



The Arrogance of Power and Imperialism as Manifested in Trump's Media Talk

A Critical Discourse Analysis

Lect. **Habeeb M. A. Al-Saeedi**
College of Education/University of Al-Qadissiyah

Email: habeeb.alsaeedi@qu.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

The American political discourse on media, under the presidency of Trump, is characterized by arrogance of power and imperialism. President Trump always seeks to present the United States as the most global powerful nation, and to demonstrate himself as the best president ever created. To look down upon others and impose the American will is the strategy that Trump embraces more to deal with allies and enemies to achieve the American projects around the world.

The present investigation is a critical discourse analysis that aims at studying the manifestation of arrogance of power and imperialism in Trump's media talk. It focuses on how these two aspects are employed in the media talk of President Trump.

The findings of the current study show that Trump usually uses threatening, intimidating, instigating and criticism in the different types of media talk; i.e. television interviews, press conferences, electoral rallies and even in his tweets that clearly express his arrogance of power and imperialism.

Keywords: CDA, media talk, Trump, arrogance of power, imperialism,

غطرسة القوة والإمبريالية كما تتجلى في حديث ترامب الإعلامي تحليل الخطاب النقدي

الخلاصة:

يتميز الخطاب الرئاسي الأمريكي، في وسائل الإعلام خلال فترة رئاسة ترامب بغطرسة القوة وبالإمبريالية اللتان تعتبران السمة البارزة لسياسة الرئيس ترامب الخارجية. حيث إنه يسعى دائماً لتقديم أمريكا على أنها الدولة العظمى والأقوى في العالم، وبأنه هو أفضل رئيس تم انتخابه على الإطلاق. إن النظر بفوقية إلى الآخرين وفرض إرادة أمريكا هي الاستراتيجية التي يتبناها ترامب مع الحلفاء والأعداء لتحقيق مشاريع وخطط الولايات المتحدة حول العالم. الدراسة الحالية عبارة عن تحليل نقدي يبحث في مظاهر غطرسة القوة والإمبريالية في خطابات ترامب الإعلامية. ويحاول البحث إيجاد إجابات حول كيفية تجلى هذين المفهومين في الخطاب السياسي للرئيس الأمريكي.

لقد بينت نتائج هذه الدراسة أن الرئيس ترامب يتبنى ويمارس غطرسة القوة والإمبريالية في خطاباته الإعلامية بمختلف أشكالها: في المقابلات التلفزيونية والمؤتمرات الصحفية والتجمعات الانتخابية بما في ذلك تغريداته على موقع تويتر.

الكلمات الرئيسية: تحليل الخطاب النقدي، الخطاب إعلامي، ترامب، غطرسة القوة، الإمبريالية

Introduction

It is a common sense for politicians to sound authentic and avoid all types of incoherencies of natural speech. However, what makes Trump so different of the other presidents of the United States of America is his language which is really incoherent; it is more like an ordinary speech than we think. In other words, he speaks spontaneously as an ordinary person and behaves naturally as he says and does what he feels.

President Trump is a new phenomenon, and his political style is unique. He is the entertainer and the relentless power-seeker who appeared, during his electoral campaign, as an outrageous outsider, and a complete political anomaly. Furthermore, Trump is a provocative person who leads the most powerful nation on the earth. Hence, politics under Trump are turned



العدد الحادي والأربعون

الجزء الرابع / تشرين الثاني / ٢٠٢٠

جامعة واسط

مجلة كلية التربية

into topsy-turvy; they are mostly based on racism, arrogance, conflict, and lies.

In consequence, the American foreign policy, as it is manifested in Trump's media discourse, is characterized by imperialism and arrogance of power. The American imperialism, on the one hand, has, actually, risen after the fall of the U.S.S.R., when the world became unipolar. It has been a crucial part of the international political system not only to the closest neighbors of the United States but also to the whole world. So, the greatest temptation of hegemon and imperialism of the United States is to go alone, govern rather than consult, preach and enforce its principles on other countries. So, the American political discourse and the nature of the American foreign policy under Trump aim at forming an imperial power.

The arrogance of power, on the other hand, is said to be associated with pathological narcissism, i.e., the arrogant behavior is one of the criteria for narcissistic personality disorder. Arrogance is simply seen as a negative personality trait and a non-reflective self-state of mind.

Accordingly, the current study aims at investigating the manifestation of arrogance of power and imperialism in Trump's media talk. It seeks to find answers to the following question:

1. How do arrogance of power and imperialism manifest in Trump's media talk?

1. Literature Review

1.1. Political Discourse on Media

First of all, the term 'discourse' refers to the different patterns of language that people use on various aspects of life. Discourse usually involves "harmonizing language with ways of acting, interacting, feeling, and with non-linguistic symbols" to make the conveyed message clear and understandable (Gee,1999 :25). It plays an essential role in the everyday interaction and reproduction of ideologies, especially those of the dominant classes or other groups, and the interpretation schemes of everyday life (van Dijk,2003:4).

