Make America Great Again
A Rhetorical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump’s Immigration Speech

Diana Sarbass
Malmö University
Spring 2017
Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to examine Donald Trump’s Immigration speech that was held September 1, 2016, in Phoenix, Arizona. The speech was a part of his campaign before he was elected president of America. The focus will be on how Donald Trump represents immigrants and talks about immigration. The research questions are how Donald Trump portrays immigrants and immigration and in what terms immigrants and immigration are argued to be a security risk for the country. The representation of the “Other” and Securitization are the theories that will be applied in the study of the speech. Discourse analysis will be used to find out what his messages are and what his perception of immigration is. The messages are based on the discourses that his language may produce through rhetoric which is the second method. The result of the analysis shows that he takes support from the discourses of “us” and “them”, security and nationalism that is a part of a larger political discourse. Immigrants are rhetorically framed as a security threat by describing them as criminals. He paints the picture of America having an immigration crisis. He mainly uses pathos, as a means of persuasion, to appeal to the audience’s emotions of anger, fear and frustration.
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1 Introduction

"When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us [sic!]. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people" (Sky News 2016-09-01).

The quote was made by Donald Trump on June 16, 2015, during the launch of his presidential bid at Trump Towers in New York (Sky News 2016-09-01). The announcement speech was described as a “political disaster”, especially because of how he described immigrants and the word “rapists”. The Trump campaign has been referred to as a spectacle which consisted of feuds, slurs and alternative facts (The New Yorker 2016-09-26). The Huffington Post announced in 2015 that they would put all news of his candidacy in the entertainment section rather as a political coverage (The Huffington Post 2015-07-17). Immigration is considered to be Donald Trump’s signature platform (USA Today 2016-08-30). Moreover, it is not only his political standpoints regarding immigration that has gained attention but also his language style to get more voters into supporting his campaign. His speeches have contributed to his image as a political outsider (Daily Mail 2016-03-16).

The thesis will be based on a rhetorical discourse analysis of Donald Trump’s Immigration speech. It was held during his campaign as the presidential candidate, on September 1, 2016, in Phoenix, Arizona (Donald J. Trump 2016-08-31). Rhetoric is a part of discourse which will connect the speech to a bigger perspective on society. It is of importance to study how he tries to convince the American people and the rest of the world that his view on immigration is the right one to make America “great” again.

1.1 Aim and Research questions

The thesis will study Donald Trump’s Immigration speech that was held on September 1, 2016, in Phoenix, Arizona (Donald J. Trump 2016-08-31). The aim is to investigate how he rhetorically positions himself and tries to reach out to the audience with his promises of change. A rhetorical and discourse analytical perspective will contribute to a more profound understanding of how Donald Trump talks about immigrants and immigration in the speech.


**Research questions**

1. How does Donald Trump portray immigrants and immigration?
2. In what terms are immigrants and immigration argued to be a security risk for the country?

**1.2 Delimitations**

The material will only consist of his formal speech and not official documents or policies about immigration. The thesis is based on rhetoric as a method and then it is necessary to analyze what he expresses himself. The speech has been chosen because it was important in the process of becoming a president and has received much media attention. The focus is the written statements and not the visual aspect of it since that is not of relevance to the aim and research questions which are focused on how he speaks, from the perspective of social science. The thesis also delimitates from statements he has made in social media, mass-media and the general public’s opinions on his speech.

**1.3 Donald Trump Biography**

A basic biography of the rhetorician is relevant to present since Donald Trump lacks a career in the political field. The background will contribute with an understanding of the context of Donald Trump and if he refers to his experiences in the speech to establish himself as the best fitted candidate to become the president.

Donald J. Trump is the 45th president of America. He became the Republican nomination for president in July 2016, after seventeen Republican contenders suspended their campaigns. He won the election on November 8, 2016. His campaign slogan was “Make America Great Again” which is his intention to do as the president (The White House Government n.d). The campaign has been considered as controversial because his political promises have been about building a wall between America and Mexico and ban immigration by Muslims. There have been massive protests at his campaign and when he became the president. Furthermore, he is the first president in America without a political career. Donald Trump is one of Americas most famous billionaires. He is known for the properties bearing his name and he has also developed hotels and casinos. Additionally, he has built an empire in the entertainment business by being the owner of Miss Universe, Miss USA, and Miss Teen USA beauty pageants between 1996 to 2015. He has hosted the reality show, “The Apprentice”, during 14 seasons for NBC (BBC 2017-01-20).
2 Previous Research

This chapter provides an overview of scholars and their research on political communications and immigration rhetoric. Murray Edelman has studied the rhetoric of presidential candidates. Vanessa B. Beasley has studied presidential discourse. Damien Arthur and Joshua Woods have studied president’s immigration rhetoric. Roderick Hart has studied presidential speeches.

Edelman’s research (see 1971, 1985, 1988) has contributed with knowledge within political communications. His research on elections identified three elements: language during campaigns, leadership and inattention. In election campaigns, hortatory language is the most common style to use which is designated to persuade the voters to think that their votes matter. Campaign language is ritualistic by repeating unquestioned beliefs. Leaders tries to gain support by dramatizing their capability to handle threats, take responsibility and show themselves as bold. The results were that candidates wish to create an image of difference between themselves and the opponents to mobilize voters. This may be done by defining groups as the enemy. Furthermore, the campaign can only sustain itself if it gets attention by the media and the citizens (Hershey 1993: 125). Edelman has studied the construction of enemies in campaigns. The result is that there were direct or indirect references to enemies such as welfare recipients, homosexuals and factory owners that are fond of Mexico. It can indicate the nature of the culture during the specific time when the campaigns are held (Hershey 1993: 135).

Beasley has studied the interplay between the history of immigration and presidential discourse. For example, on September 20, 2001, George W. Bush spoke about 9/111 to Congress and the nation. Even though the topic of the speech was not immigration per se it was mentioned when discussing the terrorist attacks. He said that he has respect for the “peace-loving Islamic citizens” of America and Muslims around the world. Beasley argues that he did so to not provoke revenge and create an anti-immigrant view. He reminded the audience to not discriminate based on ethnic background or religion. His speech acknowledges the distrust of immigrants based on foreignness (Beasley 2006: 4). The research concludes that presidential rhetoric portrays immigrants as a symbol of hope and as a source of fear. Presidents has sometimes encouraged the public to feel that immigration is a threat even though presidents and

---

1 On September 11, 2001, al Qaida hijacked four planes. Two of the planes crashed into World Trade Center in New York, the third plane hit Pentagon in Washington DC and the fourth plane was found in Pennsylvania. It killed nearly 3 000 people (The Huffington Post 2016-09-09).
politicians have been aware of the benefits. They use rhetoric to make sense of immigration, for good and ill (Beasley 2006: 272).

Negative frames of immigration (illegality, criminality, terrorism, and economic threats) is found in 50% of presidents Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama’s speeches. The research by Arthur and Woods found that immigration rhetoric depends on the social context where certain social conditions that are present at the time of the speeches results in a more negative tone (Arthur & Woods 2013: 468). Woods and Arthur maintains that low economic indicators such as unemployment results in presidents being more negative regarding immigration. It enables them to blame immigrants in their speeches (2013: 472). The presidents only mentioned Arabs/Middle Easterners two times and only one of those had a negative frame (terrorism). Instead, the presidents were mostly concerned with Latino or Hispanic (Arthur & Woods 2013: 484). Arthur and Woods found that out of the 95 negative frames that were given by the three presidents, 80 took place in Texas (2013: 482). Roderick Hart (see Hart, 1984, 1987) explored the American political system by conducting text-analysis on presidential speeches and the places where they spoke (Gronbeck 2004: 148-149). Hart found that leaders, especially during elections, will discuss immigration in regions that deal with immigration issues (Arthur & Woods 2013: 473). His results are conformed in Arthur and Wood’s research since Texas is on the border to Mexico.
3 Theoretical Framework

There are different discourses about the “Other” and the thesis will study what traits Donald Trump may attribute to the “Other”. The theory of representation and the “Other” give different ways to interpret the speech, such as looking for poles of binary opposition and stereotypes where certain people, culture and countries are simplified. What kind of representation of immigrants and immigration that might be constructed through the language he uses in his speech will be analyzed. Securitization will contribute with knowledge of how Donald Trump may link immigration to the security of America. It connects culture to words and discourse. The purpose is to study if the content of the speech can be linked to the securitization process. The analysis will proceed from the typology of securitizing speech and explore if Huysmans types of security strategies are a part of Donald Trump’s rhetoric. Both theories are built on a social constructionist approach. Meaning is constructed and not “found”. Discourse, which works as the umbrella concept, refers to any approach of meaning, representation and culture. It constructs knowledge about immigration (Hall 1997: 5-6).

3.1 The “Other”

“Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices” edited by Stuart Hall lay the foundation of the first theory. It deals with the dichotomy between “us” and “them” and how otherness is constructed through language. It will provide a bigger understanding in how different groups of people and immigration may be represented in the speech.

