Lund University   STVK02
Department of Political Science   Tutor: Martin Hall

The Acceptance of Unacceptable Behaviour

The Case of Donald Trump

Maria Vestrin

Abstract

This thesis aims to bring a greater understanding of the recent rise in right-wing populism by analysing the authoritarian populist discourse used by Donald Trump when he speaks to his base. In the study, the transcript of his speech at the Minnesota Rally in October 2019 is studied with the method critical discourse psychology. The theoretical framework is a combination of post-structuralism and critical theory. These theoretical and methodological choices allow for an analysis of the psychological as well as the political and discursive processes apparent in this global trend.

The results of the study show that Donald Trump exhibits an authoritarian populist discourse that relies on identification and group-dichotomies for support. The discourse is heavily identity-focused and seems to blur the lines between opinions and facts as well as between entertainment and politics which combined with the power of identification and perceived moral injustices of his base enables an acceptance of his questionable behaviour and statements by his followers.

Key words: Populism, Donald Trump, Critical Theory, Discourse Psychology, Authoritarianism
Words: 9759

Table of contents

1   Introduction

The last few decades we have seen a triumph of right wing populist movements worldwide. In Europe we have witnessed the success of the Freedom party in Austria, The Fidesz party in Hungary and the Brexit campaign to name a few. In Brazil, populist Jair Bolsonaro won the 2018 election and in India Narendra Modi became prime minister in 2014. But perhaps the most (in)famous example of this trend was the 2016 US presidential election where Donald Trump became the 45th president of the United States of America. The political career of Donald Trump has since its infancy been lined with scandals and controversy. In spite of this he has gone from a reality tv-star and business man with no political experience to the president of one of the worlds superpowers.

1.1   Research problem and purpose of study

In contemporary politics the identity and characteristics of politicians have become more important for their success while ideological and political objectives have taken a backseat in the political debate (Busby, 2009, s. 1). Despite of this we can see a global trend where (mainly populist right-wing) political leaders use a language and behaviour that would not too long ago have been deemed unacceptable and probably have led to political scandal. This language and behaviour is also reminiscent of the language and behaviour more traditionally used by the opposition where strategies like demanding recognition for one's group-identity have been used as a way to gain political power. There is also an apparent paradox in the way that populist right-wing leaders of today are mixing traditional values with behaviours that are typically employed by the left-wing opposition which contradicts the traditional values of the conservative movement.

  The purpose of this study is to explore the ways in which Donald Trump utilises group-identification and other legacies from social movements in his discourse and how we can understand the appeal of this discourse by applying a historical context. The research question is therefore;

- *How can we understand the acceptance of unacceptable behaviour in populist politicians by analysing how Donald Trump speaks to his base?*

2 Research Field

Populism and the recent rise of right wing populism is a phenomenon which has been studied immensely within political science. Since the aim of this thesis is to understand the rise of right wing-populist leaders and more specifically leaders like Donald Trump, who has been in many ways controversial and scandalous in his behaviour, I will in this section offer a brief overview of the research field regarding the current rise in populism and how it may have been affected by a movementization of the political system and the rise of political scandals.

2.1 Populism

Populism is a complicated concept, the meaning of which has changed over time and space. In the US the term has been used to describe politicians on both the right and the left side of the political spectrum whereas in South America it has mostly been used to describe the non-marxist left and in Europe it has mostly been used to describe the demagogic appeals of right-wing politicians to the 'people' (Judis, 2016, p. 120). For some it is seen as a threat but also a potential corrective for politics that have been too far removed from "the people" (Müller, 2016, p. 10)

I find it appropriate to reflect on Ernesto Laclaus discussion on the subject in his book "On Populist Reason" (2007). The concept of populism, while it has been attributed a plurality of definitions, has always been defined to narrowly according to Laclau. He argues that populism needs to be "rescued" from its marginal position in social science and maintains that populism can be understood as a performative act rather than an ideology. He also argues that populism, rather than being an aberration of the norm, is a constant dimension of political action which arises in all political discourse to subvert and complicate ideologies (Laclau, 2007, p. 18). In this political logic of populism, the political discourse sets up an opposition between the 'underdog' and the 'power' which is defined by demands that establish a 'frontier'. These demands can follow a 'logic of difference' or a 'logic of equivalence' and it is these demands that are the basis for the populist challenge of authority (Judis, 2016, p. 120).

2.2 Identity Politics and Social Movements

In recent decades we have seen a rise in populism but we have also seen a rise in so called 'identity politics'. There is also an apparent connection between populism

and identity politics which has been explored by Jan Werner Müller. He argues that populism always is a form of identity politics since ut entails anti-establishment sentiment and anti-plurality. Populism is always a threat to democracy since democracy requires pluralism and recognition that we need to find fair ways of living together as free and equal but also diverse citizens (Müller, 2016).

In the American context, Meyer and Tarrows argues that the civil rights movement in the 50's and 60's revitalized and legitimized the social movement form leading to a 'movementization' of both republican and democratic parties. The civil rights movement, although successful, also triggered a counter-movement, white resistance. This political situation forced the parties to weigh the cost and benefits of appealing to the median voter against responding to these mobilized movements of the ideological fringes (McAdam & Kloos, quoted in; Meyer & Tarrows, 2018, p. 6). In this process of movementization the Democrats remained a coalition of interest groups while the Republicans became more conservative and relied increasingly on the resentment towards government and those who might benefit from government initiatives. Thus the republican party realized even before Trump entered the scene that they could benefit from the mobilized anger driven by racial resentment and began to play to this populist base (Meyer & Tarrows, 2018, p. 7).

2.3   Political Scandals and the Media

Political scandals have in the late 20th century assumed a more prominent significance than earlier times. Thompson argues that this development is due to the fact that political figures are much more visible in modern times than ever before (Thompson, 2000, p.5-6).

The experience of political scandal might for the participants entail a sense of shame and embarrassment as aspects of their private life are brought into public attention. For the observers of political scandals their experiences are shaped by the fact that they derive their knowledge from media sources, it's a 'mediated experience'. For most people these scandals afflict distant others, removed from their daily life both spatially and in terms of status, wealth and power. The experience of the observer might be a source of amusement and entertainment but it can also be one of disappointment and dismay. For most people, these mediated scandals are experienced with modest levels of interest and are followed loosely and episodically if at all (ibid, 2000, p. 85-89).

Scullion and Armons argues however, that there has been a shift in the conception of 'self' as well as a rising threshold of shame which has resulted in democracy in itself being being destabilized (2018, p. 284). Building on Eric Goffmans theory of social interaction they connect post-truth politics to the civilizing process. They argue that to be civic is to be constrained, controlled and relatively predictable in response to others and it also includes a strong desire to avoid shame. The civilizing process creates interdependence and a reliance on

others that requires a wider set of understandings which they claim to be the trust in truth (ibid, p. 285-286).