Secondly, discourse is political when it achieves a political action in a political institutional setting, such as "governing, legislation, electoral



campaigning, and so on” (van Dijk,1998:19). That is to say, political discourse, whether it is spoken or written, is a form of text where language can easily be manipulated to express the speaker's ideological beliefs and ideas through the structure of sentences and selection of words (Fairclough,1992:89). In other terms, political discourse, which is the talk of professional politicians, is used to convince people of the speaker's political views and ideas, as well as to change ideologically their attitudes or beliefs. Moreover, there is a very strong link between politics and rhetoric, as it was historically said that politics is the main spot of rhetoric. Thus, the political discourse, has usually been investigated in terms of “political oratory” (van Dijk,2000: 20).

Apart from this, Media discourse is, simply, the talk that one hears on radio or TV, or even the speech one may read in newspapers or on social media like twitter, Facebook...etc. That is, media talk, in general, is a worthwhile repertoire of various objects of analytic attention for researchers from different disciplines. However, it is only recently has media talk begun to be studied as a phenomenon in its own right(Hutchby,2006:4). Furthermore, as a matter of fact, the importance of media in the modern world is crucial and indisputable. In other words, very few people around the world, if any, are unaffected by media talk. For many people, if not all, media is the primary source of understanding the world. Nowadays, in modern democracies media serves a vital function as a public forum (Talbot,2007:3). It plays a crucial role in constituting the people's realities.

Accordingly, media talk and mediated verbal interaction have been intensively studied by many scholars. (e.g. Scannell, 1991; Fairclough 1995; Hutchby, 1996; Tolson, 2001a; Clayman and Heritage, 2002). What is interesting, in the analysis of media talk, is the very mundane, routine practices of verbal interaction that occur on TV, radio or social media the same ways they happen in everyday lives. It is just like an ordinary conversation; namely, media talk is interesting because it is so unremarkable (Tolson,2006:23). It is actually an unscripted talk, or as Goffman (1981) called it the “fresh talk” (cited in Hutchby,2006:1). Furthermore, media talk is the talk that does not involve the speaker reading from a text or recalling memorized lines like talk shows, interviews, debates and the rest; i.e., the talk



as it unfolds in the real time of the show is not scripted. The participants have then to be creative in reacting and responding to one another's talk in the course of its production.

Based on what has been discussed so far, political discourse on media is a complex phenomenon. It is an institutional talk that differs from everyday interaction in being subject to institutional goals and procedures. It is a public discourse which is addressed to a mass media audience (Fetzer & Lauerbach, 2007:14). What characterizes the American presidential discourse on media is the manifestation of some concepts such as arrogance of power and imperialism. They are, actually, the most salient features of Trump's media talk. The following section sheds more lights on these two concepts.

1.2. Arrogance of Power and Imperialism

a. *Arrogance of Power*

After the end of the Second World War, the United States of America has started competing for a total global leadership. The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, and the subsequent disintegration of the Eastern Bloc, granted the United States the complete global and unilateral hegemony. The world became a unipolar; namely, the United States of America became the only power that can stabilize and destabilize any region in the world due to its own interests. Since then, the political opinions and ideological views in the United States itself and globally were formulated around this fact (Halper, 2009:3).

Concurrently, the arrogance of power is the sign of a crisis of hegemony. As Gramsci (1971) argues, "if the ruling [power] has lost its consensus, i.e. is no longer leading, but only dominant, exercising coercive force alone" (cited in Leatherman, 2005a: 9). The United States, for example, in the second half of twentieth century deployed armed forces in about 100 countries, and publicly adopted a policy of replacing governments by force. Due to these practices, there is no doubt that the United States is "arrogant, self-indulgent, hypocritical, inattentive, and unwilling or unable to engage in cross-cultural dialogue (ibid.17). To put it another way, the United States, as a leading power, can no longer ignore the fact that the rest of the world are dissatisfied with its unfair and usual violent manifestations on the different



political, economic, social, cultural, or military levels. Therefore, during the Iranian revolution in 1979, the United States was described as “the Capital of Global Arrogance.” (Leatherman,2005b:6). In addition to that, since the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the United States of America is facing an accusation of arrogance. The tendency that William Fulbright (1966), the chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the U.S. war in Vietnam, warned of: “the attitude above all others which I feel sure is no longer valid is the arrogance of power, the tendency of great nations to equate power with virtue and major responsibilities with a universal mission”(cited in Leatherman&Webber,2005: 6).

Furthermore, arrogance is due to a person’s position, dignity, or power manifested in an overbearing manner or in presumptuous claims or assumptions. It is the attitude of superiority, and a tendency to look down upon others(Akhtar &Smolen,2018:4). Hence, arrogance is a combination of superiority and a feeling of certainty, which leads one to feel a heightened sense of narcissistic satisfaction and omnipotence (Shah,2018 :117). Some people may thus translate their success, achievement, wealth, and power into arrogance.

Many studies (e.g. Hareli & Weiner, 2000; Wosinska et al.,1996), have, actually, investigated arrogance. They emphasize that it is a negative personality trait that can have an adverse impact on how one is perceived, as well as it is "maladaptive, pathological, and immoral" (Baselice &Thomson,2018:42). Blackman (2018: 60) argues that arrogance is either an unwarranted or excessive pride or feeling of superiority. Moreover, the influential German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1797:198) stresses that “arrogance demands from others a respect it denies them”, and this is exactly what the United States of America does(Akhtar,2018:13).