Meaning, language and representation

Culture is about “shared meanings” and it is through language that meanings are produced and exchanged. Language is central to culture and meaning since it is shared through common sense access to language. Language operates as a representational system, such as written text and speeches, to represent to other people our thoughts, ideas and feelings. Representation through language is a part of the process where meaning is produced (Hall 1997: 1). Cultural meanings “organize and regulate social practices, influence our conduct and consequently have real, practical effects” (Hall 1997: 3-4). A stone can be a stone, but also a boundary marker, depending on what it means. It is by how we represent things that we give them a meaning. According to Hall (1997), objects, people and events are given meaning by frameworks of interpretation - the words we use about them, the stories we tell, the image of them that we produce, the emotions that we associate them with and how we classify it. Meaning provides a
sense of identity and with whom we “belong” and the difference between groups. Members of the same culture have similar systems of representations, that is to share the same sets of concepts, images and ideas that enables them to think and view the world in the same ways. To be able to communicate these meanings, the speaker must use the same linguistic codes. Here, language is used in a broader sense, to be able to translate what “you” say to what “I” understand and think in similar ways (Hall 1997: 3-4). An individual’s conceptual map may differ from another one, in which case they would interpret the world in different ways. However, we are able to communicate because we share broadly the same conceptual maps to make sense of the world (Hall 1997: 18). The meaning is constructed by the system of representation (Hall 1997: 21).

The spectacle of the “Other”

How people that are scientifically different from “us” is represented, “otherness” and the representational practice of stereotyping contributes to the spectacle of the “Other” (Hall 1997: 225). The “Others” are exposed to binary forms of representation. They are represented through opposed and polarized extremes such as good/bad and civilized/primitive (Hall 1997: 229). Difference matters because it is essential to meaning which can be illustrated with white/black. We know what black is because we can contrast it with white. Meaning is relational. Moreover, there is a relation of power between the binary oppositions where one pole is the dominant one. In other words, it should be written white/black (Hall 1997: 234-235). Marking “difference” may stigmatize what is defined as the abnormal. Paradoxically, it also makes “difference” into something powerful because it is taboo or threatening the cultural order. It is ambivalent, because “difference” can be both positive and negative. On the one hand, it is necessary to produce meaning, culture and identity but on the other hand, it can create hostility and aggression towards the “Other” (Hall 1997: 236-238). Stereotyping “reduces people to a few, simple, essential characteristics, which are represented and fixed by nature” (Hall 1997: 257). Secondly, it is a strategy of splitting. It divides the acceptable from the unacceptable which in turn leads to exclusion of what does not belong. Thirdly, it’s a form of ethnocentrism – “the applications of the norms of one’s culture to that of others” (Hall 1997: 257-259).
3.2 Securitization

The theory shed light to how Donald Trump may represent immigrants and immigration. This part of the theory chapter is based on writings of Holger Stritzel, Jason Ackleson, Ariana Chebel d’Appollonia, John Tirman and Jeff Huysmans.

Security as a speech act

The theory of “Securitization” was developed by the Copenhagen School (Stritzel 2014: 11). Securitization can be defined as an intersubjective and discursive process where something is constructed as an existential threat. Securitization theory describes the discursive process of claiming that there is a threat as an “act of successfully attaching the meaning of “security” to a particular object, case or development” (Stritzel 2014: 4). For example, referring to the “Other” is necessary in the security concept in order to specify the conditions of insecurity. That “other” group of individuals are constructed through representation and thus, security concept arises out of discursive practices. A discursive practice is “speech acts” made by state elites to “securitize” issues. Something does not become a security problem until the elites declare it to be and then, it becomes an important part of the political agenda, which in turn justifies the solutions (Ackleson 2005: 168). Speech acts clarify the perceptions of threats, risks, security defense and national interest (Ackleson 2005: 180). The analysis of the speech will proceed from the typology of securitizing speech shown below (Stritzel 2014: 49). It will be applied to the arguments made in the 10-point immigration plan in the Immigration speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Something is dangerous (potentially an existential threat)</td>
<td>Contextualized description of the danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>If something is not done, the danger/threat will be realized</td>
<td>Contextualized description of the consequences of inaction plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Something should be done</td>
<td>Contextualized description of an action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>Proof or reasons in support of the claim/warning</td>
<td>Contextualized presentation of proof and/or reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stritzel 2014: 49).
Securitization of immigration governance

Immigration-security nexus has been powerful in America. America has a history of perceiving and treating specific groups of people as problems based on their national origin and religious or cultural distinctiveness (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: xxi-1). Western governments have been linking immigration policy to problems such as terrorism, trafficking and organized crime. Securitization of immigration governance is when Western political elites rhetorically describe immigration as a security threat (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 3). The lack of information about immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees may strengthen the public perception of immigration as something dangerous that the government cannot control. The political discourse fuels the perception that there is an existing crisis by emphasizing the consequences for job security, taxes, criminality, school, norms and social harmony (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 24).

Immigration-Security Nexus

After 9/11, global security got more connected with borders and immigration. The focus has been on Arab and Muslim communities within America and the American-Mexican border as a source of insecurity. The reaction after 9/11, have affected immigrants (Tirman 2006). The immigration and counterterrorism policies that were implemented after the attack have had consequences for the group of people that has been labelled as “security threats”. The security-driven measures adopted by the American governments since 9/11 have enhanced linkage between immigration and terrorism (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 15-16). Especially Muslims have been targeted by security-driven measures including increased police surveillance, banning of groups, and deportation (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 19). Muslims in America were being targeted and detained for a long period of time without being charged for crimes. Some were deported for minor violations of the law. Muslim charities were under investigation by the FBI and mosques are still under surveillance (Tirman 2006).

Security Strategies

The question of migration has the capacity to link internal security to larger political questions regarding cultural and ethnic identity, and challenges to the welfare state. Migration is treated as a meta-issue, a phenomenon that can be viewed as the cause of different problems (Huysmans 2000: 758-760). Huysmans three security strategies are internal security, cultural security and welfare security. The article has been written in a European context and America does not have a welfare state in the same way as Europe.
Internal Security

The assumption is that (illegal) transnational flows of goods, capital, services and people who enter a country will challenge public order and the law. If there are no internal border controls, then it is necessary to strengthen the external border. Other obstacles include visas, welfare provisions and social assistance which are alternative ways to control or limit the movement of people (Huysmans 2000: 758-759).

Cultural Security

Immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees represent cultural diversity and thereby challenge the myth of an existing national cultural homogeneity. This may result in nationalism, xenophobia and racism. Security rhetoric uses discourses of migration as a cultural challenge to social and political integration such as a class of civilization discourse to preserve traditions and rescue the Western world (Huysmans 2000: 762). Border control and internal security has a cultural dimension because individuals crossing it and entering the country are assumed to be different based on their cultural origin. Nationalism is a cultural discourse whereas racism is a biological discourse which is related to the inclusion versus exclusion of individuals (Huysmans 2000: 763-764).

Welfare Security

Access to social and economic rights is a part of the feeling of belonging in a welfare state. The distribution of social goods, such as housing, health care, unemployment benefits and jobs has become competitive. It results in a dichotomy between “us” and “them” where immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees becomes rivals to national citizens based on social services. It becomes a reason to limit the number of migration applications (Huysmans 2000: 767).
4 Method

A discussion about discourse is relevant to understand Donald Trump’s statements in the speech. What messages he sends out to the audience, i.e. the discourses, will be analyzed through the rhetorical tools he may use. Discourse will be defined by Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough, and by secondary literature from Stuart Hall, Sara Mills and Marianne Winther Jørgensen and Louise Phillips. The thesis takes support from rhetorical concepts to be able to answer the aim and research questions. It is summarized by literature from Jonathan Charteris-Black and Maria Karlberg and Brigitte Mral. The methods are interconnected since rhetoric produces discourses.

Researchers may answer a question either empirically and inductively or theoretically and deductively (6 & Bellamy 2012: 103). Interpretive research is often inductive, and begin with the empirical material to then show inductively “how the inference builds up to the interpretation” (6 & Bellamy 2012: 264). This thesis will be material driven by focusing on the speech. It is inductive since the thesis proceeds from not knowing what he says instead of presenting hypothesis and test the empirical material. The study can be understood as deductive to a certain extent, since it is assumed that Donald Trump talks about immigrants and immigration negatively. However, the study is mainly inductive because by reading the speech, the concepts and theories have been developed to analyze the material.

4.1 Discourse Analysis

The thesis will examine Donald Trump’s statements regarding immigration in his Immigration speech. It is through the discourses, i.e. his language, that he represents his topic (Hall 1997: 43). Discourse analysis (DA) will provide an insight on his messages which in turn will provide knowledge on his political view and the solutions to make America “great” again. The concept of discourse will be defined through the work of Michel Foucault while Norman Fairclough provides a bigger understanding of how to conduct the analysis.

Discourse

In any society, there are relations of power which constitute the social body, and these relations cannot themselves be established without the “production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse” (Foucault 1980: 93). Discourse make it possible to do interventions of surveillance, control and so forth (Mills: 120). This was illustrated in the theory chapter and how security driven measures has increased against certain groups. Discourse produces
knowledge through language. It constructs the topic and governs how it is talked and reasoned about. Discourse “rules in” certain ways of talking about immigration but also “rules out” and restricts other ways of talking about it (Hall 1997: 44). Foucault argues that discourse can be the general domain of all statements and sometimes an individualizable group of statements (Foucault 1984). By “the general domain of all statements” it seems to mean that discourse can be used to all statements that has a meaning and an effect. By “individualizable group of statements” he seems to indicate statements that form a grouping, such as the discourse of racism (Mills 2003: 53). According to Foucault, discourse can be seen as a system which “structures the way that we perceive reality” (Mills 2003: 55). The discourses make visible how Donald Trump may talk about immigration, migrants, asylum seekers and refugees. Through Donald Trump’s language, words and formulations, it will show what discourses he uses to fit his political interests.