The argument made is that consumer culture and a neo-liberal world view, with its priority on self-worth and personal agency, challenge a foundational element of this civilizing mission, namely the conception of the 'self'. It creates a narcissistic conception of self that desensitizes our sociality and increases the thresholds of shame. The result of this process is that we see our democratic rights but not our responsibilities. They argue that these cultural shifts are the reason for recent populist outpourings that are characterised by vulgarity, disinhibition and personal truths (ibid, 2018, p. 286) Scullion and Armon further argues that there has been a "commercialisation of shame" (ibid). This is clear in many reality tv-shows where behaviours previously seen as mortifying now passes as mildly awkward. Contemporary culture shows a picture of reduced guilt and more self-obsession. They argue that this is the result of the dominant discourse of the individualistic society where the right to choose who we want to be and decide our own niche lifestyle is a focal point (ibid, p. 289).

The reputational character of scandal depends on a range of specific circumstances but also on the properties of the field in which it takes place since good reputation is more important in some fields than others. The entertainment industry is an example of a field where reputation is not as important as notoriety of 'well-knowness' whereas the political field a good reputation is more important (ibid, 2000, p. 250-251). In recent times the line between news and entertainment has been blurred (DelliCarpini, 2012, p. 11). This is what makes Donald Trump an interesting case. He is both an entertainer and a politician, and when it comes to scandals and reputation, he doesn't seem to be as susceptible to the negative consequences of scandal as other politicians. While there has been plenty of research analysing Trumps rhetoric and how he fits in to a populist discourse I want to contribute to this field of research by analysing the meaning-building process in the discourse surrounding this phenomenon in order to better understand how and why the image of the political leader seems to be changing.

3   Theoretical Framework

This section offers a description of the theoretical framework used in this study. Since discourse analysis can be seen as both a method and a theory I will describe the theoretical basis for discourse analysis in this section while the methodological approach will be explained in chapter *4.2 Critical Discourse psychology.*

3.1   Poststructuralism

Within the tradition of discourse analysis, language is central. The focus is placed on the *discursive relations* rather than relations between groups. There are different types of discourse analysis but what they all have in common is the perspective on language and the use of language as a constructive force rather than a mere reflection of reality. Discourse analysis thus breaks the distinction between idea and reality as well as the distinction between language and action. From this point of view, language doesn't mirror reality, it creates it (Bergström & Boréus, 2005, p. 305-306).

Discourse analysis is closely connected to poststructuralism which started out as an intellectual and political rebellion and resistance to power. While it has since been incorporated in a number of different ideas, terms and theories, this political engagement is what drives the societal critique within the field (Hertz & Johansson, 2013, p. 41). The purpose of poststructuralism is to challenge the rigid categorization of social reality. This is usually done through analysing the most stable social and cultural identities, the ones which are seen as 'natural' (ibid, p. 46).

The basis for poststructuralism is that you view your material as expressions of different perspectives and interpretations rather than a reflection of reality. This means denying the naturalistic approach to science and applying a critical and reflexive perspective towards claims of truth (ibid, p. 18). Jonathan Potter argues that truth can be treated as a commodity, like money on the international markets, it can be strengthened or weakened by various procedures of representation. (Potter, 1996, p. 5)

3.2   Critical theory

Critical theory is also a form of social criticism. The concept of 'critique' is opposed to merely empirical and positivist models of knowledge. This critique is derived from German idealism and was developed in Marxist writings. The concept of critique is both an act of judgement and resistance but also a way of relating to the world and critical theory aims to both comprehend but also transform the social world. A critical theory of society uncovers the social conditions under which knowledge is articulated through the investigation of how we conceive ourselves and how this affects the way we comprehend the world around us (Thompson, 2017, p. 2).

3.2.1   Class-consciousness and Authoritarianism

Horkheimer, a leading critical theorist, believed that without a critique of political psychology, one of the most essential facts of politics would be missed in the critique of the political economy: the fact that the working-class is divided (Smith, 2017, p. 374). In critical theory the perspective on class consciousness is a combination of Marx's critique of political economy and a psychoanalytical critique of political psychology. In critical theory research working-class subjectivity appeared to combine authority fetishism with commodity fetishism (Smith, 2017, p. 369).

Critical theory on authoritarianism is mainly focused on Nazism but 'populist authoritarianism' has a broader scope. Jeremiah Morelock defines authoritarian populism as the "pitting of 'the people' against 'elites' in order to have the power to drive out, wipe out, or otherwise dominate 'others' who are not 'the people.'" (2018, p. xiv). Fromm was the first critical theorist to study the working-class and authoritarianism in the lead up to Nazi Germany and was surprised to find a lot of people being either ambivalent to or admiring fascism. He distinguished three personality-types: authoritarian, revolutionary and ambivalent. The chief discovery of this research was not that there is authoritarianism in the working-class but rather the ambivalence to it. 75% of the people in the study were categorized as ambivalent and although espousing leftist politics, these people also exhibited authoritarian tendencies (Morelock, 2018, p. xvii). They act for reasons of their own and are torn between democratic and anti-democratic values and can tend in either direction. Later studies have reiterated these findings and show that wage-earning workers, who comprise the majority in late capitalist societies, are more likely to be ambivalent toward democracy and civil liberties than radically authoritarian or anti-authoritarian (Smith, 2017, p. 387-390). Fromm tied Nazism to a growing alienation under late capitalism. He theorised that people are less tied to their families and communities in late capitalism and needs to decide what to do with their newfound freedom. This newfound freedom can create anxiety which can lead a person to different 'escape mechanisms': domination, submission, destructiveness and

automaton conformity. All of which may lead to authoritarianism (Morelock, 2018, p. xviii).

In 1950 Adorno et. al. Published *The Authoritarian Personality,* which is a study that showed that the presence of authoritarian tendencies is more common than expected (Adorno et. al., 1950). A central term in this publication is the 'Usurpation Complex' which is the tendency of authoritarians to accuse government and as having perverted democracy. The people in power are accused of usurping power and entrenching themselves dictatorially. While they are supposedly on a mission to 'save democracy' they are, consciously or not, aiming at their abolition by putting the 'right people' in power (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 685-687). This image of the usurpation of power by the ruling elite is currently aided by the rise in social media and 'fake news' which enable 'politics of delusion', where the lines between fact, fictions and opinions are being blurred (Rensman, 2018, p. 43).

3.2.2   Recognition and Morality

In critical theory, the social has always been integral to how we think of the self. A central question has been how agency and individual autonomy is possible if individuals are socially constituted (Fultner, 2017, p. 523, 529). Critical theory maintains that the context in which individuals can meaningfully act is shaped by social structures. This is reconciled with the idea of individual autonomy by the Theory of communicative action by Jürgen Habermas. In this theory there is a distinction between system and lifeworld. The systems sediment the process of social evolution which is a form of societal learning while the lifeworld is the domain of socialization and individuation process. The lifeworld provides shared knowledge (culture), regulated interpersonal relations (society) and a set of competencies enabling identity assertion (personality) (ibid p. 530). For Habermas has developed an account for "individualization through socialization" based on the idea that individualization and socialization are connected. The 'self' is intersubjectively constituted (ibid, p. 532).

