus Trump is only interested in specifying social actors rather than he is interested in generalization and naming immigrants negatively using negative ideologies. He highlights the economic effects rather than religious ones. He also uses material processes a lot to show the tangible effects of immigrants

In predication strategy Trump gives (133) predications. I (7), we (42), Republicans(3), the community (1), Mexico (1), immigrants (43), immigration (19), Democrats (5), migration laws (10), and Obama (3).Which shows that Trump is interested in presenting negative others rather than presenting the positive self although the use of predications of the two groups is very close.

In Argumentation strategy, Trump uses Topos of definition (4), burden (7), numbers (6), threat (12), cause (2), history (3), savior (5), urgency (3), authority (2), responsibility and fallacy of blame shifting (8), Argumentum ad baculum (7), legitimization (9), Argumentum ad hominem (1).Which shows that Trump tries to justify his anti-immigration rhetoric by criminalizing immigrants by showing them as a threat to the security and a burden on the economy as well as legitimization of the procedures taken against them. He shows himself as a savior at the time he blames the democrats and Obama for any negative effects of immigration.

6. Conclusions

The research has come up with the following conclusions:

1- Trump is a nationalist who hold national prejudice against strangers\immigrants whom believed to be different from him. Immigrants are constructed linguistically as criminals, violent, burden and a threat. He tries to criminalize immigrants to be out-group and victimize his nation to be in-group, so the first hypothesis is verified.

2- Trump presents himself with the unique 'Self' as he uses positive self presentation. He presents himself as protector of the nation and savior of its culture, heritage, and religion. While using negative self of 'Others' is to present immigrants and their supposed allies left-wing politicians, thus the second hypothesis is verified too.

3- Trump justifies his nationalist rhetoric against immigrants by supporting his argument through the use of different fallacies and topoi in order to give logical reasons for his prejudice and to persuade the public to accept his opinions without being accused of being xenophobic or nationalist, so the third hypothesis is verified as well.

4- Trump believes that the sovereignty of his nations is threatened by immigrants who will change the demography, culture, and religion of the nations. Trump believes in the need of concrete wall to keep Hispanics away from America as they are considered the most rapidly increasing population in the USA.

6-The alienation of immigrants in America the bonding is based on national identity thus the alienation of immigrants is based on civic nationalism and the will of putting the citizen and their interest first.

References

- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. (1st ed.). London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*, (2nd ed.). London: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). "Critical Discourse Analysis". In Van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage, 258-284.
- Flowlerdew, J. (2008). "Critical Discourse Analysis and Strategies for Resistance". In Bhatia, V. K. J. Flowerdew & R. Jones (eds). *Advances in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 195-210.
- Hart, C. & Cap, P. (2014). *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Hart, C. & Lukes, D. (2007). *Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Analysis: Application and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: MPG Books Ltd.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2000). *The Semiotics of Racism: Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vienna: Passage Verlage.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2009). "The Discourse Historical Approach (DHA)". In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Trappes-Lomax, H. (2004). "Discourse Analysis". In Davies, A. & Elder, C. (eds). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse & Society*. V. 4, pp. 249-83.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). "Critical Discourse Analysis". In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 352-371.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis : Theory and Inter-disciplinarily*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2001). "The Discourse Historical Approach". In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 63-95.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Internet Sources:

<http://youtu.be/TYXJ6Syg9vU>