**Discourse analysis of text**

Fairclough has developed DA for studying communications, culture and society (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 66). The questions to ask the text are: What discourses are drawn upon in the text, and how are they textured together? (Fairclough 2003: 193). Every discourse represents a specific way of speaking and understanding the world (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 13). This can be described as a discursive battle where they can compete with each other, one can dominate other discourses or they may complement each other (Fairclough 2003: 124). To identify discourses within a text one can a) identify the main “themes” that are represented by b) identifying the point of view which the main parts are represented (Fairclough 2003: 129). Fairclough’s approach to DA is based on language being an irreducible part of social life and interconnected with other elements. This means that an effective way of doing DA is through a focus on language (Fairclough 2003: 2). Texts may represent the social world in particular ways (Fairclough 2003: 9). The meaning-making depends upon not what is explicit but also what is implicit in a text – what is assumed (Fairclough 2003: 11).
4.2 Rhetoric

Rhetoric is called the art of persuading others and therefore, rhetoric and persuasion are inseparable, since any definition of rhetoric includes persuasion (Charteris-Black 2005: 8). The difference is that rhetoric is about communication from the hearer’s perspective while persuasion refers to the speaker’s intentions. Rhetoric stands for “ars bene dicendi”: the art of speaking well in public. The most rhetorically successful speeches are the most persuasive which is measured by the hearer’s responses (Charteris-Black 2005: 9). Therefore, Donald Trump’s speeches can be considered as successful because he became the president.

Context

In rhetorical analysis, it is not only the actual speech that is investigated but also the context, to be able to understand the background. The language is derived from a context and reflects the speaker’s conception of it. To learn something from a text, except for what at first glance seems to be the content, one needs to have a holistic perspective (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 21). This includes genre, the rhetorical situation, the audience and the rhetorician.

Genre

There are four different rhetoric genres: Genus deliberativum, Genus demonstrativum, Genus judicale and Homiletiken. The focus will be on genus deliberativum, the genre of political speeches. The aim of the speaker is to address or advice against important topics within a public setting (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 22-23). It is necessary to decide which character the speech has.

The rhetorical situation

Every rhetorical situation and text is controlled by rules. The number of rules and its character is depended on the situation, such as if it is a private, public or formal event. These factors are based on the text’s historical, political, social or economic context (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 22-24).

The audience

The audience affect the speaker’s way of expressing himself. Because of that, it is crucial to be aware of who the possible audience are. What audience did the speaker aim to reach? Who is the actual audience? (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 24).
The rhetorician

In speeches, the speaker and the writer of the speech, are not always the same person. Politicians often have an entourage of people consisting of speechwriters, special advisers and media experts. Together, they shape the presentation. Even if the speaker and the writer is the same person, it can still have been journalistically edited by someone else, so that the speaker’s opinions enhance, change or is misrepresented compared to the original text. It is also necessary to present basic biography of the speaker (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 26). The reason is to have background information regarding the rhetorician and make it easier to know when it is his own words or not. The background of the president has been presented earlier in the introduction. In this thesis, the analysis exceeds from the speaker and the writer being the same person.

The disposition of a speech

Disposition is not only about organizing a material. It is also a method to stepwise persuade the audience. The structure of the text has different function in the process of persuasion. The structure of an argument is divided into five parts: **Exordium, narratio, propositio, argumentatio** and **conclusio** (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 28). It is of importance to understand how the speech is disposed to be able to find a possible pattern of how he discusses immigration.

**Exordium** is the introduction of the speech. The aim is to get the audience attention and make it last. It starts with wishing everyone welcome or by an inventive sentence. The speaker must show himself as trustworthy, knowledgeable and committed. In the introduction, the speaker should also prepare the audience for what to come, which is called **partitio**. Examples of questions to ask the text are: What does the introduction look like? How does the speaker try to get the attention of the audience? What techniques are used? (Karlberg & Mraal 1998:28-29).

**Narratio** refers to the background of the argument and how well the speakers present the topic to the audience. A good narratio is short and clear. The content of the narratio depends on how the speaker has evaluated the audience and their knowledge, the topic and the situation. Examples of questions to ask the text are: Does the speaker provide a historical background to the topic? Are important circumstances that the audience should know about highlighted? Is anything left out, and in that case, why? (Karlberg & Mraal 1998:29).

**Propositio** is the central idea of a text. Sometimes, it is hidden within a statement, and formulated in other words. The central idea can also be ambiguous. **Antites** is when the speaker argues for their cause and against their opponent. Examples of questions to ask the text are: Does the text have a clear thesis, statement or exhortation? Is it clearly articulated or implicit
and where in the text can it be found? Does it change during the argumentation? (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 36-37).

Argumentatio, is when the speaker presents its arguments. It can be direct assertions or be presented indirect as questions, quotes etc. Furthermore, argumentation can be divided into two groups, principal argument and support argument where the principal argument comes first. Examples of questions to ask the text are: What are the arguments that support the central idea and where are they placed? (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 37-38).

Conclusio is the summary of the text. According to classical rhetoric, the ending should consist of a repetition of the strongest arguments, recapitulation, and a last appeal to the audience to support central idea of the specific topic. Examples of questions to ask the text are: How does the speaker summarize the text? What does the speaker emphasize? Does he provide a catchy or impactful concluding remark? (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 29).

Means of persuasion

*Ethos, logos* and *pathos*, are three means of persuasion in rhetoric. Ethos is about persuading the audience based on personality and credibility. Logos refers to logic and persuading the audience by reason. Pathos appeals to feelings (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31).

Ethos means to convince someone of the credibility of the speaker where the character of the speaker is more important than the actual message. Ethos is related to *delectare*, which is defined as entertaining. The speaker may refer to its background or relation to the topic in question or show individual characteristics. The concept of persona is a way to analyze the role of the speaker. Persona stands for a “mask” that the speaker wear in different situations to show the audience the necessary traits to be favored. For instance, referring to its own authority by emphasizing its professional proficiency. Another way of establishing trust is by creating a feeling of “us”, a communion, by referring to mutual ideals, values and experiences (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33).

Logos function is to inform the audience by appealing for their reasoning and critical judgment. The key point is to investigate to what extent the speaker relies on facts and other forms of objective argumentation. The degree of difficulty is also important: if the speaker takes the audience prior knowledge and interests into consideration and if it is enough. Lack of information can be a conscious decision to angle the topic (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34).
Pathos is about the motions of the speaker as well as influencing the motions of the audience. Depending on the purpose of the speaker, he can choose to arouse different feelings. Politicians might use opposite emotions such as hope or despair by painting a picture of situations we fear and then giving solutions for it. The central question is to understand what kind of feelings the speaker wishes to evoke, how and for what purpose (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35).

4.3 Validity and Reliability

In qualitative research, a reliable system of coding is consistent in the way that every time it is used on the same data, it produces the same code (6 & Bellamy 2012: 21). The material consists of the Immigration speech he held during his campaign (Donald J. Trump 2016-08-31). One speech does not provide a picture of how he generally speaks in speeches. It is one speech during a specific time in his campaign which means that he may give another type of speech about immigration as the president. On the other hand, the chosen speech is suitable for the aim of the thesis and contributes with depth. The methods and material are sufficient to analyze his rhetorical strategies and how immigrants and immigration is portrayed. A way of maximizing reliability is to be clear about how the observations are collected (6 & Bellamy 2012: 94). The research is transparent because of the clear description of the concept and operationalization in the theory and method chapters. It will make the interpretations of the analysis easy to follow (see Appendix for example of analysis). The reliability can be considered as low because the thesis cannot be generalized. Qualitative study depends on the researcher choosing the material, parts of the specific text, and interpret the material. Furthermore, in a rhetorical and discourse analysis, the interpretations of the research are likely to be subjective. This is common in qualitative research which weakens the internal validity of eliminating bias (6 & Bellamy 2012: 259). Validity is “the degree to which our statements approximate to truth” (6 & Bellamy 2012: 21). The research questions for the specific speech has been answered in an adequate way.

4.4 Ethical Aspects

The thesis is not based on interviews, meeting respondents and transcribing the answers which can have ethical implications. Instead, the thesis is about an official person and an official document that everyone has access to and are entitled to use. The research questions that are asked to the texts are not problematic. Donald Trump is not anonymous in the thesis since he is a public figure. Because of his position as the president of America, revealing the identity behind the speech is not an ethical problem. The speech is known to be his.
4.5 Position of the researcher

I am aware that my background has influenced the research problem and design. I have a Bachelor’s degree in Human Rights and a Bachelor’s degree in Media and Communication. The thesis will be a part of my Master studies in International Migration and Ethnic Relations. I also work as a social educationist at a refugee home for unaccompanied refugee minors. This passion for immigration issues can affect the possibility of being bias since I might have a preconceived idea about the topic and have followed his electoral campaign. This threatens the objectivity of the research which is “evidence based on observations that are independent of one’s feelings and thoughts of a specific phenomenon” (Rosenberg 2008: 132). The researcher has the power to choose the speeches and what statements to include in the analysis. Another researcher, who has another academically, professional and life background, might think that something else is more important to highlight. I am trying to be as objective as I can, but at the same time I have a specific position that might affect what I find important. To avoid subjectivity, the research design has presented the analytical tools, that the thesis will proceed from.