Recognition can be placed on a vertical and a horizontal axis. The vertical axis concerns recognition between individuals or groups of individuals and something 'higher' than them, for example the state or God. The horizontal axis concerns recognition between individuals or groups of individuals and is referred to as 'intersubjective recognition', which can be mediated by norms or be purely intersubjective. Recognition which is mediated by norms is mainly a matter of appropriate *actions* while purely intersubjective recognition is a matter of *attitudes* (Ikäheimo, 2017, p. 569-570).

Emancipatory struggles are fuelled by moral experiences of lack of recognition. After the fall of premodern social hierarchies, individuals and groups expect to be recognised as equals but alongside this egalitarian principle there is also an idea of the 'individualized self', the idea of everyone's uniqueness. The tension between these two ideals is what gives rise to the 'politics of recognition', or what is more commonly known as 'identity politics' (ibid, p. 573). Although recognition can be

seen as a good thing, there is also a darker side of it. Identification of groups usually come with an evaluation and when these evaluations are negative, it can have negative consequenses (ibid, p. 578)

Honneth argues there is a social struggle in society where different self-understandings of social groups are competing. These struggles are not only driven by self-interest; they are also driven by the perception of moral disrespect. He argues that there are two kinds of morality, the morality of the cultural elite and that of the subordinated social classes. While the morality of the cultural elite are coherent and logical ideas of right and wrong the morality of subordinated classes contain no such idea of a total moral order or projection of a just society. The moral claims of the oppressed classes are instead based on a sense of injustice of injurie they have suffered. The reason for this difference is both that the oppressed classes are not subjected to moral pressures to present their moral judgements in a conceptually elaborated form but also that they are less in control of the symbolic social resources needed to make discursively acceptable claims, meaning this sphere of morality has not risen to the level of discourse (ibid, p. 516-517).

Critical theories take an external perspective on morality, meaning it describes the function of moral discourse, rather than engage in it (Stahl, 2017, p. 505). A discursive form of morality can be a source of social domination and certain forms of morality can function as ideology.

4 Material and Method of Research

In this thesis I am analysing a speech made by Donald Trump with the method Discourse Psychology. In this section I will explain the selection process as well at the content of the material studied in this thesis followed by a description of the method of research applied.

4.1 Selection of Material

In the selection process of this study I went back to the purpose and research questions presented. Since I am interested in the meaning-building process of the discourse utilised by Trump, I chose to only study one speech where he addresses his base. I chose the rally in Minneapolis on October 10th 2019 because it was the first rally after the impeachment enquiry regarding the Ukraine scandal. Since I am not able to study the views and opinions of his voters directly within the scope of this thesis the material chosen is instead based on Donald Trump's rhetoric and discourse when talking directly to them. I chose to analyse this speech in particular as I am interested in if and how he addresses the scandal in front of his base since his behaviour doesn't seem to affect the voters in a substantial way.

The speech is a nearly two-hour long speech where he addresses policy issues like immigration, military and law-enforcement, the economy and international relations but also conceptual views on democracy and representation. He also addresses the Ukraine scandal as well as his views on his political opponents and the media. I have used a transcript found on rev.com but also listened to the material. By studying a relatively small sample I am able to analyse the discourses of the speech in depth which combined with theoretical framework can add to an understanding of the meaning-building processes which are taking place.

4.2 Critical Discourse Psychology

The method of research applied to the material in this thesis is discourse psychology which is a type of discourse analysis. The approach taken in this study is one which recognises that when people talk, they are using a repertoire of terms which have been provided to them by history. All sequences are seen as embedded within a historical context. Critical discourse psychology recognises that people have choices, there are a multiple way of speaking about any object, but these choices aren't always equal since some ways of understanding the world can become

culturally dominant. This is what is called a hegemonic discourse. This method aims to analyse the process of normalization and to investigate whose interest are best served by different discursive formulations (Edley, 2001, p. 190).

There are three key concepts in critical discourse psychology: Interpretive repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. *Interpretive repertoires* can be seen as "a lexicon or register of terms and metaphors drawn upon to characterize and evaluate actions and events" (Wetherell & Potter, quoted in Edley, 2001, p. 198). The term is closely connected to discourse but it is more fragmented and places more emphasis on human agency. Interpretive repertoires can be identified when people are using similar lines or making the same kind of arguments as others have done (ibid, p. 198-199). *Ideological dilemmas* are the inconsistencies, fragmentations and contradictions of the 'lived ideology'. Building on Billing et al. Edley argues that there are two different ideologies as play, the intellectual and the lived. The lived ideology can be seen as the condensed wisdom of a society and is much more inconsistent than the intellectual (ibid, p.202-204). *Subject positions* are the identities made relevant by specific ways of talking. It refers to the way ideology constructs subjects by drawing people in to particular identities or positions. The process of being called by a particular discourse is called an *interpellation* (ibid, p. 209-210).

4.2.1   Operationalisation

I will apply the method by following the twenty steps laid out in Ian Parkers book Critical Discursive Psychology (2015, p. 209-223). I have divided these steps into three separate readings of the material. (A more thorough description of these steps can be found in *attachment 1*.)

The first reading includes the first five steps and are based on categorization of the material and its content. In this reading I am using the method of creative association in order to highlight patterns and identify connections. It is important in this step to treat the text as the object of study and remember that the objects within the text are constructed and that it is this construction that concerns me, not the validity or truthfulness (Parker, 2015, p. 212-214). The second reading contains step six through eight. The purpose of this reading is to analyse the subjects and relationships that are conjured in the text (ibid, 214-218). The third and last reading of the material contains steps nine through twenty and focuses on discourses and audiences (ibid, p. 218-222). It is in this reading the *interpretive repertories*, *the subject positions* and the *ideological dilemmas* are identified and analysed as well as the context and power-dimensions of the discourse.

4.3   Theoretical and Methodological reflections

Just as it is, according to the poststructuralist, important to take a critical approach towards any discourse, it is just as important to have a critical approach to myself

as the interpreter of the material. Since the method used in this thesis is based on a reading of selected sections of the material the research is always at risk of being subjective. I aim to avoid this by a consistent and transparent use of method and theory. In order to reach a high level of intersubjectivity all the steps of the method are explained and the interpretations and analysis made are based in the theoretical framework for the study.

The material is also cause for some reflection. I have chosen to only analyse one speech made by Trump and although this decision is based on the purpose and aim of this paper as I have explained in the previous section, this is a choice that has consequences. This speech is only one case of a populist discourse and as such, I am only able to draw limited conclusions on the general trend on the rise of right-wing populism. I am however able to draw certain conclusions even from a limited material and this study can also be seen as a starting point for further research in this field and it is therefore, in my opinion, a contribution to the field of political science and populism.

5   The world according to Trump

In the initial reading of the text the connotations of the material were explored through creative association. In this section these associations are listed and I have chosen to treat both subjects and objects simultaneously but with a higher focus on subjects since it is more in accordance with the purpose of the study. Where I have included objects they are in some way bound to relationships. This list is by no means exhaustive but it functions to highlight patterns and identify connections.