Imperialism

According to the international relations theory, imperialism is the policy of dominating other countries. It refers to the ways of expanding a nation's power and domination through a direct territorial conquest or by getting indirect control over the political or economic life of other countries (Lubojemski,2018: 40). Furthermore, imperialism is a foreign policy which is



resulted from the absence of critical thinking and action to resist “inequality, violence and injustice in the world, and their daily manifestations”(Zoelle&Josephson ,2005:71). The United States has been imperialistic in certain, if not all, periods of its existence, and has applied all the three ways of imperialism, i.e., “military imperialism; economic imperialism; and cultural imperialism”(Morgenthau, 1960:59). Nowadays, The term 'imperialism' conveys a negative meaning, and no country would want to be labeled as imperialistic.

The American new 'Grand Strategy' establishes the new notion of 'neo-imperial' which appeared, as the American Administration pretends, as a response to terrorism, but it indeed has deeper roots. In consequence of this strategy, “the United States of America feels less obliged to cooperate with her allies and less bound to international rules. It would rather use its new military superpower to fashion the world to her own ideas” (Krell,2003: 21). Hence, due to the neo-imperialism, the United States will do everything to maintain its military advantages in all its regions of influence; no other power should be given the opportunity to catch up with it (ibid: iii).

For the purpose of this study, imperialism is used as an umbrella term to refer to all types of policies pursued by the United States of America to maintain the leading position in the international political system by applying the various militaristic, economic and cultural methods. In other terms, imperialism is used to refer to the American hegemony, and the projection of its power through the processes of globalization.

2. Data and methodology

1.1. Data

The data of the current study consists of twelve extracts. They represent TV interviews and electoral rallies of President Trump during the period from (2015-2020). Data were collected from different TV channels on YouTube.com (see primary sources).

1.2. Methodology

According to the purpose of the current study to analyze media talk, critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) is an ample method that can be used to get interesting findings. CDA is designed to examine the dynamic



relationship between discourse and society, between the “micropolitics of everyday texts and the macropolitical landscape of ideological forces and power relations” (luke,2002:100). That is to say, the methodological tactics of CDA is to move back and forth from analysis of text to analysis of social formation and institution, then the text can only be made sense out of if one has sufficiently theorized power, political relations material and historical change, and the social institutional under scrutiny. This means that text analysis can only be explicitly normative and political if it explicates how “discourse does ideological work”(Wodak, 1996:17). To put it another way, CDA focuses on the “intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture” (van Dijk,1993: 250). It also emphasizes the discursive strategies that validate control, or otherwise naturalizes the social order, and particularly the relations of inequality(Fairclough,1985:50). That is, CDA is an analysis approach that integrates linguistic and social analyses of discourse aiming at revealing power relations and ideology.

1.3. The Study Model of Analysis

To study how a powerful nation threaten other states with military intervention if they do not comply, or with the deprivation of some resources or services that are necessary to them or when they use manipulation rather than persuasion, then their power is exercised at the expense of other states freedom. Hence, exercising of power over others can be done through physical coercion or the threat of it; through persuasion or manipulation, or through the promise to grant or the threat to withhold some resource or service they need (Beetham,1991:43-5). In other words, to study how language is used to demonstrate the domination of some people over others, and to analyze how power and imperialism are exercised in conversation and other forms of talk that reveals people ideologies, this study adopts Fairclough's (1989) critical model to study features such as, illusive speech, manipulation and threat. Fairclough's model consists of specific linguistic mechanisms that include persuasion, speaking illusively and threat. In this, these mechanisms will be analyzed in relation to power and ideology.



3. Analysis and Discussion

3.1. Overconfidence and air of superiority

The United States of America holds a place of prestige in the world political topology. There is actually an international attention to its “actions and inactions”. Hence, the president of the United States, in certain aspects, is viewed as the president of the world (Balogun and Oladayo,2018: 64). Trump, from the very beginning of his tenure, acted according to this assumption. So, as it is shown in extract (1), Trump, in his inauguration speech, addresses the people of the world, presupposing that his words will be heard everywhere around the globe.

(1): President of the world

Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans and people of the world, thank you.[...]. We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power (Trump,2017).

Being the president of the most powerful nation on the earth made Trump feels arrogant, overconfident and superior to all, as if he were the leader of the world. It is, in fact, very usual that powerful leaders feel confident, but what is important to emphasize here is that confidence is an unreliable signal of competence.

Arrogance is actually one of the most salient traits of Trump's personality, but rather he could be the symbol of the American's modern arrogance, as Baselice and Thomson (2018:25) argue that “arrogance wins. Look no further than the 2016 U.S. presidential election. The winner, Donald J. Trump, now the forty-fifth president of the United States, is a supremely arrogant man”. Furthermore, in a tweet, Trump proclaims that he is the best president that God ever created, and he frequently portrays himself as the world's greatest person or the absolute king that nobody knows more than him in the various domains.



(2): I'm the king

Nobody knows more about taxes than I do. Nobody knows much more about technology than I do. I know more about ISIS than the generals do. Believe me. Nobody knows more about banks than I do, Nobody knows more about trade than me, I understand the tax laws better than almost anyone. I'm the king. I understand money better than anybody, I understand politicians better than anybody. Nobody knows politicians better than me(Trump, 2020).