4.6 Material

The material consists of the Immigration speech from September 1, 2016, in Phoenix, Arizona (Donald J. Trump 2016-08-31). It is a speech that was held during his campaign, two months before he became the president. Donald Trump has promised to turn his statements into reality. Therefore, it is necessary to study his Immigration speech where he addresses the topic of immigration specifically, to understand what he aims to achieve to make America “great” again. A transcript of his speech is published on his own website but it is not a full transcript of what he said, it is 11 pages. Therefore, a transcript made by the New York Times (2016-09-01) will be used in the analysis to examine what he actually said since it is 21 pages.
5 The Study - Analysis

In the introduction to the thesis, a quote from Donald Trump’s first speech in his presidential campaign, was highlighted. Donald Trump established himself as the only candidate that talked about the topic that others preferred to avoid - immigration (The New Yorker 2015-08-19). To get a clarification of how he talks about immigration, the study is based on Donald Trump’s Immigration speech (Donald J. Trump 2016-08-31). The analysis follows the structure in the method chapter: context and disposition of a speech in rhetoric as well as discourse. The means of persuasion and the theory concepts are used as analytical tools.

5.1 Genre

Genus deliberativum, is present in the whole speech where he addresses and advices against ten points in his immigration plan (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 22). The genre is specifically highlighted in the typology of securitizing speech in 5.8 Argumentatio, where he mentions the immigration issues and provides solutions on how to approach the challenges. Another example of it is that he refers to illegal immigrants throughout the speech and his way of solving the problem is to send them back, “they will have one route and one route only”. They must seek legal status from their countries of origin which is a part of his new legal immigration system that is the theme of the plan (New York Times 2016-09-01).

5.2 The rhetorical situation

The speech was held in Arizona that has almost consistently voted Republican for two decades (The Telegraph 2017-02-24). He states that Arizona has a very special place in his heart², that he loves the people of the state and that “together we are going to win the White House in November”. When criticizing the Democrats, he claims that Arizona knows “better than most exactly what I’m talking about” (New York Times 2016-09-01). He does not explain more than that “they know”. In relations to logos, information is lacking and he assumes that the audience has prior knowledge and the same opinions as him (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). It is a rhetorical political move in line with ethos to create a feeling of “us”, sharing the same republican interests (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 33).

² A year before the Immigration speech, Donald Trump spoke at a rally in Phoenix, Arizona. Two dozen supporters stood behind him holding the sign “Trump, Make America Great Again”. It attracted thousands of people (CNN 2015-07-12).
A few hours before Donald Trump was expected to deliver the speech, he met with the Mexican president Enrique Peña Nieto. The meeting was held behind closed doors but the topics included the proposed border wall and ended with a dispute about the border wall payment. After the meeting, Mexico declared that they will not pay for it. In contradiction, Donald Trump insisted that they had only discussed the wall and not the payment for it (Chicago Tribune 2016-08-31). In the speech, he mentions the meeting with Mexico’s president.

“Towers, aerial surveillance and manpower to supplement the wall, find and dislocate tunnels and keep out criminal cartels and Mexico you know that, will work with us. I really believe it. Mexico will work with us. I absolutely believe it. And especially after meeting with their wonderful, wonderful president today. I really believe they want to solve this problem along with us, and I’m sure they will”. (New York Times 2016-09-01).

In line with ethos, the credibility of his statements increases when referring to meeting with the Mexican president shortly before the speech was held. The meeting itself can make it seem as he is capable of becoming the president. Furthermore, ethos is present as entertainment, where one can assume that the audience was curious of what was said in the meeting (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). However, when knowing the rhetorical situation, Enrique Peña Nieto has denied that Mexico will pay for it. Donald Trump does not address the Mexican president’s statement regarding the border wall. By not acknowledging it, his credibility is threatened. Donald Trump repeats that he believes that Mexico will do as he says but does not provide information on how it can be stated that Mexico has changed its mind about the border wall payment. Logos, may persuade the audience by angling the statement so it benefits him since he cannot rely on facts. Therefore, lack of information is a conscious decision (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). On the other hand, by repeating his trust in that Mexico will follow his lead, the feeling of hope is created in line with pathos, to reassure the voters that his plan will be realized (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35). In that way, his trip to Mexico can be viewed as a good public stunt. Moreover, according to him Mexico will pay for it but “they don’t know it yet, but they’re going to pay for it” (New York Times 2016-09-01). This quote implies that he did not talk about the payment of the wall during the meeting.
5.3 The audience

One of the most important factors of strategic political communication is microtargeting, i.e. adapting the messages depending on the audience. The central thing is not to reach everyone, the central thing is to win over certain target groups (Strömbäck 2009: 212).

American workers

Donald Trump is mainly talking to the American workers which he refers to as the “forgotten people”. According to him, his ten steps towards immigration reform is in the best interests of America and its workers. He claims that he and his administration are going to take care of the American workers by changing the immigration system that is currently only serving wealthy donors, political activists and powerful politicians. His politics on the other hand, serves the American workers (New York Times 2016-09-01. By stating that the immigration system benefits powerful politicians, he is excluding himself from the political elite. Through ethos, he takes the role as a worker too that knows how to help the people when in fact he is a billionaire and a politician in the most powerful nation in the world. He argues that the current immigration system has a negative impact on their “jobs, wages, housing, schools, tax bills and general living conditions” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Donald Trump does not rely on logos, such as facts or statistics to back up his argumentation on exactly how the system does not serve the American workers (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). Via pathos, the aim is for the workers to feel that they are being treated unfairly and being discriminate against. Donald Trump rhetorically combines decreased immigration with increased life quality for Americans. This is an example of Huysmans welfare security strategy. Social and economic rights is rhetorically described as a competition between “us”, the Americans, and “them”, the immigrants. To serve the American workers interests, migration should be limited (Huysmans 2000: 767).

African-American and Latino workers

Donald Trump tries to be inclusive, by saying that the concerns of immigration are expressed by citizens from all backgrounds. In relation to his trip to Mexico, he states that Mexican-Americans have done great contributions in America and that he has “love for the people of Mexico” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Twice in the speech, he includes African-American and Latino workers as American workers and “our citizens”. He expresses that “uncontrolled, low-skilled immigration” continues to reduce jobs and wages and that especially African-American and Latino workers are treated unfairly (New York Times 2016-09-01).
He portrays the African-American and Latino communities as homogenous. They are stereotyped into one group where their varieties, such as ethnicity or class, are simplified. He paints the picture of these workers as in need of help, but does not state why they are in an especially vulnerable position as requested in logos. Pathos creates feelings of anger for having to compete for something that undocumented immigrants are not entitled to and how their lifestyles changes because of immigration. The targeting is contradicting where he at one hand talks about Mexicans positively but on the other hand blames them for America not being a “great” country anymore. In that way, he makes a distinction between legal Mexicans and undocumented Mexicans. Donald Trump tries to create a feeling of “us” immigrants against the “Other” immigrants. “Us” who have entered America legally and who works hard against the “Other” immigrants who have taken “our” jobs. He tries to establish trust by creating a feeling of “us” workers through ethos since he has established himself as a worker too (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 33). The aim is to persuade the minorities in the audience to vote for him. However, ethos as a form of persuasion is not as successful as it could have been, since he is also making a distinction between these groups and white workers, immigrants and Americans. Nationalism and the exclusion of groups based on cultural origin is a form of Huysmans cultural security strategy (Huysmans 2000: 763-764).

Veterans, the police force and border-control agents

Vets are also referred to as “forgotten” and he claims that immigrants are being treated better than them. Other working groups he is targeting are the police force and border control agents. He urges the audience to “say hello to the police” and states that they are great people who does not get the credit they deserve. According to Donald Trump, his politics on immigration will contribute with local police not being abused by “thugs” anymore. He illustrates this by the proposed passage of legislation named “Detective Michael Davis and Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver”. He provides a vague background information, that it was two law enforcement officers that were killed by a “previously deported illegal immigrant”. Additionally, he promises to hire 5.000 more border control agents and emphasize that 16.500 of them have given him their endorsement (New York Times 2016-09-01). The numbers appeal for the audience critical judgment according to logos (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). Donald Trump legitimizes his political goals through the endorsement of border control agents. By pathos, he refers to the feeling of instability by targeting these workers, where there is no control when even police officers become victims and more border control agents needs to be hired. Furthermore, the word “thugs” stands for “a violent person, especially a criminal” (Oxford Dictionaries n.d). He
makes a binary opposition of Americans being law abiding citizens and immigrants as criminals. In line with Hall, immigrants are represented through polarized extreme of civilized/primitive (Hall 1997: 229). According to Chebel d’Appollina it is a securitization act based on fear which fuel the perception that there is an existing crisis that the government cannot control. It has consequences on criminality and social harmony (2015: 24). The focus, then, is on Huysmans’s internal security strategy. The assumption is that people who enter America via the American-Mexican border will challenge public order and the law (2000: 758-759).