5.1   The Dirty Political Establishment and the Freedom-loving American Patriots

In the speech, the political establishment, the democrats and the media are constructed in opposition to Trump and his followers. "*The Political establishment*" is associated with words like "frame you", "persecute you", "dirty", "lawless", "frauds" and "fakers" (Trump speech 1, 44:23, 48:50, 51:25). *"Politicians"* is also associated to negative words like "corrupt" and "bleeding America dry" (ibid, 18:18). "*Media*" is associated to the democrats and to the political establishment in the speech. The term is also associated to the words "dishonest", "bad", "twisted world-view" and "fraudsters" (ibid, 22:38, 43:20, 47:51, 01:07:03). *"Polls"* is associated with the words "phony" and "crooked" (ibid, 21:50).

The strongest negative associations in the speech is towards the *"Democrats"* which is also connected to the political establishment in the speech. In the speech Trump mentions several democrats by name and they as well as the term "democrats" are associated to words like "the swamp", "phony", "crusade", "extremist", "radical leftist", "vicious", "horrible", "con-artists" and "scammers" (ibid, 25:51, 31:50). The hostility towards the democrats is clear in the following quote:

> Democrats are now the party of high taxes, high crime, open borders,
> late term abortion, socialism, and blatant Washington corruption.
> (Trump speech 1, 01:48:56)

Since the democratic party is the main opposition party this negative association with democrats is not surprising. The way he speaks of them is however stronger than conventional which will be discussed further in the following section.

In the speech there is also many cases of positive association. "Law-enforcement", "cops" or "police" are associated to the words "love", "great", "respected*", "beautiful" and "amazing" (ibid, 18:18, 31:50, 36:49, 01:17:09).

"Minnesota" is associated with "great state" and "freedom-loving American patriots" (ibid, 14:42, 01:49:58). The speech is held in Minnesota so this is also not surprising. The word Minnesota is however also associated with "angry" when he speaks of the people in Minnesota electing congresswoman Omar, who he calls an "America hating socialist" (ibid, 54:16).

"America" is another word which has both positive and negative associations. It is associated with "number one economy", "strong", "winning", "thriving" but also "robbed" and "toughest nation to deal with". America is also mentioned in opposition to China, India and Russia (ibid, 16:17, 18:18, 41:19, 50:04).

6   Donald Trump and 'The People'

In this section the subjects of text are analysed in order to better understand the construction of identification and relationships in the material. This reading of the material is focused around what the subjects are saying and how relationships are conjured and defended. The first step of this reading is a systematic listing of subjects and their marker. This list is not included in the analysis but can be found in *attachment 2*.

6.1   The construction of Donald Trump

Donald Trump is in the speech constructed as a charitable and self-sacrificing leader, a businessman and a family man but also a political underdog. The image of the self-sacrificing leader is made clear through a statement about how he loses money being president and what he does make, he gives away (Trump speech 1, 52:26). He also states that being president has alienated him from his friends as seen in the quote: "I've lost all my friends because they're all scared to talk. Honestly, I'm the president that they can't talk to me anymore" (ibid, 48:50). This constructs the image that he has sacrificed both personal relationships and money in order to be the president.

He also constructs himself as a great businessman in the speech which is exemplified by the quote:

> I look at these trade deals and I say, "Who the hell could have done this?" If you didn't … If you had no business instinct, no business ability, if you had nothing, if you're dumb as hell, you wouldn't make these deals, they're so bad. I say, "Who made these deals? Who made these deals?" But we're ripping them all up and redoing them and they're going to be very good. Wait until you see what happens. Now that I'm your president, you see it. America is winning again and we're respected again as a nation. (Trump speech 1, 41:19)

In the quote he places himself in opposition to the previous administration who he claims has no business-instincts, which have resulted in bad trade deals having been made. He is positioning himself as a business-man who can use his experiences and business-instincts in his political career. This business repertoire is also seen in statements about record sales of red t-shirts (ibid, 18:18) as well as in talks of how he would be better than the previous administration in trade-negotiations (ibid, 41:19. He is also constructed as well-connected as is seen in the statement that he knows all the smart guys on wall-street (ibid, 36:49).

Identifying himself as a business man rather than a politician sets him apart from the political establishment who are constructed in the speech as incapable and corrupt (Trump speech 1).

Apart from being a businessman, Trump also depicts himself as a family man when he talks about his father and his son. He mentions his father two times in the speech. He says his father was tough but great and respects law-enforcement. His father is also constructed as a teacher to Trump (ibid, 01:04, 01:16). His son is instead framed as a little boy and who will always be his little boy (ibid, 01:11:36).

Trump is also framed as the political underdog which is clear when he talks about the fact that nobody thought he would win but also in the statement that democrats spent more money, had more celebrity endorsements and had the media on their side (ibid, 01:10:11). Close to the 'underdog' narrative is the construction of Trump as a victim which is clear in the quote:

> So we have the greatest economy, the greatest military. We've rebuilt our military, $2. 5 trillion, because when I took it over, it was a mess. And what do they want to do? "Let's impeach our president," right? I don't think so. (Trump speech 1, 28:51)

In this quote, Trump is evoking the sense that he has sacrificed a lot for this country in order to clear up 'the mess' that the establishment has caused and as a thank you, he gets impeached.

6.2   The construction of 'The people'

Trump uses different ways to differentiate "us" from "them". He talks of "we" as opposed to the establishment, the democrats and the media. Evoking the image that while 'they' are ruining America, 'we' are putting America first. Within this discourse 'we' is constructed as the 'American people' and Trump is constructed as the sole representative of 'the people'. The community evoked in the speech is one of patriotism and shared traditional values, but also one of a victim-identity.

The patriotism of the community is clear throughout the speech with quotes like "Freedom-loving American patriots" (Trump speech 1, 14:42) "pro-American agenda" (ibid, 18:18) and "we will always protect American families first" (ibid, 01:23:12). It is also clear that Trump wants to differentiate himself to his political opponents by framing their politics as anti-American as is made clear by the quote:

> For years, you watched as your politicians apologized for America. You remember that? Gee, I'm sorry, I'm so sorry. Now you have a President who's standing up for America (Trump speech 1, 01:49:58)

Towards the end of the speech Trump evokes patriotism when he speaks of the honor, religion, pride and history of the country.

"We believe that children should be taught to love our country, honor our history, and always respect our great American flag. And we live by the words of our great national motto, In God We Trust. We stand on the shoulders of American Patriots who built this country into the greatest nation ever to exist in history. Our ancestors crossed the oceans, settled a continent, tamed the wilderness, revolutionized industry, pioneered science, won two World Wars, defeated fascism and communism, and put a man on the face of the moon. Proud citizens like the people of Minnesota helped build this country, and together we are taking back our country. We are returning power to you, the American people." (Trump speech 1, 01:52:55)

Apart from being patriotic, the community is also constructed as democratic, as opposed to the democrats and the 'ruling elite' who are accused of attempting to "overthrow our government" (ibid, 25:51) and dismantle democracy as in the quote below:

They want to erase your vote like it never existed. They want to erase your voice. And they want to erase your future. But they will fail, because in America, the people rule again. (ibid, 18:18)

In this quote, Trump and his followers are constructed as 'the people' who are defending democracy while the democrats want to erase 'the peoples' voice. Another distinguisher of the community evoked is the shared conservative values like honour and Christianity.

In the Republican party, we believe that those who seek to join our society must embrace our values, honor our history, and love our people (ibid, 01:26:10)

The religious values of the republican party are constructed in opposition to the democrats who are seen as jeopardising Christian communities and opposing Christian values as made clear by the quotes:

"Previous administrations lust for regime change, and also put historic Christian communities in vastly more danger than they were before we started. They are some of the biggest victims of these power vacuums and reckless foreign adventures." (01:43:27)

"Virtually every top Democrat also now supports late term abortion, ripping babies straight from the mother's womb, right up to the moment of birth. That is why I've asked Congress to prohibit extreme late term abortion, because Republicans believe that every child is a sacred gift from God. Democrats are now the party of high taxes, high crime, open borders, late term abortion, socialism, and blatant Washington corruption. The Republican Party is the party of the American worker, the American family, and it's the party of the American Dream." (01:48:56)

The trump community as evoked in this speech is also made up of people who doesn't trust the media, the democrats (or the political establishment) or the polls. They believe that the media and the democrats are conspiring against them as exemplified by the quote:

> I can do the greatest things in history, and they'll [the media] make them bad to very bad. And if I do a neutral, something neutral, it worked out okay, not great, it's like, "Give him the electric chair. That was terrible." […] These people and the Democrats, they're partners. It's a partnership. How about on the newscast, like the word "manufactured," it's manu… And every newscast, "Tonight, in a manufactured deal along the border …" The word's never been used … All of a sudden every newscast is using it. It's a talking point given to these fakers by the Democrats. So they know they can't win the 2020 election, so they're pursuing the insane impeachment witch hunt (ibid, 24:26)

This description of the mainstream media is placed as opposed to Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Mark Levin and Lou Dobbs who are members of media which supports him (ibid, 25:51). Scott Johnson is another writer who is constructed as truthful and talented as opposed to the mainstream media (ibid, 57:13). The people, but also the nation, is just like Trump constructed as victims, which is made clear by the quote:

> And I'll tell you another thing, we have to be treated fairly. We have to be treated fairly. We're not treated fairly by other nations. We captured many, many ISIS fighters. Most of them came from Europe. They came from Germany. They came from France. They came from all of these countries. And we called them, I called them myself in many cases, I said, "Take your fighters." They said, "We don't want them. You take them." I said, "No, no, no, we did you a big favor. They're citizens of Germany. They're citizens of France. They're citizens of these various countries in Europe. Take your fighters." "We don't want them, sir. We don't want them.' And I said, "How unfair are we treated? We do them a great favor, and they won't take the fighters." (Trump speech 1, 01:41:34)

In this quote, the US is constructed as the benevolent nation who is helping other countries but are not being treated fair in return.

6.3   Defending the Community

Althusser argued that the way people feel about themselves and the world around them is, at least in part, a consequence of a particular ideology or discourse. Ideology creates 'subjects' by drawing people in to certain identities by the process of *interpellation* (Edley, 2001, p. 209). In this speech, the audience is being hailed

as patriotic, self-reliant and Christian but also as victims of previous administrations and the ruling elite.

With this construction of the community it also becomes clear how it can be defended if attacked by negating the identification of the community (Parker, 2015, p, 216). Since the image of the community is patriotic, those who refuse to be a part of it may be accused of being anti-American. Since they are portrayed as self-reliant, others may be accused of being weak or dependent. Since they are the ones with traditional and Christian values, other may be accused of being immoral. Since they are portrayed as the ones with the truth, those who refuse to be a part of this community could be accused of lying or simply being naïve or stupid. In the construction of the 'us' as victims, opponents could also be accused of being the oppressor or in other ways victimizing them.

7 Discourses and Institutions

In this section the contrasts, oppositions and overlaps in the discourse are analysed by studying the discursive frames that Trump uses when talking about himself and his politics. These different discursive are studied in order to determine how he speaks to different audiences or appeal to different sides of the audience. The analysis is focused around the power-aspect of the discourses by analysing what institutions are reinforced and what institutions are subverted as well as what categories of people are gaining from the discourses employed and thus what categories of people would promote or oppose the discourses as well as how these discourses interlock with other oppressive discourses (Parker, 2015, p. 2018-222). The dominant discourse in the speech can with a critical theory perspective, be interpreted as an authoritarian populist discourse.

7.1 Group Dichotomies

A number of group dichotomies can be identified in the speech as has been shown in the first reading of the material. As was shown in the last section, Trump and his followers as well as sometimes the nation, who are the 'us' in the speech, is constructed as victims of different injustices.

Trump is not only constructing the 'us' with which his constituents can identify, he also constructs 'others' who they are constructed in opposition to. The 'others' in the speech are the establishment and the media as has been shown earlier but also immigrant which is made clear by this quote:

> If Democrats were ever to seize power, they would open the floodgates to unvetted, uncontrolled migration at levels you have never seen before. Do you think you have it bad now? You would never have seen anything like what they want to do. But in the Trump administration, we will always protect American families first, and that has not been done in Minnesota. We've also implemented the strongest screening and vetting mechanisms ever put into place. We are keeping terrorists, criminals and extremists the hell out of our country […] We will not make the mistakes made in European countries, that allow a violent ideology to take root in our country, on our shores. We're not going to allow it to happen. And as you all know, to protect our citizens from those who would do harm to us, I instituted a very controversial, very hard to get, travel ban on some of the world's most dangerous countries. (Trump speech 1, 01:23:12)

Another group dichotomy is constructed between the 'us' as Christians and the 'others' as anti-Christian democrats in the following way:

> Virtually every top Democrat also now supports late term abortion, ripping babies straight from the mother's womb, right up to the moment of birth. That is why I've asked Congress to prohibit extreme late term abortion, because Republicans believe that every child is a sacred gift from God. Democrats are now the party of high taxes, high crime, open borders, late term abortion, socialism, and blatant Washington corruption. The Republican Party is the party of the American worker, the American family, and it's the party of the American Dream. For years, you watched as your politicians apologized for America. You remember that? (Trump Speech 1, 01:48:56)

On the same theme, he also makes a statement about how democrats have interfered militarily in Christian societies, making it worse for them, which he uses as an argument for withdrawing US forces from the middle-east (Trump speech 1, 01:43:27). Through this dichotomy he is able to speak to the Christian morals of his base and reinforce the institution of Christianity while subverting domestic institutions like welfare and women's rights and international institutions like the responsibility to protect.

Another group dichotomy which is constructed in the speech are the patriots and the anti-american establishment. This dichotomy is used many time but one example is when he speaks about American military involvement abroad.

> But from now on, we want to fight where it is to the benefit of the United States of America, not to the benefit of other countries. And we will only fight to win. We're only going to fight to win […] After years of building up other countries, we are finally building up our country. That's what we have to do (Trump speech 1, 01:31: 29 & 01:45:50)

This is another example of how Trump constructs the image of the US as being a self-sacrificing nation that receives nothing in return for its sacrifices. This dichotomy reinforces protectionist politics while subverting international cooperation.

7.2   'Usurpation Complex'

As has been shown in the previous section Trump depicts himself as a businessman first. There is also a heavy emphasis on 'winning' in the speech. Both in Trump being a 'winner', Trump as being in competition with other political leaders and the US being in competition with other countries. Trump is constructed as the best candidate because of his experience in business rather than his experience in politics.

The discourse could legitimise the subverting of democratic institutions like transparency by claiming it to be ineffective and destructive to 'business'. An example of this is when he speaks of the phone call to the president of Ukraine, with whom he supposedly had an "appropriate casual, beautiful, accurate phone call with a foreign leader" (Trump speech 1, 31:50).

> "And I don't want to do that as president, every time a president from a country calls me, or I call them, we have to release the text. How can you do business that way? Who's going to want to speak to your president?" (Trump speech 1, 25:51)

This populist type of business repertoire will speak to people who think that the political arena should be more like the business arena which is in accordance with what Adorno calls the 'pseudoconservative' and their attitude towards government. The pseudoconservative believes that power should be in the hands of the people who are in command of production, the economically strongest group, without interference of democratic dissention or by groups whom he regards as being in power only on account of formal political processes. (Adorno et. al., 1950, p. 677). In Trumps speech, he talks about protecting the 'industrial backbone' like this:

> "And to protect our industrial backbone, I placed tariffs on foreign aluminum and foreign steel […] In the previous administration, they put our nation's natural resources under lock and key […] Last year, I traveled to Duluth and announced that we would be ending this injustice, reopening Superior National Forest, and restoring mineral exploration for the iron ore mines of Minnesota. Tremendous jobs. And now the iron range is back in business. The last time I was here, a man came up to me, he said, "Sir, President Obama took our heart away, took our life away.' I'll never forget it. A man, strong guy, had tears in his eyes. He said, "You gave us back our life," because they took it away from him. We gave it back. Best iron ore there is anywhere." (Trump speech 1, 01:46:18)

The people that would gain from this discourse would be people that work in the production industry and they would be the strongest proponents to this kind of discourse since they have the most to gain from it. This discourse is reminiscent to what Abromeit calls the ideology of producers and parasites which shows a contempt for the poor, who they view as parasites while there is an admiration for the wealthy and successful who are supposedly the most productive members of society (Abromeit, 2018, p. 10). This ideology of producers and parasites has been used in both the French revolution and in attacks on the bourgeoisie in the 19th century but it can also be found in the fascist ideological arsenal and it is an example of how populism has transformed from left to right on the political spectrum (ibid, p. 15).

Democracy is in the speech constructed as something that is under threat and needs to be saved. At the same time there is a critique of democratic institutions like free press and transparency. This construction is reminiscent of the 'pseudo-conservative' conscious or unconscious attempt at the abolition of democratic

institutions in the name of upholding American values and institutions and defending against more or less fictitious dangers (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 676). Adorno argues that the goal of the pseudoconservative is to create a dictatorship of the economically strongest group by means of a mass-movement which promises security and privilege to the so-called "little man". This wish can be identified in the ideology by their description of representative democracy. Government and representation is seen as having perverted democracy. The people in power are accused of usurping power and entrenching themselves dictatorially. This is what is called the 'usurpation complex'. They thus accuse the progressives of the thing they themselves wish to do (ibid, 1950, p. 685). As Trump is doing in this speech, the pseudoconservatives call for a defence of democracy against is 'abuses', but would in the attack against these abuses abolish democracy altogether (ibid, p. 686).

The pseudoconservative have a sense of legitimacy where the 'legitimate' rulers are the ones who are in command of production. Progressives are thus seen as the usurpers because they have assumed positions of power which should be reserved for the 'right people' (ibid). Adorno et al. argues that the pseudoconservative recognises that the democracy as a formal system of political government never touched on the economic fundamentals and therefore the life of the people depends on the economic organisation of the country. The pseudoconservative thus senses an un-truth in the idea of 'their' representative government and realize that they don't determine their fate by going to the polls. But instead of directing this resentment towards the contradiction between economic inequality and formal political equality, it is directed towards democracy itself to put those who they deem as the most powerful anyway in direct control (ibid, p. 687).

7.3   Authoritarian politics of delusion

From a post-structural perspective. Language doesn't just mirror reality, it creates it. It is therefore interesting to look at how accounts are made to seem solid and factual but also what mechanisms are used to undermine factual accounts. The idea is that descriptions construct the world but they are also themselves constructed. Reality is constituted in one way or another based on the categories and descriptions that are made by humans as part of human practices (Potter, 1996, p. 97-98).

In the speech Trump evokes a sense of longing for a former glory of the United States of America that has been lost. He is also evoking family and Christians values as can be seen in the following quote:

> "We believe that children should be taught to love our country, honor our history, and always respect our great American flag. And we live by the words of our great national motto, In God We Trust. We stand on the shoulders of American Patriots who built this country into the greatest nation ever to exist in history. Our ancestors crossed the oceans, settled a continent, tamed the wilderness, revolutionized industry, pioneered science, won two World Wars, defeated fascism and

communism, and put a man on the face of the moon. Proud citizens like the people of Minnesota helped build this country, and together we are taking back our country. We are returning power to you, the American people" (Trump speech 1, 01:52:55)

This discourse reinforces institutions like family and Christianity but a specific kind of these institutions. The pseudoconservative express some kind of collectivist value system but believes that the control should be in the hands of people he can identify with. Adorno argues that this 'pseudosocialist' element of pseudoconservatism "serves as a democratic cloak for antidemocratic wishes" (Adorno et. al. 1950, p. 677). Adorno argues that all fascist movements officially employ traditional ideas and values but in actuality give them an anti-humanistic meaning (Adorno et. al., 1950, p. 676).

Trump constructs the 'us' as the ones with the truth while the 'others' are either lying or being stupid enough to believe the lie being told. He often refers to 'truth' and 'facts' in his speech. He also accuses his opponents, as well as the media of lies. Trump is known for being untruthful which makes this quite interesting. Rensman argues that the rise of 'fake news' and 'post-factual' politics enables what he calls this 'Authoritarian politics of delusion' (Rensman, 2018, p. 43).

Authoritarian populists have for a long time accused the media and the establishment of lying and the have also sought to blur the lines between fact, fiction, opinion and propaganda. But it is only with the rise of social media and 'citizen journalism' has this sentiment reached mass audiences. Rensman calls this process the 'democratization of resentment' (ibid).

This blurring if the lines between facts and opinions goes hand in hand with the boundless protection of free-speech in which hate-speech, lies and outright racism can be tolerated in the name of the right to express yourself. This is what Marcuse called 'repressive tolerance', which means that the content is always secondary to the right to speak (Marcuse 1960, cited in; Bronner, 2018, p. 95). They thus manipulate tolerance for repressive ends and when the opposition tries to censor them, they become martyrs and only grow stronger.

8   Conclusion

When assembled, it becomes clear that there are patterns in this speech when it comes to describing 'us' and 'them'. By looking at these ways of describing these categories of people, we begin to understand the limitation for the construction of 'self' and 'other' (Edley, 2001, p. 201). In this speech the shared understanding is that the Democrats, the media and ruling elite are conspiring against America and the American people. They are lying to the people and are filled with radical leftist who are threatening the American democracy and way of life. There is a conception of America and its people being under threat, both internally and externally, and therefore needs to be protected by a strong and competent leader as well as a robust law-enforcement and military.

From this analysis it is clear that this speech is an example of authoritarian populism by Morelocks definition as pitting the people against the elite in order to drive out or dominate 'others' who are not the people (2018, p. xiv). The discourse shows multiple cases of a populist repertoire being utilised. The audience is being interpellated through an authoritarian populist ideology which positions them as subjects by their identification with workers, patriots and Christian values. The ideological dilemmas are clear when it comes to the usurpation complex displayed in the speech where there is a construction of the establishment as being anti-democratic while proposing undemocratic solutions. Another ideological dilemma is made clear in the anti-elite rhetoric where Trump claims to be anti-elite when he's actually just trying to replace the political elite with the economic elite (Gounari, 2018, p. 208).

By interpreting the language used by Donald Trump in this speech, the shifting boundaries of what is deemed acceptable behaviour can be explained by the strong need for recognition for one's identity. This demand for recognition has for a long time been used by oppressed groups in society to claim their rights but there has now been a shift where it has been appropriated in the political sphere by the white, middle class men. Although recognition is important for every human being, the use of recognition for one's identity in the political sphere does come at a price. After several successful social movements demanding rights for oppressed groups we can see the power in demanding recognition for an identity-based group. The problem is that this recognition is based on the perception of powerlessness and injustices and not actual powerlessness. The success of this type of right wing populism can be explained by the ambivalence that most people feel which can make them sway in either direction towards democracy and authoritarianism. By the strong forces of group-identification and the 'usurpation complex' identified in the speech, the ambivalence is shifted towards authoritarianism rather than democracy.

The image of what it means to be a political leader seems to be changing within this camp because there is a distrust for politicians who they feel don't recognise them and their identity. The lost privileges which are a consequence of a modern, globalised capitalist society are experienced as oppression and therefore there is a willingness to follow a leader with whom you can identify even if, and maybe because, this leader doesn't fit in to the traditional image of a political leader. This allows for the forgiving of behaviour which would otherwise be deemed unacceptable.

9 Discussion

> 'demagogy makes its appearance whenever a democratic society is threatened with internal destruction [...] its function has always been [...] to lead the masses towards goals that run counter to their basic interests' (Löwenthal and Guterman 1949, xi, cited in Gounari, 2018, p. 208)

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which Donald Trump utilises group-identification and other legacies from social movements discursively when speaking to his base and how we can understand the appeal of this discourse by applying a historical and sociological context.

This study has shown that Trump uses an authoritarian populist discourse and utilises the power of identity and recognition when speaking to his audience. We can understand the acceptance of Donald Trump's unacceptable behaviour as a misdirected resentment toward the current global development. His base has lost, or perceive a loss of certain privileges and they realise that the political representation is secondary to the economic structure that creates inequality. Instead of directing this resentment toward the contradiction of representative democracy and global capitalism, they direct it towards the 'ruling elite'.

These results support earlier research about the psychology and politics of authoritarianism and populism. Today, just as when *The Authoritarian Personality* was published in 1950, people are shocked to find that so many people exhibit conscious or unconscious wishes for authoritarian solution to the contradictions that besieges a capitalist and liberal society. Then it was because of the result of a sociological study (Worell, p. 475), now it is because of the democratic election of authoritarian populist leaders. The research shows that this publication from 1950 is still relevant to this day for understanding authoritarianism and fascism. Although the research in the field of populism is extensive and earlier research shows that there may be many contributing factors to the rise of right-wing populism, this research contributes to this field by also offering an insight as to how people react to these factors and how these psychological reactions can be used by populist leaders. I have in this thesis studied Donald Trump as an example of the rising success of this type of 'outrageous' politicians but more research is needed in order to fully understand his, and other populist's voters as well as the meaning-building process that comes with the identification with, and support for, these populist leaders. This field is paramount in the political research field since this trend could change the political sphere and threaten democracy from the inside.

10 References

Abromeit, John "Frankfurt School Critical Theory and the Persistence of Authoritarian Populism in the United States" in, *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism.* Pp. 71–82. London: University of Westminster Press. DOI: https://doi. org/10.16997/book30.e. License: CC-BY-NC-ND

Adorno, Theodor W. (red.) (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper

Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (red.) (2005). *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys.* 2., [omarb.] uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Busby, Robert. (2009). *Marketing the populist politician [Elektronisk resurs] The demotic democrat*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Bronner, Stephen Eric, "From Modernity to Bigotry" in; *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism.* Pp. xiii–xxxviii. London: University of Westminster Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16997/book30.a. License: CC-BY-NC-ND

Delli Carpini, Michael X. "Entertainment Media and the Political Engagement of Citizens", in: Semetko, Holli A. & Scammel, Margaret (red.) (2012). *The SAGE handbook of political communication.* London: SAGE

Devetak, Richard. "Post-structuralism". in Burchill, Scott (2013). *Theories of international relations*. Fifth edition Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Edley, Nigel (2001). Analysing masculinity: interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. *Discourse as data*. S. 189-228

Fultner, Barbara, "Collective Agency and Intentionality: A Critical Theory", in; Thompson, Michael J. (red.) (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US

Gounari, Panayota, "Authoritarianism, Discourse and Social Media: Trump as the 'American Agitator' in; *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism.* Pp. 71–82. London: University of Westminster Press. DOI: https://doi. org/10.16997/book30.e. License: CC-BY-NC-ND

Hadzhidimova, L. and Stacey, A. (2019) 'Attending to the wrong issue in the political spectrum: Right-wing populism for left-wing concerns in the EU', *Politikon*, 40, pp. 7–27. doi: 10.22151/politikon.40.1.

Herz, Marcus & Johansson, Thomas (2013). *Poststrukturalism: metodologi, teori, kritik*. 1. uppl. Stockholm: Liber

Ikäheimo, Heikki, "Recognition, Identity and Subjectivity", in; Thompson, Michael J. (red.) (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US

Judis, John B., (2016) 'Rethinking Populism', 63(4), pp. 116–122. doi: 10.1353/dss.2016.0082.

Kellner, D. 2018. Donald Trump as Authoritarian Populist: A Frommian Analysis. In: Morelock, J. (ed.) *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism.* Pp. 71–82. London: University of Westminster Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16997/book30.e. License: CC-BY-NC-ND

Laclau, Ernesto (2007). *On populist reason*. [New pbk. ed.] London: Verso

Müller, Jan-Werner (2016). *What is populism?*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Morelock, J. 2018. Introduction: The Frankfurt School and Authoritarian Populism – A Historical Outline. In: Morelock, J. (ed.) *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism.* Pp. xiii–xxxviii. London: University of Westminster Press.

Parker, Ian (2015). *Critical discursive psychology [Elektronisk resurs]*. 2nd rev. ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Potter, Jonathan (1996). *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage

Rensman, Lars, "The Persistence if the Authoritarian Appeal: On Critical Theory as Framework for Studying Populist Actors in European Democracies" in, *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism.* Pp. xiii–xxxviii. London: University of Westminster Press.

Scullion, R & Armon, S 2018, 'Democracy in a de-civilizing age: The rise of shameless personal truths', *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 283–300

Smith, David Norman, "Theory and Class Consciousness" in, Thompson, Michael J. (red.) (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US

Stahl, Titus, "The Metaethics of Critical Theories" in Thompson, Michael J. (red.) (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US

Tarrow, S. G. and Meyer, D. S. (2018) *The resistance: the dawn of the anti-Trump opposition movement*. Oxford University Press.

Thompson, Michael J. (red.) (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US

Thompson, John B. (2000). *Political scandal: power and visibility in the media age*. Cambridge: Polity

Trump speech 1: Trump, Donald, (2019), "Minnesota Rally Speech", Minneapolis, 0ct 10. Transcript available at: https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-minnesota-rally-speech-transcript-minneapolis-mn-rally-october-10-2019 [accessed 04/03/2020]

Winther-Jörgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2000). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Worell, Mark P, "The Social Psychology of Authority" in; Thompson, Michael J. (red.) (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US

Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism [Elektronisk resurs]. (2018). London: University of Westminster Press

Attachment 1.

First reading - Categorization:
1. Turn the material into text
2. Explore connotations through creative association
3. Itemize the objects
4. Treat the text as our object of study
5. Listing the subjects

Second reading – Subjects
6. Speculate on what subjects say within this system of discourse
7. Explore network of relationships that are conjured
8. Speculate on how these relationships and pictures of the world could be defended if attacked.

Third reading - discourses
9. Explore oppositions by identifying contrasts between ways of speaking.
10. Analyse the overlap of different ways of speaking about the same object.
11. Consider how these different discourses speak to different audiences
12. Chose labels for the identified discourses
13. How did these discourses emerge historically?
14. Unravel the ways in which the discourses weave their own story of origin and how, in the process, they conceal their historical character.
15. What institutions are reinforced?
16. What institutions are subverted?
17. What categories of persons gain from this discourse?
18. Who would promote and who would oppose these discourses?
19. Explore how these discourses interlock with other oppressive discourses
20. Study how discourses justify the present

Attachment 2 – List of subjects mentioned in the speech

Mike Pence (marked as Vice President and having helped the President)

Karen Pence (unmarked, wife of Mike Pence)

China (used as subject in the form 'they', marked as admiring the US and President Trump and wanting to make a deal)

Our opponent (marked as inferior to Trump, China "would be number one economy in the world" if she was elected)

Cops (marked as loving Trump and being loved by Trump, fast, record, good service)

Ruling class/political establishment (marked as corrupt politicians and radical leftists who are bleeding America dry, pillaging and looting our country, vicious, horrible, disgraceful, dirty, sick and deranged people)

Washington swamp (marked as wretched and undemocratic)

Peter Strzok (Marked as being against Trump)

Lisa Page (Marked as Peter Strzoks lover)

Democrat con-artists and scammers (marked as desperate)

First lady (mentioned when telling audience what Trump said about the press, marked as Trumps wife and 'darling')

Media (marked as defeated, "they know they cannot win" and opposed to Trump, as fakers. Partnership with the democrats)

Trump (marked as capable – "I can do the greatest things")

Democrats (marked as in partnership with the media and guilty of witch hunt against Trump, undemocratic, phony, bad people, extremists, crazy)

Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Mark Levin and Lou Dobbes (marked as great people)

President of Ukraine (marked as defending Trump regarding the phone-call brought up in the impeachment)

Adam Schiff (marked as crooked, shifty, fraudulent and sick)

Nancy Pelosi (marked as sick, shifty, stupid or 'lost it' or dishonest)

White house counsel (marked as brilliant)

Mayor of Minneapolis (marked as rotten, bad)

Roger Penske (marked as fast, winner)

Joe Biden (marked as sleepy, bad at debating, owned and controlled by the Washington swamp, not a good senator, kissing Obamas ass, robbing us blind, bad at negotiations and bad at business)

President Obama (unmarked)

Hunter (marked as Joe Bidens son, genius on wall street, dumb, loser, inexperienced, immoral and clueless)

Chuck Tood (marked as sleepy-eyes)

Mike Lindell (marked as 'my pillow', the greatest ad negotiator in history)

Donald Trump (Marked as self-sacrificing, good at business, charitable, powerful)

George Stephanopolous (marked as a journalist)

Robert Mueller (marked as obstructing good things by good people and a bad witness)

Young woman (marked as incredible, wanted to help, was ruined by the political establishment)

Richard (marked as friend of Trump, great businessman, successfull)

Ilhan Omar (marked as an American hating socialist, anti-Semitic, minimizing islamist terrorism, disgrace to our country, liar, fraudulant)

Mr Scott Johnson (marked as a talented writer)

Congressman Tom Emmer (marked as tremendous, talented and tough)

Congressman Pete Stauber (marked as self-sacrificing, patriot)

Jim Hagedorn (marked as great friend with an incredible family, smart, brilliant, incredible)

Senator Tom Cotton (marked as great guy)

Senate majority leader Paul Gazelka (unmarked)

Minnesota GOP Chairwoman Jennifer Carnahan (marked as incredible)

Hispanics (marked as understanding borders, safety and crime, talked about as supporters of Trump)

Ronna McDaniel (marked as fantastic, great)

Hillary (marked as crooked)

Brad Parscale (marked as being good at computers)

Trumps father (marked as a teacher to Trump, great but tough)

Beyoncé, Jay-Z and Bruce Springsteen (marked as unnecessary, as opposed to for Hillary)

Eric Trump (marked as Trumps little boy)

Mr Jason Lewis (marked as tough and smart)

Ainsley, Steve and Brian, Pete Hegseth, Jessie Waters, Tucker and Sean Hannity (marked as great, great people, good and legendary)

Maria Bartimoro, Lou Dobbs, Greg, Judge Jeanine (marked as good and terrific)

Bob Kroll (marked as effective and good)

President of Mexico (marked as incredible)

Generals (marked as winners)

The Turks and the Kurds (marked as fighters, not Americas business)

A specific Colonel (marked as good, professional)

(American) Warriors (marked as beautiful, amazing, great, hurt and devastated)

Parents (marked as caring and loving)

Doctors, Army and Marine (marked as unbelievably great people)

Other nations (marked as unfair)