Politicians, particularly those who come to power through genuine elections, are mostly perceived to be 'better' and thus behave 'better' than ordinary people. "They are expected to be faultless, perfect citizens, who do not only preach what they practice, but also practice what they preach" (Fetzer,2002:188). However, Trump's way of speaking and presenting his stances is viewed as a kind of 'frankness' and a sort of everyman plain speaking. He is also seen as "the first hybrid entertainment celebrity politician, a 'politainer', riding the wave of a new form of politics, 'politainment'" (Lynch,2017: 8). This is clearly seen in extract (2) as Trump overuses the expression 'nobody knows more than I do' which often comes accompanied by the audience laughing and applauding. This phrase has, in fact, some sort of becoming his trademark.

3.2. Arrogance of Militaristic Power

According to William Kristol and Robert Kagan's assumption of the "benevolent global hegemony" of the United States that emerged after the cold war, the American unchallengeable military power was important for the retention of the global order (Kagan,1996:3). However, this period of supremacy was characterized by the American military interventions in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and less overtly in Syria and Libya. The rhetoric of "promoting democracy, protecting human rights, and confronting aggression," were used to validate the hegemonic practices of the United States in these regions(cited in Trifcovic,2017: 29).



3.2.1. The Policy of Imposing the American Will

The American arrogance of power and imperialism refer to the conducted policies that attempted to extend the political, economic, and cultural influence of the United States over regions away from its borders which may implicate military interventions in some countries around the world (Lubojemski,2018 :39). Namely, the U.S. imperialistic expansion, without doubt, goes due to their vested interest. Therefore, the oil rich Arab countries in the Middle East, for instance, were reduced to the status of semi-colonies, completely subordinated to the interests of the American imperialism.

As a matter of fact, the stated goal of the United States presence in Iraq after 2003 was to foster democracy, but it turned into occupation for several years until they became obliged to leave due to a local and international pressure. After a short period of time the American troops came back, this time under pretention of fighting ISIS.

Iraq, according to the U.S. policy planners, is one of the 'rogue states', but rather it is the only 'rogue state' that represents a serious threat to the entire project of globalization. Because, if Iraq ambition of annexing Kuwait led to creating a revolutionary Arab regime particularly in Saudi Arabia, "it would have been in control of about half the world's known oil reserves and would have established itself as a price-setter in the world's most heavily-traded source of energy" (Catley,1999: 171-2). Hence, the American invasion of Iraq came to containing Iraq's ambitions and taking its oil. This reality was clearly disclosed by Donald Trump in an interview on FOX NEWS in 2015, during the presidency race to the white house. He stated that ISIS fight is not America's fight, rather the Americans have to achieve one goal: to take the Iraqi oil which represents the second-largest oil fields in the world after Saudi Arabia. That is to say, the main purpose of the American military intervention in Iraq, according to Trump's imperialistic vision, is neither to foster democracy nor to fight ISIS, but to control and steel the Iraqi oil. Trump, in extract (3) below, publicly and overtly announces his political view of taking the Iraqi oil as long as it has weak army and corrupt society.



(3) Taking the oil of Iraq

That's not our fight, that's other people fight. Iraq has the second-largest oil fields in the world, 15 trillion dollars' worth of oil, second to Saudi Arabia. Their armies are wiped out, they have weak armies at a corrupt society. Anyway, I mean it's totally corrupt. So, I said very simply, that if it's me we take the oil.

What's more disturbing about imperialism, is “its long-term toxic effect, what secures it, what cements it, is the benevolent self-representation of the imperialist as savior” (Leatherman & Webber, 2005:157). Some American politicians in the ex-administrations (e.g. George W. Bush and Colin Powell) stated that the aim of the American invasion of Iraq is to guarantee the Iraqi people a place in the world as a “free, stable and self-governing country” (Krell, 2003:i). However, extract (4) below illustrates the American lies as well as the Trumpian vision of the American conquest of Iraq.

(4): There is no Iraq

Trump: I would take away their wealth, I would take away the oil.

IR¹: Would you be destroying the wealth of Iraq?

Trump: no! no! let me, there is no Iraq, there is no Iraq. Their leaders are corrupt.

IR: But Iraqi are different with you.

Trump: excuse me, there are no Iraqis they've broken up into so many different factions.

Based on his apparent imperialistic arrogance, Trump, during his electoral campaign, and in a TV interview on CNN in 2015, does not hesitate to fluently announce that Iraq is no longer exist, and Iraqis are broken up into different fractions. So, in Trump rhetoric, it is the time for the United States to take the wealth of Iraq and steal its oil.

¹ The Interviewer



العدد الحادي والأربعون

الجزء الرابع / تشرين الثاني / ٢٠٢٠

جامعة واسط

مجلة كلية التربية

Moreover, due to the neo-imperial model, arrogance is an aspect of psychotic or criminal thinking which can be resulted from narrow-mindedness in the realm of feeling and perception (Krell,2003:21). This is, undoubtedly, the case of Donald Trump who thinks that Iraq is America's war spoil.