*Angel moms*

Donald Trump targets the parents, family members and friends that have experienced their loved ones being victims of crime committed by undocumented immigrants. He says that he has met many parents who have lost their children due to “sanctuary cities and open borders” (New York Times 2016-09-01). He convinces the audience of his credibility through meeting with them personally before and during the speech. It acknowledges his relation to the topic and show his individual characteristics such as kindness via ethos (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). Furthermore, he highlights that American families have been permanently separated because of “preventable homicide, because of a preventable death, because of murder” (New York Times 2016-09-01). It implies that the Barack Obama’s administration has let it happen. He claims that he is going to ask Congress to pass “Kate’s Law” named after Kate Steinle who was murdered by an undocumented immigrant that had been deported five times (New York Times 2016-09-01). Additionally, the parents of ten victims of murder joins Donald Trump on the stage to introduce themselves and share their story. What the “Angel moms” said will not be presented since this thesis only focuses on Donald Trump’s rhetoric. According to logos, he presents background information on criminality of undocumented immigrants by this performance. In line with pathos, the information about this group of people establish feelings of sympathy but also fear. It sends the message that immigration must be restrained for the safety of the American people. The Angel moms are crucial to his “us” and “them” message (Vox 2015-09-01). This is a part of Huysman’s internal security strategy where the free movement of people should be limited (Huysmans 2000: 758-759). The immigration-security nexus is present where the goal is for the voters to feel that they and their loved ones are at risk of being murdered by people who are not supposed to be in America. He appeals to pathos for why undocumented immigration must stop. It is a persuading move that to a large extent is targeting women and/or mothers as voters.
Students

Once, he aims at students, more specifically “at-risk students”. Instead of spending money on illegal immigration he suggests that the money can be spent on them instead by giving out school vouchers (New York Times 2016-09-01). The speech is mainly targeting workers and “Angel moms” but addresses different audiences at the same time. It covers the spectrum of elderly people who have retired, workers and families, to young people. The strategic political communication is one of the main reasons for the victory of presidents and is a part of campaigns as well as achieving political goals (Strömbäck 2009: 197).

5.4 The Rhetorician

As mentioned before, in 4.6 Material, the transcript of the Immigration speech from Donald Trump’s own website is not a full transcript. It seems to only include the statements that was written and prepared for the speech. The text that is the basis of the analysis comes from the New York times (2016-09-01). When comparing the transcripts, Donald Trump can seem impulsive. That is confirmed by the fact that his administration did not include it in the official address on immigration. Rhetorically, it enhances the belief that the statements are his own and has not been changed to be “politically correct” and that it was not a part of the manuscript of the speech. As a rhetorician, he has added more statements.

5.5 Exordium

Donald Trump begins by stating that there is a lot of people that have come to hear his speech. He says, “that’s a lot of people” and “thank you, Phoenix” several times. He also says that he is glad to be back in Arizona and asks the audience if they remember what a “massive crowd” he had last time too. Thereafter, he uses parititio, by preparing the audience for the disposition of the speech and how it differs from his previous ones. Instead of delivering a rally speech, he will deliver a “detailed policy address on one of the greatest challenges facing our country today, illegal immigration”. Moreover, he gets the public’s attention by talking about his meeting with the Mexican president. He reveals that they agreed on the importance of ending “the illegal flow of drugs, cash, guns, and people across our border, and to put the cartels out of business”. He tells the audience that they had the first of many conversations and that in “the end we’re all going to win. Both countries, we’re all going to win”. America will win by establishing new and fairer relationships (New York Times 2016-09-01).
It implies that Mexico has taken advantage of America where there has been an imbalance between the countries. He makes it seem like there were no differentiation between the leaders during the meeting and that Mexico is open to continue discussing the issues of America’s security. The statement of more meetings to come strengthen the credibility of him as a leader as well as his policy to work. Through ethos he presents his favorable traits such as being diplomatic and able to discuss sensitive issues. That in turn, acknowledges his professional proficiency (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). Furthermore, Donald Trump argues that Mexico’s president agreed with his opinions which appeals for the audience reasoning and critical judgment that they should agree as well (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). Pathos is present by the feeling of optimism and that his solutions are likely to become reality. In relation to Huysman, the assumption is that (illegal) transnational flows of goods, capital, services and people who enter America is a threat to the internal security and have to be secured by a new external border (2000: 758-759).

5.6 Narratio

The background of the immigration problem is the failure of the leadership in Washington and that it must change. Thereafter, he explains that the immigration system is worse than anybody has realized but that the facts are unknown to the public. He argues that politicians do not want to talk about it because they have their own special interests. He claims that they spend money to cover the problems up because they make a fortune on it (New York Times 2016-09-01). But during the speech, Donald Trump will give America the truth. Donald Trump does not refer to himself as a politician but as one with the people. According to ethos, he wears a “mask”, for the audience to favor him and make him seem as a trustworthy candidate and not part of the elite (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). Donald Trump claims that other politicians talk about immigration reform as “amnesty, open borders, lower wages” when it should mean something else. He argues that to be able to change it, one must be able to talk about immigration honestly and without fear (New York Times 2016-09-01). Moreover, he does not go in depth about which leaders he is referring to or give a background information about what the current immigration system looks like, as in logos. He does not exemplify what the politician’s interests are and how they make a profit out of the immigration system. Via pathos he stirs up the feelings of the audience, of them being betrayed and deceived by the political elite. The main focus in the narratio of the speech is to provide background information about why the security of America is at stake. He provides detailed information about Americans who have died recently because of the open border policies of “Hillary Clinton’s administration”. He claims that she
and the Democrats have caused this “horrible, horrible thought process”. He does not back up his statements with facts about what he means by the Democrats “open border policy”. He tells the stories of five Americans who have been killed by illegal immigrants. It includes a student, a young man from Arizona, Kate Steinle whose proposed law was mentioned earlier, a 90-year-old man and a veteran. It implies that the politicians were aware of the risks. However, the Democrats system failed to stop them (New York Times 2016-09-01).

“Also among the victims of the Obama-Clinton open-border policy was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk and a really good guy from Mesa, Arizona. A lot of you have known about Grant. He was murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member previously convicted of burglary, who had also been released from federal custody, and they knew it was going to happen again.” (New York Times 2016-09-01).

Pathos may scare the voters into thinking that they or someone they know can be the next victim. He strategically brings up the case of Grant Ronnebeck which makes the danger more obvious and feel closer, that it has and will happen again in Arizona. Then he presents numbers from an official report according to logos, the report Accountability Office written in 2011. It found that “illegal immigrants and other non-citizens, in our prisons and jails together, had around 25,000 homicide arrests to their names, 25,000”. Additionally, they cost the country more than $113bn a year and “this is what we get” (New York Times 2016-09-01). The report makes his argumentation seem objective and relevant (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). The assumption is that illegal immigrants are to blame for the disruption of internal security. The “Others”, i.e. the non-citizens, are stigmatize and the “difference” threatens the cultural order (Hall 1997: 237). It is a dehumanizing rhetoric where the stereotyping reduces all illegal immigrants to criminals. According to Ackleson, the “Other” is used to specify the conditions of insecurity (2005: 168).
5.7 Propositio

The central idea of the speech is to secure the border, stop illegal immigration and reform the laws. Moreover, he claims that there are many “illegal immigrants” that are good people but that many of them are lower skilled workers with less education, who compete directly against vulnerable American workers”. He argues that these “illegal workers draw much more out from the system than they can ever possibly pay back” and that hurts a lot of Americans. (New York Times 2016-09-01). This is a part of the main argumentation which also suits his targeted audience. The improvements through the ten-step plan will make life better for the American people and thus, make America “great” again. His opponent, Hilary Clinton and the Democrats politics, are being criticized and blamed for the consequences of immigration. To illustrate, he says “innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty” (New York Times 2016-09-01). It is linked back to his solutions to secure the border and change the immigration system. According to proposition, the issue of security is explicit and found throughout the transcript of the speech. Moreover, he is consistent with his demands during the argumentation (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 36-37).

5.8 Argumentatio

The arguments are part of his ten-point immigration plan where he argues for how and why the immigration system should change. These are the central arguments of his speech and they are placed in the middle of the speech. It will be summarized through the typology of securitizing speech (Stritzel 2014: 49). Proceeding from the transcript of the speech, I have made eleven tables, as presented by Stritzel in the theory chapter. The tables examine what claims, warning and demands he makes and how he supports his arguments. The tables are introduced under the following headlines: The Wall, End catch and release, Zero tolerance for criminal aliens, Stop funding for sanctuary cities, Cancel Barack Obamas executive orders about immigration, Suspend Visas, Countries must take back the immigrants that America deports, Finish the biometric entry-exit visa tracking system, Turn off the jobs and benefits magnet and Reform legal immigration. I have made the tables and I have put together the text in each one myself. This is presented on the following pages.
The Wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is criminal cartels.</td>
<td>Description of the consequences of the danger is not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>The criminal cartels need to be kept out from America.</td>
<td>Description of the consequences of inaction is not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>A wall between the border of Mexico and America must be build.</td>
<td>He will issue the demand to start working on it on day one as president and Mexico will pay for it. It will have “the best technology” such as above and below ground sensors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>Mexico has agreed on cooperating on the building of the wall.</td>
<td>He says “(...) and Mexico you know that, will work with us” as support for his claim/warning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Donald Trump has stressed the building of the wall and that Mexico will pay for it in his speech. In the beginning of the speech he said that he would present a detailed delivery of a policy address (New York Times 2016-09-01). However, the danger attached to his claim and the threat if his plan is not realized is not sufficient. One can assume that it is only discussed briefly since the topic of the border has been summarized earlier in the speech when talking about the meeting with Mexico’s president. It is implicit that criminal cartels are “illegal immigrants” that does not serve the best of America. This suggestion is supported by the target of “illegal immigrants” in point number two. The propositional content seems unlikely based on the analysis in “The rhetorical situation”. Overall, the argument is to make America secure again by the building of a new more powerful border wall in line with Huysmans internal security strategy (2000: 758-759). Logos and the lack of information about the criminal cartels and immigration, strengthen the public perception of migration as something dangerous that the government cannot control (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 24). According to Tirman, the American-Mexican border is treated as a source of insecurity (Tirman 2006). Immigrants are represented through opposed and polarized extremes such as good/bad (Hall 1997: 229). It creates feelings of hostility and aggression through pathos towards the “Other” (Hall 1997: 238).
End catch and release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is illegal immigrants.</td>
<td>When entering the country illegally, it is dangerous to catch and release them close to the border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>The catch and release policy under president Eisenhower’s administration.</td>
<td>“We’re not dropping them right across. They learned that. President Eisenhower. They’d drop them across, right across, and they’d come back”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>End catch and release.</td>
<td>Illegal immigrants will be detained and deported to their country of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>President Eisenhower’s politics.</td>
<td>The proof in support of the claim/warning is that illegal Mexicans has been deported before.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Donald Trump makes a reference to former president Eisenhower and his “Operation Wetback”- but not by name. It was an effort to repatriate Mexicans who had entered America illegally. Donald Trump used it as a proof that a large number of illegal immigrants have and can be deported. The term “wetback” is controversial and politically unacceptable to use to describe Mexicans which can be a reason that he avoided the name. In contradiction, the action itself seems acceptable (The Washington Post 2015-11-11). Not mentioning the name is a conscious decision. Proceeding from logos, he assumes that the audience are aware of president Eisenhower’s immigration politics (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). The reference is used in a positive light to support his claim/warning. It is also used in negative light where the “long distance” is a security problem. He demands that they are deported “great distances” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Donald Trump rhetorically describe immigration as a security threat. It leads to political promises that justify an expansion of state powers (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 3). The policy aims at controlling and limiting the movement of people according to the Huysmans internal security strategy (2000: 758-759). They are represented through the opposed and polarized extremes as civilized/primitive (Hall 1997: 229). The meaning of representation is that the “Others” are not to be trusted so they must be released far from the border.
Zero tolerance for criminal aliens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is criminal aliens.</td>
<td>Two million criminal aliens are inside America but the police and law enforcement cannot do anything about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>Barack Obama’s non-enforcement policies.</td>
<td>The “deadly” policies have allowed 300,000 criminal aliens to return to America since 2013. It enables them to “(...) crime all over the place”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>The crime will stop.</td>
<td>Restore the Secure Communities Program, expand the 287(g) partnerships, triple the number of ICE deportation officers, create a new deportation task and put more police by the border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>Endorsement.</td>
<td>As the first presidential candidate, he has received endorsement from law enforcement officers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

He claims that during “my first hour in office, those people are gone.” He calls it “deported” but states that the press doesn’t like that term. He argues that he does not care and that “you can call it whatever the hell you want. They’re gone.” He uses a simple rhetoric by repeating his goal such as “they’re going to be gone. It will be over. They’re going out. They’re going out fast”. The terms “alien” and “terrorist” is used for the first time to describe “illegal immigrants” (New York Times 2016-09-01). The term “illegal” is not neutral and implies that all non-documented immigrants are criminals. It is a dehumanizing process where they are not seen as individuals. It is not clear if one needs to have a criminal record or if it includes all undocumented immigrants. As Ackleson argues, that “other” group of individuals are constructed through representation where the security concept arises. The “Others” are viewed as criminals and thus as a security problem which in turn justifies the immigration plan (Ackleson 2005: 168). He suggests that Hillary Clinton should be deported because she has “evaded justice” (New York Times 2016-09-01). He implies that she has “evaded justice” by being a part of the Barack Obama’s administration. Through ethos, the role of the speaker is to show himself as a better candidate by pointing out her “failures” (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). He does not specify what the Democrats policies and programs are and assumes that the audience have prior knowledge about it (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). He uses opposite emotions by painting the picture of despair before giving solutions for it (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35).
Stop funding for sanctuary cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claim</strong></td>
<td>The threat is sanctuary cities.</td>
<td>Sanctuary cities have resulted in “so many needless deaths”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warning</strong></td>
<td>People will continue dying if funding is not blocked for certain sanctuary cities.</td>
<td>The sanctuary cities are receiving taxpayer dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand</strong></td>
<td>Block funding for sanctuary cities.</td>
<td>The administration will work with Congress to “pass legislation to protect those jurisdictions that do assist federal authorities”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propositional content</strong></td>
<td>Proof or reasons in support of the claim/warning is not provided.</td>
<td>Contextualized presentation of proof and/or reasons is not provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The argumentation for point number four consist of only five sentences which affect logos. There is no definition of what constitute as a sanctuary city, where in America these are located and which of those he is referring to. He does not specify on what issues that the cities need to cooperate to receive money. Also, there is no examples of the “needless deaths” (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). However, it could be linked to point number three about “criminal aliens” and the previously mentioned Angel moms. Before presenting the stories about the children he stated that they had been killed due to sanctuary cities and open borders. He wishes to provoke the feeling of danger by highlighting issues inside the borders to show that it has gone “too far” in order for the audience to accept his policy (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). “Illegal immigrants” living in sanctuary cities threatens the American citizens and the internal security in line with Huysmans strategy (Huysmans 2000: 758-759).
**Cancel Barack Obamas executive orders about immigration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claim</strong></td>
<td>The threat is Barack Obama’s “unconstitutional” executive orders.</td>
<td>He has given amnesty to approximately five million “illegal immigrants.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warning</strong></td>
<td>Criminals, gang members, security threats, visa overstays and public charges.</td>
<td>Those who rely on public welfare and threaten the safety of America have not been deported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand</strong></td>
<td>Cancel the executive orders and enforce the immigration laws.</td>
<td>“(...) no one will be immune or exempt from enforcement. And ICE and Border Patrol officers will be allowed to do their jobs the way their jobs are supposed to be done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propositional content</strong></td>
<td>The Supreme Court.</td>
<td>He reminds the audience to not forget about their Second Amendment and Obamacare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Donald Trump argues that anyone who has entered America illegally is going to be deported. “That is what it means to have laws and to have a country. Otherwise we don’t have a country”, he says (New York Times 2016-09-01). He does not make a distinction between undocumented immigrants who have a criminal record and undocumented immigrants who are not a security threat. It is a generalization where he divides the acceptable from the unacceptable, the “illegals” and those who go through the process “legally”. According to Hall, he uses an “us” and “them” rhetoric by saying that the system is unfair to the millions who are going through the process legally (New York Times 2016-09-01). It leads to an exclusion of what does not belong (Hall 1997: 258). As logos requires, he does not provide much information about the amnesty programs nor why he describes it as “unconstitutional”. Furthermore, he is not clear about why he mentions the Second Amendment and Obamacare which leads to assumptions (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34).

The Second Amendment is about the right to “keep and bear Arms”. That is, the right to carry a gun (Legal Information Institute n.d). Donald Trump implies that the issue of security requires the targeted audience to protect themselves from the danger he is warning about. He relates it to Hillary Clinton’s immigration plans and claims that she has pledged to keep the amnesty programs. He means that her pro amnesty approach will turn into a disaster for the country in many ways (New York Times 2016-09-01). He uses Huysmans’s internal security strategy to show why it is necessary to strengthen the external border and includes visas as an obstacle (Huysmans 2000: 758-759). He also takes support from the welfare security strategy by
mentioning Obamacare. The message he sends out is that American citizens pay tax for immigrants to receive health care which is a social service they are not entitled to. It results in a dichotomy between “us” and “them” based on social goods (Huysmans 2000: 767). It is related to his warning about “public chargers” and how immigrants rely on public welfare. He aims to persuade the audience via pathos by arousing feelings of desperation and chaos, especially by highlighting the Second Amendment. The purpose is that the audience will vote for him and thereby not have to carry guns to feel safe (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35).