(5) To the victor belongs the spoils

You know the old days yet a war you ever heard the expression to the victor belongs the spoils. I said if we leave it, we'll take the oil at least pay us back and I come out on the front page news, oil companies a horrible human being, he wants to take the oil from a **sovereign** country. **Sovereign?** give me a break. You see the people ripping off. **Sovereign?** unbelievable!! (Trump,2015)

Trump tries, in extract (5), to act out and make fun of the phrase 'sovereign country'. He mockingly repeats the word 'sovereign' three times to show that he does not believe in it at all. On contrary, Iraq in Trump's rhetoric is a war spoil that belongs to the victor, the United States of America. In addition, he insists that when the Americans under local and international pressure were obliged to leave Iraq, they should have taken the Iraqi oil.

Some closest allies and many American intellectuals believe that the United States has recently been tempted by the 'arrogance of power' which would, as the well-known U.S. political scientist Stanley Hoffmann puts it, be a "disastrous regression" (Krell,2003: 42). This is the real image of the United States that the presidency candidate, Donald J. Trump, portrays in extract (6) as he plans to stay and take the Iraqi oil in order to pay himself (3.5)billions dollars and to take care of other countries that helped America in the conquest of Iraq.



(6): **Distribution of spoils**

We stay and protect the oil and we take the oil and we pay ourselves back to three and a half trillion dollars or more. We take care of Britain, we take care of other countries that helped us and we do not be so stupid.

Consequently, it is not fair to say that imperialism does not exist anymore; it has just adjusted to the XXI century, as it had beforehand to other periods of time when trade or economic expansion was more important than territorial expansion (Lubojemski,2018: 43).

3.2.2. Policy of Threatening and Intimidation.

As it has been discussed earlier, imperialism does not merely mean militaristic expansion, rather it also relies on economic ties that may indirectly control not only a specific country but also groups of countries (ibid: 41). Due to his imperialistic tendencies, which are supported by the American unchallenged militaristic power, Trump acts out and uses a satirical language to demonstrate how he told King Solomon of Saudi Arabia that he has to pay for his protection. Though Saudi Arabia is one of the closest Arab allies of the United States, Trump, as extract (7) shows, tries to escalate pressure on them to curb rising of oil prices and pay for their military protection. Such actions clarify that the United States of America has nothing to do for fostering democracy or protecting allies there, but to force them to pay under threatening. Because, as Trump clearly puts it, they might not be there for two weeks without the U.S. protection.

(7): **Pay to stay**

Listen! We protect Saudi Arabia, would you say they're rich, and I love the King, King Solomon. But I said King we're protecting you. You might not be there for two weeks without us you have to pay for your military besides the price of oil being discussed today (Trump, 2018).

The American imperialistic ideology is obvious; they protect Saudi Arabia because it is a rich country. Trump's rhetoric is undoubtedly an explicit



threatening to the Saudis that they can't defend themselves and protect their country without the American protection. It is indeed in the heart of imperialism to force countries to pay under threatening and intimidation. Imperialism, without doubt, implies any action conducted by a powerful state for its own interest that goes beyond its own sovereignty. This action, as (Lubojemski,2018: 43) argues, can be anything from establishing military bases in other countries to the formation of military alliances where at least one state, because of this alliance, loses a part of its own will such as the case of the Gulf rich countries. The American imperialistic policy of pay for protection is imposed on many other countries around the world; namely, not only Saudi Arabia but other international countries are also subjected to the American hegemony. Japan and South Korea, for instance, as Trump states in extract (8), also pay for their protections.

(8): We protect Japan and South Korea

Japan is going also to contribute now Japan, we protect Japan they pay as a small percentage. We protect South Korea, they pay us, and by the way we're doing great on North Korea. But South Korea they got to reimburse us they got to reimburse us (Trump, 2018).

Trump also asked Germany and France to pay for the American military presence on their territories, and for the U.S. participation in the NATO, but they refused to pay. It is hence clear that the United States of America follows an imperialistic foreign policy which is clearly demonstrated by the vast use of "soft power" and the American militaristic interventions in all parts of the world (Lubojemski,2018:50).

Furthermore, as part of his controversial foreign policy stances and according to his ideology as an imperialistic arrogant, Trump, with an underestimating and threatening language in extract (9), says that he will get the Gulf States to pay for the American plans in Syria:

(9) The Gulf States

You wanna do safe zones in Syria. I'll get the Gulf States who aren't doing much, believe me. The Gulf States have nothing but money. We are [...] 19 trillion dollars, we are not paying for It. They are gonna pay, they are gonna pay. We gonna get the Gulf States pay for, they pay. Don't forget! without us Gulf States won't exist. They won't exist" (Trump,2016).

Trump, as (Arditi, 2007, 78) points out, is like a “drunken dinner guest[s]” who always relies on provocation and a more aggressive rhetoric. In recalling the super power notion, Trump goal of being in the Middle East is to control countries and to have them pay for the American conflicts and expansions in the region. From an imperialistic vision regarding the Gulf states, Trump says: "I'll get Gulf States to pay" , he neither uses 'ask' nor 'demand' them to pay, but to 'get them' mean to order or to force them to pay. Trump's imperialistic ideology is manifested through his language of threatening and intimidating that he uses here. It is a harmful and impolite language to describe sovereign countries as having nothing but money and they will be forced to pay since they have no other choice because without the protection of Washington they will not be exist.