**Suspend Visas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Claim</em></td>
<td>The threat is terrorists.</td>
<td>Minimum 380 foreign born have been convicted in terror cases in America and a large number are under investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Warning</em></td>
<td>Not justified immigrants.</td>
<td>Nearly 100,000 immigrants from Iraq and Afghanistan has been admitted into the country. Most residents from those two countries believes that honor killings are justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Demand</em></td>
<td>“(...) suspend the issuance of visas to any place where adequate screening cannot occur.”</td>
<td>Immigration from countries, such as Syria and Libya, must be suspended until they have effective vetting mechanisms. Safe zones will be build and the other reform is a screening tests that include ideological certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Propositional content</em></td>
<td>The country is a “mess”.*</td>
<td>“We don’t even know what to look for anymore” and the number of terrorists are likely higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Donald Trump makes a reference to 9/11 when discussing the claim of his argument and that the numbers of terrorists are in the interest of the country. Moreover, he exemplifies the countries in which immigration will be suspended by naming four countries in the Middle East (New York Times 2016-09-01). According to Huysman’s cultural security strategy, asylum seekers tend to be seen as culturally different (Huysman 2000: 764). This is confirmed by the mentioned countries where people flee from today. According to Tirman, 9/11 relates to borders and immigration with a focus on Arabs and Muslims as a source of insecurity (2006). Furthermore, Chebel d’Appollonia argues that banning of groups and deportation has increased for Muslims (2015: 19). The argumentation strengthens this perception. The aim is to exclude people who has a certain background. According to Huysmans’s cultural security strategy, they are rhetorically framed as a cultural and integrational challenge. The “Others” are portrayed as
radically different from the American values, norms and tradition (Huysmans 2000: 762). The cultural discourse leads to Halls study of binary oppositions (1997: 234-235). The reform to ask Arabs and Muslims about their views regarding honor killing portrays them as oppressors and implies that American women may become passive victims. They will also be asked for their views on gays, minorities and radical Islam. He expresses ethnocentrism by comparing cultures by right/wrong (Hall 1997: 258). Via pathos, he represents the government as not having control over the immigration situation which leads to the assumption that a new terror attack will happen soon. He uses opposite emotions; his argumentation make Hillary Clinton and the Democrats seem responsible for the danger by saying that she has “brutalized” the State of Department. Thereby, he presents himself as the most fit candidate by suggesting different solutions (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35). How it has been “brutalized” is not illustrated. Moreover, he claims that the Gulf states will pay for the building of the safe zones (New York Times 2016-09-01). The lack of information about the proposed payment makes it on one hand not seem convincing but on the other hand it can be a conscious decision to portray himself as confident. According to logos, he gives numbers such as that for the price of resettling one refugee in America, 12 could be resettled in a safe zone. He also backs up his numbers of convicted terrorist by referencing to the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration (New York Times 2016-09-01).
Countries must take back the immigrants that America deports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is violent criminals.</td>
<td>Over 23 countries refuse to take back “their people”. It includes “individuals convicted of killings, sexual assaults, and some of the most heinous crimes imaginable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>The violent criminals cannot be sent back to their country of origin.</td>
<td>The consequence of inaction is exemplified by Casey Chadwick’s death. Thousands of violent criminals are “all over the place.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Ensure that other countries take the deported people back.</td>
<td>Contextualized description of an action plan is not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>Boston Globe.</td>
<td>Boston Globe’s review of 323 criminals that were released in New England between 2008-2012. 30% committed new offenses such as rape, attempted murder and child molestation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Donald Trump has connected immigrants to criminal behavior in all points leading up to number seven. He has specifically had it as a claim in number one, two, three, six and seven. Proceeding from logos, he relies on facts by presenting Boston Globe’s review but it is not representative of the whole country. It is a form of persuasion by angling the topic. He claims that Hillary Clinton has disregarded an existing law that “commands the secretary of state to stop issuing visas to these countries” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Furthermore, he does not explain which countries that does not cooperate with America on this topic as in logos. He strategically mentions the death of Casey Chadwick’s to influence the motions of the audience (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). Nevertheless, it is not a policy since he has not a plan on how to make the countries take back the people that America aims to deport. Donald Trump articulates that the “Others” and specific countries are a danger to America. Through his representation, the security concept arises (Ackleson 2005: 168). To illustrate this, he uses the metaphor of America being “the big bully that keeps getting beat up” (New York Times 2016-09-01). It implies that America is a powerful country that should not tolerate this treatment. Criminals threatens the security of America and should be an internal security problem of their countries of origins instead.
Finish the biometric entry-exit visa tracking system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is visitors that overstay their visas.</td>
<td>Two of the 9/11 hijackers had expired visas. The 9/11 Commission said that a tracking system would have assisted the search of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>9/11.</td>
<td>Regarding not having a complete tracking system in 2001 he says, “and you know what that would have meant, what that could have meant”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>America must have a proper tracking system.</td>
<td>The biometric entry-exit visa tracking system includes land, sea and air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>Obama-Clinton’s open borders policy.</td>
<td>In 2015, around half a million individuals overstayed their temporary visas. They have no reason to leave when no one is telling them to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Donald Trump believes that the message America’s politicians send out by not enforcing people to leave after their visas has expired is “stay as long as you want, we’ll take care of you”. Therefore, he wants to send out a new message; that visa expiration dates will be strongly enforced (New York Times 2016-09-01). Through ethos, he establishes himself as capable of finishing what is priority one and which the administration has failed to realize. However, he does not specify what is included in the system, such as fingerprints etc. Furthermore, because of Obama-Clinton politics, “we no longer have a country” (New York Times 2016-09-01). This sentence is connected to point five, where he claimed that not having laws equals not having a country. It implies that immigration laws are crucial. Via pathos, it creates the feeling of the country being taken over by immigrants and that they are above the law. The assumption is that they can do whatever they want without the government interfering. The linkage between immigration and terrorism is present throughout his speech and especially in this point in the policy. Chebel d’Appollonia argues that security-driven measures have increased since 9/11 (2015: 15-16). The tracking system is an example of such a measure. The suspicion of overstaying visas is in line with the internal security strategy of controlling the movement of people (Huysmans 2000: 758-759).
Turn off the jobs and benefits magnet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is illegal immigrants on welfare programs.</td>
<td>Immigration laws exists to protect American life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>Immigration laws does not exist only to keep criminal immigrants out.</td>
<td>“If we only enforced the laws against crime, then we have an open border to the entire world.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Turn of the jobs and benefits magnet. Enforce all immigration laws.</td>
<td>E-Verify will be strengthened and expand and those who “abuse our welfare system” will be deported directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>The Center for Immigration Studies and federal law.</td>
<td>The Center for Immigration Studies estimates that 62% of illegal immigrant’s households use cash or non-cash welfare program. It “violates the federal public charge law designed to protect the United States Treasury”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Based on logos, Donald Trump assumes that the audience knows what the system of E-Verify is by not defining it (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). E-Verify is an electronical program that check employment eligibility and if one is authorized to work in America (USCIS). Donald Trump implies that it is about bringing back the jobs to those who are legally entitled to work. But the implementation of E-Verify is contradicting in his argumentation. He stresses that undocumented immigrants that receive government benefits have “tremendous costs” for America (New York Times 2016-09-01). At the same time, E-Verify will make it impossible for immigrants to get employed (legally) which in turn makes them dependent on welfare. The consequences for the employers who continues to hire undocumented immigrants is not specified nor how the system will be improved. The demand implies that undocumented immigrants will leave the country due to less possibilities. This is a part of Huisman’s welfare security strategy where benefits such as food stamps or housing assistance turns into a competition. Jobs and unemployment benefits are reserved for American citizens only (2000: 767). The topic of welfare makes immigration seem as an economic burden (Huysman 2000: 769). The “us” and “them” message is sent out through pathos to persuade the audience based on the binary opposition of rich/poor. The pathos is aimed at unemployed American citizens (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35).
Reform legal immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic speech act</th>
<th>Securitizing speech act (abstract)</th>
<th>Contextualization (empirical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>The threat is that the American workers will be unemployed.</td>
<td>Companies will produce their products in another country and sell it into America so that no taxes are received. In turn, this will result in “total unemployment”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>If legal immigration is not reformed then the best interest of America and its workers is affected negatively.</td>
<td>The current trade deal is the most “incompetently worked trade deals ever negotiated probably in the history of the world”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Reform legal immigration by renegotiating trade deals.</td>
<td>Three times in a row he says that “We’re going to bring our jobs back home”. If companies choose to leave the state of Arizona or other states “there will be consequences.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional content</td>
<td>Trade deals.</td>
<td>He gives example of Nafta and TPP as a “great disaster”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donald Trump targets the unemployed Americans which was only implied in point number nine. He states that he will bring the jobs back home and take care of the workers. It will be a result of a renegotiation of the trade deals. He does not explain the mentioned trade deals, why they are a “disaster” and what he aims to do differently. Three times he says that “there will be consequences” but does not specify what will happen if companies do not bring the jobs back home. The assumption is that he has professional experience and knows what he is talking about. Via ethos, he takes the role of the business man which make him seem trustworthy (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). But according to logos, his information is limited and he relies on not having a political background (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). He links the discussion to immigrants being self-sufficient and assimilation.
According to Huysman, metaphors like “flood” makes immigrants, asylum-seekers and refugees seem like a threat to the socio-economic system. This problematization causes a discourse of security where the socio-economic uncertainty is turned into fear (Huysman 2000: 769). He uses the word “wave” and want them to be selected. It implies that they will not become an economic challenge and the welfare state will remain strong for “our” needs. Donald Trump highlights assimilation as an “important word” and implies that it will be easier when immigrants are selected. What merit, skill, and proficiency that are needed to be selected is not defined. Furthermore, logos is not used to inform the audience of where the line between assimilation and integration goes (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34). Assimilation rather than integration implies that immigrants will challenge the national cultural homogeneity, in line with the cultural security strategy. Security rhetoric is expressed by using discourse of migration as a challenge to integration and that the cultures are too different (Huysmans 2000: 762). The argumentation is contradictive when he talks about immigration waves because he also claims that it has “enriched our country” and that “tremendously positive things have happened”. Once again, he does not provide a further explanation. The indecisiveness is a sign of him trying to target a bigger audience and attract immigrants as voters. It is confirmed when he says that American workers must be put first which particularly includes African-American and Latino workers. Immigrants are represented as the “Other” but also as one of “us”. He puts on different masks depending on who he targets.

5.9 Conclusion

He begins by saying that “it’s our last chance” three times and mentions Supreme Court justices and Second Amendment to remind the audience “what we’re fighting for and who we are fighting for” (New York Times 2016-09-01). What he is fighting for is America by changing the immigration system and who he is fighting for is the forgotten people. After that, he asks the “Angel moms” to join him on the stage to share their stories and eleven parents are invited. He emphasizes that he has gotten to know them (New York Times 2016-09-01). Through ethos, he refers to his relation to the topic and his personal traits are presented as genuine and caring by giving them a voice (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 32). Throughout the speech, he has talked about the deaths of Americans to appeal to pathos. In the conclusion, he takes pathos to another level as support for his claims, warnings and demands (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 34-35). After they have shared their stories, he summarizes his speech by the quote below.
“Let’s fix this horrible, horrible, problem. It can be fixed quickly. Let’s secure our border. Let’s stop the drugs and the crime from pouring into our country. Let’s protect our social security and Medicare. Let’s get unemployed Americans off the welfare and back to work in their own country.” (New York Times 2016-09-01).

The word “pouring” implies that it is a large number of unwanted immigrants and goods that enters America. Furthermore, belonging in a welfare state has to do with access to social and economic rights. According to Huysman, immigrants, asylum-seekers and refugees tend to not be regarded as eligible to social assistance and welfare (Huysman 2000: 767). He reminds the audience about November 8 five times, for them to vote for him and that Arizona is an important state for him in order to win (New York Times 2016-09-01). His character, and the ability to get the world’s attention, is highlighted through ethos (Karlberg & Mraal 1998: 31-33). When all the ten steps are accomplished, America will have peace, law and justice. He repeatedly uses antites to argue against Hillary Clinton’s by saying, “she doesn’t have the strength or the stamina to make America great again.” The aim is to show that she will danger Americans security. His concluding mark is; “together we can save American lives, American jobs, and American futures. Together we can save America itself. Join me in this mission, we’re going to make America great again” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Making America “great” again is by bringing the country back. He ends the speech by the religious doctrine - “God bless you” (New York Times 2016-09-01).

5.10 Discourse

His perception of the world is shown through the discourses he has chosen to include in his speech and express through his political statements. His messages include: culture, values and Islam through an “us” and “them” discourse, criminality, terrorism and the American-Mexican border through a security discourse as well as discrimination, exclusion and inclusion through a nationalistic discourse. The aim has been to establish the feeling of an American identity and he does not believe that people with another ethnic, cultural and religious background is compatible with the American norms. Immigrants and immigration are seen as a threat to the security of the country. Immigration is the cause of problems and his solutions will make America “great” again. The discourses are a part of a larger political discourse. It indicates a xenophobic approach which is a part of all ten points in the immigration plan. The discourses are overlapping and interconnected which positions him in the immigration debate.
Politics is about acting in response to certain circumstances. It is about choosing policies and the actions are based on practical argumentation. Political discourse is a form of practical argumentation, by providing reasons for or against a way of acting (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 1). Narratives of a crisis affects which strategies that are chosen. The narrative of a crisis function as a reason for what should be done (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 6). Donald Trump’s arguments of change is based on the assumption that there is an immigration crisis that needs to be solved and immigrants are blamed for problems of unemployment, welfare and security. A national discourse defines who the “Others” are and who “we” are and what the difference is (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 167). In discursive group formations, the “Other” is excluded and differentiations within the group is ignored – and thereby also the other possible ways to form groups. Group formation is a part of the discursive battle of the idea of a country and who belongs to it by the division of people (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 52-53). Immigrants are represented through negative stereotypes to legitimize his immigration policy. As mentioned in the method, there is a discursive battle where he also describes immigrants as a part of “us” such as the African-American and Latino workers or how Mexicans have contributed to America (New York Times 2016-09-01). The discursive battle is based on the aim to attract more voters which needs him to change his rhetoric. However, the speech is mainly targeting voters that fit his discursive formation of an American. Donald Trump’s anti-immigration rhetoric produces a discourse of danger and fear based on internal, cultural and welfare security.
6 Summary

The goal has been to study what perception of immigrants and immigration that is expressed through a rhetorical and discourse analytical perspective. An answer of the research questions will be presented with concluding remarks.

How does Donald Trump portray immigrants and immigration?

Donald Trump has an aggressive rhetoric style by using words like “illegal”, “criminal aliens”, “terrorists” and “death”. He also has a soft approach in certain sentences to persuade immigrants and other ethnic groups to vote for him such as saying that he has love for the people of Mexico. His rhetoric style depends on who his targeted audience is. Words are important and he strategically uses loaded words. He repeats specific words and sentences that he wants to emphasize, for example “Zero tolerance for criminal aliens. Zero. Zero. Zero. They don’t come in here. They don’t come in here” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Furthermore, his sentences are incoherent which makes it seem like he is not following any manuscript. The incomplete sentences make it difficult to follow his argumentation since it lacks focus. His language is not neutral and includes politically incorrect words.

He uses ethos by comparing his immigration politics to Hillary Clinton’s and the Democrats. He portrays them as “weak” and as a part of the political elite with their own interests. In that way, he presents himself as the opposite. By excluding himself from politicians, he refers to his career as a businessman which increases his credibility when talking about trade deals and jobs. The image he presents is that he is not a politician which is confirmed by his language style. It differs from other politicians and stands out in formal speeches. Moreover, he highlights their immigration approach as “wrong” to establish his opinions as “right”. He mentions his popularity, that his campaign has attracted attention and big crowds and received positive polls as well as endorsement.

Logos is used by referencing to different studies and statistics. It seems to be an objective argumentation but may be biased to persuade the audience that his statements are logical and relevant. However, logos is not sufficient and is the rhetorical technique he uses the least. It is evident throughout the speech where he more often makes statements without backing them up with further information. The ten-point immigration policy is an example of the lack of details. Therefore, it leads to assumptions of what he means and leaves the audience guessing.
Pathos is the rhetorical technique that he relies on the most. He appeals to the audience emotions, specifically the feeling of anger, by linking immigration to topics which people fear and specific incidents. The aim is for them to be frustrated over the situation and feel like a change is needed. Furthermore, he uses pathos when talking about Hillary Clinton and the Democrats as uncappable of doing a good job. All three techniques result in a powerful persuasive argumentation. The imbalance of the means of persuasion when talking about immigrants and immigration may explain his success, especially within the working class and unemployed.

**In what terms are immigrants and immigration argued to be a security risk for the country?**

He refers to the issue of security by talking about the Americans that have died because the border has not been secured and the immigration laws have not been enforced. Immigrants are rhetorically framed as a security threat by describing them as criminals such as gang members, murderers, drug-dealers and terrorists. The problem of visa overstays is mentioned to illustrate the consequences of giving visas to certain countries where 9/11 is highlighted. Furthermore, the threat includes social security that undocumented immigrants receive and that it needs to be protected. He claims that “uncontrolled, low-skilled immigration” reduces jobs and salaries which leads to insecurity for Americans and unemployment by “stealing” their jobs. Americans and their security is at danger. His political promise is safety and security for all Americans by focusing on “illegal immigrants” as the cause of it. He argues that the police and law enforcement does not have the authority to “clear up this dangerous and threatening mess” (New York Times 2016-09-01). Promising to hire more border control agents, extending the police officers work and enforcing all immigration laws paints the picture of an immigration crisis. The endorsement is used as a proof that his statements are accurate. Donald Trump’s statements in the speech are in line with the theory of Securitization. He claims that “illegal immigrants” are a threat to America. It is a discursive process of arguing that there is a threat and attaching the security concept to immigration (Stritzel 2014: 4). The lack of information about immigration, like saying that the government has no idea how many immigrants that are in the country, strengthens the public perception of migration as something dangerous that the government cannot control and that there are too many immigrants. The political discourse fuels the perception that there is an existing crisis by emphasizing for example job security, that taxes supports sanctuary cities and criminality (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 24).
9/11 is said to have had consequences for the group of people that has been labelled as “security threats”. Donald Trump aims to implement security-driven measures that creates a linkage between immigration and terrorism (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015: 15-16). All three of Huysmans’s security strategies are used in the speech. Interestingly, the securitization of the border does only mention the American-Mexican border and not the Canadian one.

6.1 Concluding remarks

At first glance, the speech seems to be detailed based on meeting with the Mexican president and the ten-point plan. However, he is not specific about how he will accomplish it. The policy is insufficient but his unique form of rhetoric is persuading and his ethos is strong enough to make him seem capable of doing as he promises. What is clear is that undocumented immigrants and people who have refugee status are not welcome inside America. Also, immigrants that are in America legally are described as a threat, if they are on welfare. Overall, the speech is vague which may result in false assumptions rather than facts. He enhances prejudice and stereotypes that risk causing racism and an increased segregation. It is of importance to be aware of the use of language since words have the power to influence the perception of the world. When certain words are used many times, it can turn into common sense knowledge. Through his rhetoric, he might physically and mentally build walls instead of bridges, between countries and people.
7 Future research

Even if the aim was not to compare his speeches, it was noticed that Donald Trump presented ambivalent statements regarding immigrants in his Immigration speech. A proposed future research is to do a similar analysis with more than one of his speeches to examine what rhetorical similarities and differences that can be found. It would be interesting to study whether he exaggerates or tones down his statements depending on the type of speech and the targeted audience. It could be done through a comparative study of his rhetoric as a candidate and as the president.
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Appendix

- **The rhetorical situation** The audience
- **Exordium** Narratio Propositio Argumentatio Conclusio
- **Securitization** The “Other”
- **Ethos** Logos Pathos

**Example 1: Means of persuasion**

**On my first day in office** I am also going to ask Congress to pass Kate’s Law, named for Kate Steinle...to ensure that criminal aliens convicted of illegal reentry receive strong mandatory minimum sentences. Strong. **And then we get them out.** Another reform I’m proposing is the passage of legislation named for Detective Michael Davis and Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, two law enforcement officers recently killed by a previously deported illegal immigrant.

**Example 2: Argumentation**

It does not serve you the American people. Doesn’t serve you. **When politicians talk about immigration reform,** they usually mean the following: amnesty, open borders, lower wages. Immigration reform should mean something else entirely. It should mean improvements to our laws and policies to make life better for American citizens.

**Example 3: Securitization of immigration**

A 2011 report from the Government Accountability Office found that illegal immigrants and other non-citizens, in our prisons and jails together, had around 25,000 homicide arrests to their names, 25,000.