Washington that forced its local allies in 1990 to give ground for its military forces to participate in the Gulf War, would force them again to pay money for the United States new projects in the region (e.g. safe zones in Syria). Trump's rhetoric in fact reveals his imperialistic policy in the Middle East which simply based on the notion of 'pay to stay' that can be seen as a new ideology adopted by Trump's Administration.

According to (Colvin,2016:2), Trump talks naturally, not like a politician; he says out loud what he thinks right. His language, as (Swaim, 2015:13) claims, is different; the forms of his sentences do not work the way modern political rhetoric does. In addition to that, unlike other politicians, Trump does not use ambiguous and complicated language to impress his audience rather he “turned from an amusing anecdote and the most discussed and controversial phenomenon in modern politics, into the leader of the most powerful country in the world” (Kayam,2017: 1,4).



3.3. The Arrogance of Global Power

3.3.1. Replacing Governments

The relationship between language and politics, as Lakoff (1990:7) suggests, is inextricable; he argues that “language is politics, politics assigns authority, and authority regulates how people speak and understand them”. He further admits that manipulation of words in political discourse relies on the used language, because language initiates and interprets power relationships. In other words, any political action is, undoubtedly, accompanied, controlled or influenced by language use. That is to say, language is important for those who plan to gain, practice and maintain power; it plays an important role in announcing policies and ideologies (Balogun & Oladayo: 2018:65).

The United States of America has usually readymade accusations against any opponent in any part of the world. So, based on the Narcotics Rewards Program, and as part of the “sweeping actions” declared by Trump's Administration to remove Maduro from the leadership of Venezuela, criminal charges brought against him and a number of top Venezuelan officials for drugs trafficking and sponsoring terrorism, in addition to an aggressive campaign of economic sanctions that aimed to force Maduro out of power (Guerrero, et al. 2020:1).

(10) Socialism is dying in Venezuela

We're here to proclaim a new days coming in Latin America it's going in Venezuela and across the Western Hemisphere. Socialism is dying and liberty prosperity and democracy are being reborn today. [...]. The people of Venezuela are standing for freedom and democracy and the United States of America is standing right by their side (Trump,2019).

Trump, in extract (10), celebrates the Venezuelan uprising and incites people to stand against Maduro's regime. He also reminds them that the United States is standing right by their side in their movement for prosperity and democracy.



During Trump's presidency, arrogance of power and imperialism became crucial parts of the American's foreign policy. The United States of America, as being the most powerful nation in the world, can stabilize or destabilize any region around the world according to its own interests. What happened in Venezuela, as the Venezuelan Foreign Affairs Minister clarifies, is a new form of a coup d'état used by Trump's Administration through vulgar and inflammatory language, and baseless allegations. It is an attempt to undermine Venezuela's accomplishment in the fight of drugs trafficking. The United States wants to fashion the world according to its own interest by giving the power in this country to someone who satisfies their needs and perform their plans in the region (Guerrero et al., 2020:2).

3.3.2. Criticizing Allies

Trump, in fact, does not like to be criticized by anyone. He thinks that his ideologies are the best to be followed inside and outside America. Namely, the whole world should function according to his vision and ambition. In extract (11) below, Trump attacks a foreign politician and treats him as if he were an employee in one of his companies. He further advises the British government to fire him. Sadiq Khan, the mayor of London, opposed Trump's visit to the UK and he once tweeted that the British officials are so obsessed with trying to please America in a way they act in a sycophantic manner. Because of this statement, Trump lunches a fierce campaign on twitter against Khan, and claims that London needs a new mayor to replace this 'nasty stone clod loser'.

(11) Mayor of London

Sadiq Khan who by all accounts has done a terrible job as Mayor of London, has been foolishly “nasty” to the visiting President of the United States, by far the most important ally of the United Kingdom. He is a stone cold loser who should focus on crime in London, not on me. LONDON needs a new mayor ASAP. Khan is a disaster - will only get worse! (Trump,2019)



Trump, actually, does not hesitate to use any harmful expression or harsh word to describe others. In many times his language does not sound presidential or even political. The use of expressions like "nasty", "stone cold loser" and "disaster" shows how Trump is arrogant and racist at the same time as he talks about a Muslim person. Arrogance is an "offensive" strategy rather than a defensive one Trump uses to attack his opponents and critics (Akhtar and Smolen,2018:4). Further, It is an attitude of superiority and a tendency to look down upon others. This behavior proves that Trump is "riddled with anger and hostility and self-praise and arrogance" (Summers, 2000:198).

In a different situation, Trump again uses the term 'nasty' as a reference to another foreign ally. He insults the Prime Minister of Denmark after she rejected to discuss Trump's idea of purchasing Greenland and described the idea as an 'absurd idea, Greenland is not for selling'.

(12): A nasty prime minster

I thought that the prime minister's statement that it was *absurd*, that it was an *absurd* idea was *nasty*. I thought it was an inappropriate statement. We can't treat the US the way they treated us under president Obama. She's not talking to me. She's talking to the United States of America. You don't talk to the United States that way, at least under me."

It is inappropriate and impolite to describe Trump's idea as an 'absurd idea' by the Danish Prime Minister. On contrary, it is so and more for Trump to describe her statement as "nasty". Because, as he pretends, she addresses the United States of America; the most powerful global power that should be respected by all, particularly under the presidency of Trump. In this regard, he is also tagging Obama under whom America, as he claims, was treated badly. There is also a racial hint underneath as president Obama belongs to the black community. It is a rude behavior based on the arrogance of global power. There is a combination of superiority and a feeling of certainty that leads Trump to feel with a heightened sense of narcissistic satisfaction and omnipotence (Shah 2018: 117).



4. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the analyzed data, the study concludes the following:

1. Arrogance of power and imperialism are not new to the American political discourse, rather they became more salient and visible under Trump, or more precisely they became the landmark of his presidency and foreign policy. As an arrogant person, Trump imagines that he is the president of the world and his voice will be heard everywhere around the world, he presents himself as he knows everything and all things better than anyone else. In addition, Trump rhetoric reveals his reality as a political speaker who uses a simple language full of vulgar expressions and harsh words that do not sound presidential at all.
2. Trump foreign policy is based on arrogance of power and imperialism which are clearly manifested through the offensive language he uses with allies rather than enemies. Threatening, intimidating, instigating and harsh critic are the most applied strategies in Trump's media talk to demonstrate the American arrogance of power and imperialism.
3. The analysis also reveals that the American presence in the Middle East region is not for fostering democracy or protecting allies, but to steal the wealth of the Gulf rich countries and forcing them to pay for the America's projects of expansion in the region.
4. According to Trump's ideology of arrogance of power and imperialism, Iraq is a war spoil belongs to America. Saudi Arabia and other Gulf States have to pay for their false protection and for the United States' projects in the region, as they are in Trump's rhetoric have nothing but money and they will not be exist without the American protection. The socialist regime in Venezuela should be removed and London mayor should be changer as he is a nasty stone cold loser. The Danish prime minister is nasty too because she describes Trump's idea of purchasing Greenland as absurd idea. To sum up, Trump's rhetoric reveals that he would like to fashion the world according to his thoughts and ideologies.



REFERENCES

- Akhtar S. and A. Smolen. (2018). *Arrogance: Developmental, Cultural, and Clinical Realms*. New York: Routledge.
- Akhtar, S. (2018). "The Realm of Arrogance". In Akhtar, S. and A. Smolen (eds). *Arrogance: Developmental, Cultural, and Clinical Realms*. New York: Routledge.
- Arditi, B. (2007). *Politics on the Edges of Liberalism: Difference, Populism, Revolution, Agitation*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Balogun, S. and M. Oladayo. (2018). "Language in Political Discourse: A Pragmatic Study of Presupposition and Politeness in the Inaugural Speech of President Donald Trump". In *Bulletin of Advanced English Studies – Vol. 1, No. 1, 2018*, pp. 64 -76 Available online at <http://www.refaad.com>.
- Baselice K.A. and J. Thomson. (2018). "An Evolutionary Hypothesis on Arrogance". In Akhtar, S. and A. Smolen (eds.) *Arrogance: Developmental, Cultural, and Clinical Realms*. New York: Routledge.
- Beetham, D. (199). *The Legitimation of Power*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blackman, J.(2018). "Defensive Arrogance in Adult Philanderers" In Akhtar, S. and A. Smolen (eds.). *Arrogance: Developmental, Cultural, and Clinical Realms*. New York: Routledge.
- Catley, B. (1999). Hegemonic America: The Arrogance of power. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 21(2), 157-175. Retrieved July 2, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/25798451.
- Clayman,S. and J. Heritage. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Colvin, G. (2016). Explaining Donald Trump's Massive Branding Power, 27 April. Available at: <http://fortune.com/2016/04/28/donald-trump-branding-power/> 20.06.2020
- Fairclough, N. (1985). Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis. In *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 9, Issue 6, Pp. 739-763.
- _____ (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman .
- _____ (1992). "Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis Within Discourse Analysis". In *Discourse and Society* 3(2):193-217 DOI: 10.1177/0957926592003002004.
- _____ (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fetzer, A. (2002). "Put Bluntly, You Have Something of a Credibility Problem. Sincerity and Credibility in Political Interviews". In Chilton, P. & A. Ch. Schäffner (eds.) *Politics as Text and Talk Analytic approaches to political discourse Edited by*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.



- Fetzer, A & G.E. Lauerbach. (2007). *Political Discourse in the Media Cross-cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gee, J. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited by Q. Hoare and G. Smith. New York: International Publishers
- Guerrero, K. , Perez, E. and D. Shortell. (2020). Trump Administration Targets Venezuela's President and Other Top Officials. In CNN politics. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/03/26/politics/venezuela-trump-administration-terrorism/index.html> 10.6.2020
- Halper, D. (2009). *Icons of Talk: The Media Mouths That Changed America*. London: Greenwood Press Westport, Connecticut.
- Hareli, S and B. Weiner. (2000). Accounts for Success as Determinants of Perceived Arrogance and Modesty. In *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 24(3), pp.:215-236. DOI: [10.1023/A:1005666212320](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005666212320)
- Hutchby, I. (1996). Power in Discourse: The Case of Arguments on a British Talk Radio Show. In *Discourse and Society*. Vol. 7, Issue 4, pp.481-497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926596007004003>
- _____ (2006). *Media Talk Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. England: Open University Press.
- Kagan, R. (1996). "Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy". CARNEGIE <https://carnegieendowment.org/1996/07/01/toward-neo-reaganite-foreign-policy-pub-276>
- Kant, I. (1797). *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Kayam, O. (2018). The Readability and Simplicity of Donald Trump's Language. In *Political Studies*, Vol. 16(1) pp.73–88 DOI: [10.1177/1478929917706844](https://doi.org/10.1177/1478929917706844) journals. sagepub.com/home/psrev
- Krell, G. (2003). Arrogance of Power – Arrogance of Impotence: The Iraq Conflict, US “Weltpolitik”, and Transatlantic Relations. In *Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF)*. <file:///C:/Users/dell/Downloads/Documents/prif67.pdf> 05.05.2020
- Kristol, W., & Kagan, R. (1996). Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(4), 18-32. doi:10.2307/20047656
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in our Lives*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leatherman, J. and J. Webber. (Eds.) *Charting Transnational Democracy; Beyond Global Arrogance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leatherman, J. (2005a). "Global Arrogance and the Crisis of Hegemony" in Leatherman, J. and J. Webber (Eds.) *Charting Transnational Democracy; Beyond Global Arrogance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.



- _____ (2005b). "Making Space for Transnational Democracy" in Leatherman, J. and J. Webber (Eds.) *Charting Transnational Democracy; Beyond Global Arrogance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lubojemski, A. (2018). 19th Century American Imperialism. A Theoretical Outlook. <file:///F:/Trumpism%20and%20racism/ilovepdfmerged.pdf> 20.04.2020
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond Science and Ideology critique: Developments in Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* (2002) 22, P.p. 96-110. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, Th. (2017). President Donald Trump: A Case Study of Spectacular Power. In *The Political Quarterly Publishing Co*. Pp. 1-10.
- Morgenthau, H. (1960). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York, p. 59. <file:///F:/Trumpism%20and%20racism/ilovepdfmerged.pdf>. 25.04.2020
- Nai, A., F. Martinezi and J. Maier. (2019). Donald Trump, Populism, and the Age of Extremes: Comparing the Personality Traits and Campaigning Styles of Trump and Other Leaders Worldwide. In *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 49, No. 3, September 2019, 609– 643 DOI: 10.1111/psq.12511.
- Scannell, p. (1991). *Broadcast Talk*. USA: Sage
- Shah, A. (2018). "Arrogance in text and in context". In Akhtar, S. and A. Smolen (eds.). *Arrogance: Developmental, Cultural, and Clinical Realms*. New York: Routledge.
- Shah, D. (2018). "Arrogance in countertransference". In Akhtar, S. and A. Smolen (eds.). *Arrogance: Developmental, Cultural, and Clinical Realms*. New York: Routledge.
- Summers, A. (2000). *Arrogance of Power: The Secret World of Richard Nixon*. New York: Penguin Books
- Swaim, B. (2015). How Donald Trump's Language Works for Him. The Washington Post, 15 September. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2015/09/15/how-trump-speak-has-pushed-the-donald-into-first-place>. 15.06.2020
- Talbot, M. (2007). *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.
- Tolson A. (2001) ed., *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle (lea's Communication Series)*. London: Routledge
- _____ (2006). *Media Talk Spoken Discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburg: Edinburg university press.
- Trifcovic, S. (2017). Trump's Foreign Policy: A Victory for the Deep State. In *POLITEA*, Vol. 7, No. 13. DOI 10.5937/pol1713028T,
- van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse and Society*, London. Newbury Park and New Delhi: SAGE, vol. 4(2): 249- 283.
- _____ (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.



- _____ (2000). New (s) Racism: A Discourse Analytical Approach. In *Ethnic Minorities and the Media Journal*. Vol. 37, pp. 33-49.
- _____ (2003) The Discourse-Knowledge Interface. In *Critical discourse analysis*. Pp. 85-109. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R.(1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman
- Wosinska, W., Dabul, A. J., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Cialdini, R. B. (1996). Self-Presentational Responses to Success in the Organization: The costs and benefits of modesty. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 18(2), 229–242. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspp1802_8
- Zoelle, Z, and J. Josephson (2005). "Making Democratic Space for Poor People". In Leatherman, J. and J. Webber (eds.) *Charting Transnational Democracy; Beyond Global Arrogance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Euronews.com: Trump says Gulf states will pay for Syrian war. <https://www.euronews.com/2016/08/03/trump-says-gulf-states-will-pay-for-syrian-war>.
2. MSNBC. Com: President Donald Trump Knows More Than Anybody, And Nobody Knows More. MTP Daily. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=49kG7HfD-oM>
3. nbcnews.com: Trump vows 'new day' for Venezuela <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/donald-trump/trump-vows-new-day-venezuela-n972891>
4. Trump Twitter Webpage. <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/1135453891326238721?>
5. Whitehouse.gov: The Inaugural Address of the 45th president of the United president. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/the-inaugural-address/>
6. YouTube.com: Trump slams Danish prime minister's comments on Greenland as "nasty" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9-En49ftGI8>
7. YouTube.com: Trump's 'Take Iraqi oil' quote video compilation by Abizaid N. Alqassier. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sqkQU5anI0>
8. You Tube .com: President Trump Says Saudi King Wouldn't Survive 'Two Weeks' Without U.S. Backing |TIME. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEyADITbSSc>