

The Concept of Alliance in the American Political Discourse: A Critical Study

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ali Abdulhameed Faris

Department of English / College of Arts / University of Basrah

Abstract

This study is an attempt to find out how the approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) plays the essential role in revealing the underlying ideologies in the discourse of the former American President Trump while addressing the American allies namely the NATO's countries. It seeks to identify the referential strategies used by him during the time of referring to the American alliance system. The study involves data analysis of "Donald Trump's Foreign Policy Speech, April, 27, 2016 – transcript". It is available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/12/world/what-is-donald-trumps-foreign-policy.html> Reisigl and Wodak's (2001, p. 42) **Referential Strategies** are adopted to analyze the given data. The research design of this study is qualitatively oriented asking open-ended questions whose answers cannot be easily analyzed throughout numbers.

Keywords: Political Discourse, CDA, Ideology, American Alliance System, Referential Strategies.

Received: 15/02/2024

Accepted: 13/05/2024

مفهوم التحالف في الخطاب الأمريكي السياسي: دراسة ناقدة

الأستاذ المساعد الدكتور علي عبد الحميد فارس

قسم اللغة الأنكليزية / كلية الآداب / جامعة البصرة

المستخلص

تعد هذه الدراسة محاولة لمعرفة الدور الأساسي لمنهج التحليل الناقد للخطاب (CDA) في الكشف عن الأيديولوجيات الكامنة في خطاب الرئيس الأمريكي السابق ترامب أثناء مخاطبته حلفاء أمريكا وتحديدًا دول الناتو. ويسعى إلى التعرف على الاستراتيجيات المرجعية التي استخدمها في زمن الرجوع إلى نظام التحالف الأمريكي. تتضمن الدراسة تحليل بيانات "خطاب السياسة الخارجية لدونالد ترامب في ٢٧ أبريل ٢٠١٦ - نص". وهو متاح على الرابط التالي: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/12/world/what-is-donald-trumps-foreign-policy.html> (ص. ٤٢) تم اعتماد الاستراتيجيات المرجعية لودك و ريزل (٢٠٠١: ٤٢) من أجل تحليل البيانات المعطاة. إن التصميم البحثي لهذه الدراسة موجه نوعيًا ويطرح أسئلة مفتوحة لا يمكن تحليل إجاباتها بسهولة من خلال الأرقام. وتوصلت الدراسة إلى نتائج معينة. أولاً، ان استراتيجيات «الجماعية» المرجعية هي الأكثر هيمنة في الخطاب كله؛ ومن خلال هذه الاستراتيجية يتم الكشف عن أيديولوجية "الشمول".

كلمات مفتاحية: الخطاب السياسي ، تحليل الخطاب الناقد ، الأيديولوجيا ، نظام التحالف الأمريكي ، الاستراتيجيات الاشارية.

تاريخ القبول: ٢٠٢٤/٠٥/١٣

تاريخ الاستلام: ٢٠٢٤/٠٢/١٥

1. Research Objectives

The major purpose of the current study, which conducts a critical discourse analysis, is to describe, interpret, and explain the embedded ideologies in the discourse of the American President Trump while talking about the American alliance system. This study, specifically, endeavors to reach the following objectives:

1. to identify the referential strategies used by Trump in regard to the American allies,
2. to uncover the underlying ideologies in the discourse of Trump while referring to the American alliance system.

This study is limited to analyzing, interpreting, and explaining Trump's stretches of discourse that incorporate the referential strategies put forward by Reisigl and Wodak's (2001, P. 47), and, then to reveal, with the help of these strategies, the embedded ideologies which contribute to establishing and reestablishing the American alliance system.

2. Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. what are the referential strategies employed by Trump while addressing the American allies? and
2. what are the covert ideologies in the discourse of Trump while tackling the American alliances?

3. Methodology

The research design of study is qualitative in nature embracing the conventions of critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA). According to Creswell (2003), qualitative procedures are based on text and different strategies of inquiry, and they expose a variety of perspectives ranging from thinking on social justice to diverse ideological perspectives.

The selected written transcriptions of Trump were the primary data of this study. This study employs Reisigl and Wodak's (2001) Referential Strategies to explore the political ideologies hidden in the discourse under discussion.

Collecting the text samples required downloading on Trump's speech entitled "Donald Trump's Foreign Policy Speech", and printing it out. The sampling of data incorporated the data that revolve around the concept of American alliance system.

4. Introduction

CDA, as an approach, aims to establish in-depth understanding and comprehension of social and political issues emphasizing in particular the relationship between dominance and discourse or to put it differently the relationship between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture. It seeks to draw attention to the role of discourse to structure relations of power in society that is how discourse is related to and is implicated in the production and reproduction of social power relations. Being problem-oriented, interdisciplinary, and eclectic, CDA aims at critiquing ideologies as they are infiltrated or conveyed in discourse and other semiotic systems. It is involved in studying textual features in consideration of the larger social context to promote social justice (van Dijk, 1998). Entailing the knowledge of the interrelatedness of text, interactions, and contexts, CDA Practioner, according to Fairclough (1995), is supposed to go through three stages: description (text analysis), interpretation (processing analysis), and explanation (social analysis).

Although it is originated as a philosophical term, ideology is referred to today as a systematic body of concepts and values. It was conceived by A. L. Destutt de Tracy in 1796 as the science of ideas, which can develop a rational system of ideas to stand against the irrational impulses of the mob. Pejoratively employed by Hegal and Marx, the term "ideology", as a set of values where people are deceived by, is described as "false consciousness" (Ostrowski, 2022). It is a view that is based on the assumption that people are no more than instruments of history since they enact roles that are assigned to them by means of forces, which they do not conceive. Karl Mannheim and Max Weber see ideology as idea systems, having a class basis and a class bias, produced by life conditions whereas it is the unconscious rationalizations of class interest according to Freud (Freedden, 2003).

The term "ideology", in political science, is manipulated descriptively to indicate the political belief system concerning economy, education, health care, labor code, criminal code, the justice system, the provision of social security, trade, eco-system or environment, minors, immigration,

race, military intervention, patriotism, and the established religion. Political ideologies are classified by means of different methods; each one generates a particular political spectrum wherein ideologies are identified as the left, the center, or the right. By the same token, democracy, demagoguery, theocracy, authoritarianism, libertarianism, federalism, capitalism, socialism, etc. are all ideas that political ideology contains. An opposed view was proposed by Francis Fukuyama, in his writing on the *End of History*, who views that post 1991 was the start of post-ideological age. Post-ideology, according to him, is a sort of false consciousness that is engaged in lending one's point of view pretending neutral cynicism without truly being so. It is conceived as a certain ethical set of ideals, principles, doctrines, myths, or symbols of a small or large group in social studies (Heywood, 2021).

Fairclough, on his part, views ideology as a system of potential underlying language practice, which can be a code, a system, or a formation (Fairclough, 1995, p. 71). It is the account that is advocated in the data analysis of the current study. Along, ideology is not only related to the representing of social representing but it is also a particular method of representing and constructing a society with a variety of power relations. It is a system of ideas, which is sociocognitively-shared representations of social groups produced and reproduced by text and talk (van Dijk, 2006).

An association whereby people, groups, nations or countries work together for a specific purpose is called an alliance. It is an agreement that is mainly used in times of war when countries make an alliance promise to help one other. Such countries are said to be allied and they are called allies. To keep America safe at home, the American leaders, following World War II, recognized to manage threats abroad before they arrived at the American homeland. Consequently, the decision was to establish a set of formal treaty alliances that would lead to a collective defensive effort that was capable enough to contain communist expansionism. In such a context, the U.S. brought into being several alliance treaties that have continued to this day, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) with Canada and Western Europe in 1949, a Security Treaty with Japan in 1951, a Security treaty (ANZUS) with Australia and New Zealand in 1951, and a mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of Korea in 1953. All of these alliances have continued to this day. Establishing alliance system, the U.S. is capable enough to

construct like-minded states and a network of collective defense arrangements that could effectively and efficiently protect America's global interests. America's alliances in Asia and Europe, over the past 70 years, have shaped the cornerstone of the "Liberal International Order" which is a U.S. led system that mostly focuses on promoting democracy, market economics, the rule of law, and respect for human rights. Sharing commitment to respond collectively to armed attacks was the essential feature of U.S. alliance treaties. Against such background, sharing intelligence, training and exercising alongside each other, and creating combined capabilities have been the day by day concern of these allies which have fought alongside America in every conflict since the world war II (Johnstone, 2017).

That an armed attack against one or more [member countries] in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all states that the American power is magnified by the American partners and allies, which are extremely vital to America's security. To support his views, Sloan (2020) produces a historical background on the significance of alliance for America by referring to Benjamin Franklin who traveled to Paris in 1776 to hammer out an alliance with France, which, on its turn, provided the U. S. with supplies, arms, ammunition, troops, and naval support as well as transporting support to fight off a British fleet and protect Washington's forces in Virginia. Recently, France has generally been a strong American ally especially in the rough spots such as Suez in 1956, and NATO in 1966. When ISIS swept into Iraq and Syria, France was one of a handful to join the U.S. in conducting airstrikes on both fronts.

The theory of U.S. behind establishing alliance system was to build the capabilities of like-minded states as well as to create a network of collective defense arrangements that would be more effective and efficient in protecting America's global interests. The benefits of alliances for the U.S. go far beyond the military domain in that the allies of America provide support for the American political priorities. Japan, as an American ally, works together with the U.S. to advance fair and transparent international standards regarding issues such as digital governance and cyber security. What is significant in this respect is that the past 70 years of American international leadership would have been impossible if America had not had allies (Hastedt, 2020).

Sayle (2019) views that in bipolar and multipolar systems; the concept of the security dilemma is applied to alliance relations. Defensive realism is the core assumption of security dilemma.

The world, according to Kenneth Waltz, is anarchic, as it does not have a common government; hence, survival has become the main motivation of states. States always tend to maximize their own security because they are distrustful of other states' intentions. Security dilemma tackles the issue that security seeking states, even if their intentions are benign, could end up in conflict. Security dilemma is more intense in certain situations and this is due to the account of offence-defense balance. Defensive realists argue that when offensive actions have the advantage in certain circumstances, the security dilemma will be particularly intensive and states will be encouraged in taking preemptive offensive actions. Based on such assumption, defensive realists often look upon the American success in World War 1 and in World War 2 as a result of the defensive approach adopted by the U.S.

Offensive realism and defensive realism, which are variants of structural realism, incorporate the basic beliefs of survivalism, statism (state as the primary unit), self-help, and anarchy. Nevertheless, offensive realism, in opposition to the defensive one, regards states as aggressive power maximizers and not as security maximizers. Mearsheimer (2014) adds that uncertainty about the intentions of states is unavoidable as it can never be sure that other states do not have offensive intentions going along with their defensive capabilities.

Having believed that the international system is anarchic and that each state has to independently run its own survival, Waltz (2010) debates that in order to have a guarantee of security against offensive action by an enemy state, the weaker states seek to find a balance with their rivals and to build up an alliance with a stronger state. Being not sure of other states' intentions, Mearsheimer, as an offensive realist, holds the idea that anarchy motivates all states to always think of increasing their military capability. Defensive realists, on their part, believe that security dilemma is escapable when security is balanced (2014).

Defensive buildup might be interpreted as an offensive since states are not sure of the intentions of other states. Consequently, arms race may become a powerful possibility. An example of magnified security dilemma resulting from arms race, given by Jervis (1976), was the behavior of Germany and Britain before World War 2. The behavior of these two states was the product of technology and beliefs. Strategists, in this example, believed that offence would be more advantageous than defense. Another example was the race of nuclear weapons construction

between the United States and the Soviet Union during the cold war. States might be forced by security dilemma to form new alliances or to strengthen already existing ones.

Alliance security is interconnected in a multipolar world in that when one ally determines to be involved in a war, all its alliance partners are committed into the war too, a case that is referred to as chain ganging. Wendt is on the view that security dilemma is a social structure that is based on intersubjective understandings among alliance partners (Jervis, 1999).

5. Theoretical Framework

Reisigl and Wodak (2001, pp. 47-52) present, with example, a set of referential strategies, with their linguistic means, to represent the social actor:

1. Collectivization: This includes:
 - a. Deictics such as we, us, them.
 - b. Collectives such as family, group, team, tribe, union, majority.
2. Spatialization: This includes:
 - a. Toponyms such as Turkey, Africa, America
 - b. Anthroponyms referring to a person in terms of living on a place, such as resident, inhabitant, occupier, dweller.
3. De-spatialization: This includes:
 - a. De-toponymics anthroponyms, such as southerner, Europeans, Indians.
 - b. De-adverbial anthroponyms, such as outsider, insider.
4. Explicit dissimilation: (Xenonyms) such as alien, stranger, the others.
5. Originalization (origonyms), such as natives, compatriots, ancestor.
6. Actionalization: (Actionyms/ praxonyms and professionyms), such as asylum seekers, migrant, refugee, criminals, 'guest worker', workers, employees.
7. Somatisation: This includes:
 - a. Racionyms, such as blacks, negros.
 - b. Genderonyms, such as man, woman, girl, boy.
 - c. Gerontonyms, such as the aged, youngsters, the youth, child, parents, boy, girl, generation.
 - d. Specific body meronyms, such as blonde, fatty/fasto, beanpole.

- e. Antronponyms describing bodily connotations, the sick, the blind, passer-by, idiot, drunk.
 - f. Negative habitonyms, such drug users
8. Culturalisation: This includes:
- a. Ethnonification, such as Turks, gypsies, Romanians, poles.
 - b. Linguification, such as stammerer, stutterer.
 - c. Religionisation, such as Christ, Muslims, Jews
 - d. Primitivisation (metonymic anthroponyms denoting primitivity such as barefooted, barbarian)
9. Politicization: This mainly includes:
- a. Nationalization, such as Austrians, Turks, Romanians.
 - b. Classification, such as the rich, the poor, upper class, high society
 - c. Party political alignment (party names)
 - d. Polarization, such as the leftist
 - e. Organizationalisation, such as committee congress, parliament
 - f. Professtionalization, such as politician, minister, major, president
 - g. Political actionalisation, such as voters, civilians
 - h. Granting or deprivation of political rights, such as citizens, non-citizens, voters, refugees, bogus refugees
10. Militarization, such as warrior, soldier, army, troop, enemy
11. Economisation: This includes,
- a. Professionalization, such as worker, laborer, employees
 - b. Possessivisation, such as rich, poor
 - c. Ideologisation, such as capitalist.
12. Problematiation: This includes:
- a. Negation, such as illegal, unemployed, unskilled.
 - b. Criminalization, such as criminals, illegals, dealers, gang.
 - c. Negative ideologization, such as racist, nationalist, ethnicist, sexist, misogynist, chauvinist, fascist.
 - d. Pathologisation, such as psychopath, schizo

13. Victimization, such as victim.

6. Data Analysis and Discussion

The data analysis of this study involves nine extracts. Their selection is based on the assumption that they all revolve around the various referential strategies employed by Trump respecting the American alliance system.

Extract 1

Our allies are not paying their fair share, and I've been talking about this recently a lot. Our allies must contribute toward their financial, political, and human costs; have to do it, of our tremendous security burden. But many of them are simply not doing so.

The utterance "Our allies are not paying their fair share" puts spotlight on Trump's extortion scheme. Trump seems to run an extortion campaign against the American allies. The use of the inclusion pronoun "our" in the nominal phrase "our phrase" goes beyond the perspective of ingroupness and inclusion to heighten the notion of American authority over the allies. It specifically echoes the American power dynamics, which has, in privilege, maintained American supremacy over time. Trump, via the use of the given nominal phrase, introduces guiding principles of allyship practical strategies for shaping superior relationship with the U.S allies providing a blueprint for a rigorous strategy to how allies, as social actors, should be enacted so as to create a social change that goes in line with the Trumpest political agendas. Such agendas appear so clear by means of the obligation modal "must" in the utterance "Our allies must contribute..... costs". What can be realized from the aforementioned utterances is the speaker's tendency to provide a utilitarian grounding for political obligation. As noted above, the speaker puts forward and he is sure that the American allies have an absolute obligation to obey his views. It is an obligation on the part of the constituting authority to make the kind of alliance that suited to the ideologies of the speaker.

Extract 2

They look at the United States as weak and forgiving and feel no obligation to honor their agreements with us.

The employment of the exclusive pronouns "they", in the above utterance, denotes the American political dominance over its allies. The utterance "They look at the United us" uncovers that Trump's strategy towards the American allies have undergone a massive change.

He expresses frustration with the US allies for not spending more of their budget on their national defense. According to Sayle (2019), Trump was the first American president who let the levels of defense spending dominate his policy to NATO countries. It is worth noting that the exclusive pronoun "They" echoes the act of being left out. In other words, it reverberates a state of social vulnerability stemming from the policy of geopolitical pressure the speaker exercising against the US allies.

Extract 3

In NATO, for instance, only 4 of 25 other member countries besides America, are spending the minimum required 2 percent of GDP on defense. We have spent trillions of dollars over time on planes, missiles, ships, equipment, building our military to provide a strong missile defense program for Europe and Asia.

The strategy of militarization is employed by Trump via the words "planes", "missiles", "ships", "equipment", "enemies", and "missile defense program". Having employed this strategy, Trump tries to emphasize the significance of military predominance in politics. Militarization is inseparable part of the ideology of militarism, which glorifies a state's military, armed forces, weapons, and military power.

Extract 4

The countries we are defending must pay for the cost of this defense, and if not, the U.S must be prepared to let these countries defend themselves. We have no choice.

The deictic form of collectivization "we" is employed twice in the sentence above. It is used to refer to the American political system under Trump's administration. The use of the modal auxiliary of "obligation" 'must' creates a context characterized by strong incentives for American totalitarianism and American dictatorship. It indicates a sense of political extortion practiced by Trump throughout the funding of the U.S. "..... must pay for the cost" and arouses the mobilization of political control over the NATO countries. In addition, it acknowledges a non-sustainable and a non-collaborative framework between the two social parties, the American and the NATO members.

Extract 5

The whole world will be safer if our allies do their part to support our common defense and security. A Trump administration will lead a free world that is properly armed and funded, and funded beautifully.

Trump, in a contradictory stance with the NATO countries, in this sentence, operates the discursive strategy of inclusion throughout the use of the pronoun "our" in "our allies" and "our common defense and security". By means of this pronoun, he attempts to establish conditional inclusiveness and hypothetical unity with the NATO countries. It is an opportunity of inclusiveness and unity that is conditioned by the financial support of these countries, "..... if our allies..... security". According to Sclafani (2018), Trump's presidency is characterized by incitement of rampant political and racial polarization.

Extract 6

Thirdly, our friends are beginning to think they can't depend on us. We had a president who dislikes our friends and bows to our enemies, something we've never seen before in the history of our country. He negotiated a disastrous deal with Iran, and then we watched them ignore its terms even before the ink was dry. Iran cannot be allowed to have a nuclear weapon, cannot be allowed.

Reading the whole excerpt thoroughly, it can be figured out that the speaker tries to prompt the NATO's nation-actors to respond to his strategy of 'provocation' in kind by considering the consequences of not paying the U.S. for their defense. Moreover, Trump's strategy of political provocation toward the NATO's countries is triggered by reminding them of the Iranian nuclear weapons as they pose, in his view, a real threat to the whole countries of NATO. Hence, he pivots his concern around capturing the attention of the addressees regarding this threat. The nominal phrase "our friends" is utilized twice in this excerpt to emphasize the significance of alliance system for America.

Extract 7

President Obama gutted our missile defense program and then abandoned our missile defense plans with Poland and Czech Republic. He supported the ouster of a friendly regime in Egypt that had a longstanding peace treaty with Israel, and then helped bring the Muslim Brotherhood to power in its place.

The nominal phrases “our missile” and “our missile defense plans”, betokening a discursive strategy of collectivization, are utilized by the speaker to assert that Americans are collectivized. Via these two phrases, Trump tries to draw the attention of his listeners that America, as a whole, under his leadership, seems to be not in line with the strategies advocated by Obama, the former American president, in regard to the U. S. National Missile Defense System which was basically designed to shield the country against any incoming missile. Zarchan (2013, p. 12) sees that this program was designed to counter a relatively small attack from a less sophisticated adversary. It is a system that has been in development since 1990s. It was renamed as Ground Based Midcourse Defense to make it different from other American missile defense programs as space-based, sea-based laser, and high-attitude intercepted programs. It can be noted that the discursive strategies of specialization and collectivization are merged together in the above excerpt when the given speaker makes a reference to the toponyms of “Poland” and “Czech Republic”. Costigliola (2011) states that U.S. has a defense treaty with these two countries. This treaty outlines the legal position of the U.S. in the aforementioned countries. It empowers the U.S. forces in these countries to provide the necessary authorities for the U.S. forces to access specific military installations and conduct activities for mutual defense. Costigliola (ibid) adds that the U.S. has missile defense complex in these countries; it is called the European Interceptor Site (EIS), which is an American missile defense base. The American troops in both countries aim to deter Russia from attacking a NATO country and to defend every inch of NATO’s territory.

Extract 8

Israel, our great friend and the one true democracy in the Middle East has been snubbed and criticized by an administration that lacks moral clarity.

The toponym **Israel** is followed by the nominal phrases **our great friend** and **true democracy** to emphasize the idea that America has always remained the longest, loyal, and strategic ally to Israel, despite the fact that it is designated by the U.S.A. as major non-NATO ally (Costigliola, 2011). The speaker, via the above text, tries to shed light on the strong and historic bonds between the two countries. Waltz (2010) expresses that America has been a true supporter of Israel since the 1960s and it has always promoted togetherness, closeness, and association between this newborn state and its neighboring Arab countries like the Arab Gulf states, Jordan,

and Egypt. The United States has gone further to keep up the durable and stable member of the UN Security Council, which has recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. To assure its persistent stand, the US. moved its embassy from Tel Aviv to the disputed city in 2018. That Israel "has been snubbed and criticized" by the administration of Obama, as Trump announces in the above text, asserts the ideology of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation in regard to the relation of U.S.A. with Israel. In his remarks, Trump attacks the outgroup (the democrats) for treating Israel badly namely when Obama signed Iran deal. He attempts to put the outgroup in awkward position by portraying Obama as an insufficient supportive of the Jewish State. Making Israel a growing point of contention, he intends to prompt consternation among Americans Jews concerning his political opponent's politics on Israel.

Extract 9

To our friends and allies, I say America is going to be strong again. America is going to be reliable again. It's going to be reliable again. It's going to be a friend again. We are going to finally have a coherent foreign policy based upon American interests and the shared interests of our allies.

Using the nominal phrases **our friends and allies** and **our allies**, the speaker intends to include and integrate the American allies in his political activities and processes. By means of this phrase, he could create an environment where every American ally feels welcome and supported. Underpinning all this is political inclusion; he incites the American allies to engage with and contribute to the functioning of his political institution. He tries to downplay Obama's administration for not giving priority to Israeli interests when it decided to sign Iran deal. He goes to persuade them that his administration is different from that of Obama. Although there is no formal treaty of alliance between Israel and the U.S., it could be noted that the speaker is quite engaged with the security, advantages and activities of Israel. It is worth mentioning that the word "America" is repeated four times. As an important literary device, repetition is used to place emphasis on the significance of alliance for the American politics. As a social cue, psychologists state that the optimal number of times that a thing should be repeated for maintaining effectiveness ranges from three to five. Going beyond such a range, repetition could bring about opposite consequence (Agit, 2016).

7. Summary of Findings and Discussion

The following table summarizes the frequency of referential strategies used by Trump concerning the American alliance system.

| Referential Strategy | | Referential substrategy | Sentence No. | Frequency |
|----------------------|------------------|--|--------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Collectivization | A.Deictics | | |
| | | Our | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8,9 | 14 |
| | | We | 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 | 7 |
| | | B.Collectives | | |
| | | Allies | 1, 4, 5, 9 | 5 |
| | | NATO | 3 | 1 |
| | | Friends | 4 | 4 |
| 2. | Spatialization | A.Toponyms | | |
| | | United States, | 2, 3, 6, 7, | 12 |
| | | America, Europe, Asia, Iran, Poland, Czech Republic, Egypt, Israel, Israel, America, Middle East | 8, 9, 7, 6 | 4 |
| 9. | Politicization | f.Professionalization | | |
| | | President, President | 2 | 6, 7 |
| 10 | Militarization | Planes, missiles, ships, equipment, enemies, | 3, 6, 7 | 5 |
| 11 | Economisation | C. Ideologization | | |
| | | Muslim Brotherhood | 7 | 1 |

The referential strategy of collectivization appeared to be the most dominant in the discourse of Trump. The pronouns 'our' - which occurred 10 times (see excerpts 1, 2, 3,4,5,8, and 9), and we, which occurred 5 times (see excerpts 2,3,4,5, and 9), are used by the speaker to affirm the inclusion of his administration with the American allies. Underpinning this inclusion, the speaker tends to evoke the American allies by joining them into common objectives with his administration. It is an affirmative action, on his part, to involve the American allies in his political activities and processes. Via the inclusive pronouns (**our**, and **we**), he sets to showcase prejudice in the form of negative attitudes towards the other (Obama's administration). This act is associated with the act of political projection practiced by him against the other (the democrats). "Allies", "NATO", and "friends" are more forms of collectivization overused by Trump to emphasize his concept of solidarity and integration with the American Allies. Significantly enough, the three given forms refer to the same object which is the members of North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In an attempt on the part of Trump to accentuate his patriotism, he mentions the nominal phrase "United States" 12 times in his speech (see excerpts 2, 3, 6, and 7). This strategy of specialization was employed by him to underline feeling of love, devotion, and attachment to his country. Being an American President, he confers a special honor and dignity for America in the eyes of the world. He tries to underscore the theme that American power and position are incomparable to those of any other country. Moreover, such an overuse of the nominal phrase "United States" echoes the American authority and domination over the NATO's countries.

Throughout the referential strategy of professionalization whereby the noun "President" is mentioned twice in the given speech (see excerpts 6 and 7), Trump highlights the power of the American presidency. Presidency, for him, plays an increasingly important role not only in the American political life but also in the political life of many countries across the world. Against such background, he levels his criticism at the former American democratic President Obama who, according to him, was grossly incompetent for his handling certain international issues such as Iran nuclear deal. Via this strategy he stresses his position as an American President possessing remarkable domestic and international hard and soft power.

Trump punctuates the idea that America is the top military power in the world. This seems to be obvious through the strategy of militarization (see excerpts 3,6, and 7). He shows that American military resources are sent to the NATO's countries. By way of this referential strategy, he tries to establish hegemony through the promotion of military values, fear, and defense. The values of militarization, as seen by Trump, are natural, normal, and desirable since America has a strong and large army whose priority is to establish peace and security around the world.

Trump criticized Obama's administration for abandoning the American strategic ally Hosni Mubark who served as President of Egypt from 1981 to 2011, and permitting the Muslim Brotherhood Organization to run the political life of Egyptians in 2011. Trump, by means of the referential strategy of ideologization, tries to stress the dangers this organization poses to the American interests around the world. Making reference to the nominal phrase **Muslim Brotherhood** (see excerpt 1), he intends to alert the Americans to the strongly anti-western ideological agenda of this Islamist organization.

8. Conclusion

The referential strategy of 'collectivization' appeared to be the most dominant in the whole speech. Via this strategy, Trump intends to emphasize the ideology of 'inclusion' that his administration tries to establish with the American allies. This strategy turned also to be helpful in disclosing the ideology of 'political projection' practiced by him against the 'other' (Obama's administration).

Referential strategy of 'specialization' comes second in frequency among other referential strategies. It was employed by Trump to affirm the ideology of 'American devotion' and 'American attachment' he embraced. The over use of this strategy also revealed the ideology of Americanism (American authority and American domination).

'The power of American presidency' stroke as being another ideology uncovered by the referential strategy of 'professionalization'. The Other (Obama) looked to be the target behind Trump's employment of this strategy. Via it, he attempted to stress the incompetence of Obama's administration in managing certain domestic as well as international issues specifically the Iranian nuclear deal.

The strategy of 'militarization' was also notable in the speech under discussion. By way of this strategy, he tried to expose the supremacy of American militarization over the whole world. 'Ideologization', as referential strategy, was further used by Trump to accentuate Obama's strategic mistake when he ignored indulgently the Muslim Brotherhood Organization controlling the political life of Egypt which was an important ally of America.

References

- Agit, M (2016). Repetition Compulsion: Understanding the Cognitive basis. Boston: Dorrance Pub Co.
- Costigliola, F. (2011). Roosevelt's lost Alliances: How personal Politics helped start the cold war. New York: Harper Collins.
- Creswell, J. (2003). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Freedon, M. (2003). Ideology: A very short Introduction. London: OUP Oxford.
- Hastedt, G. P. (2020). American foreign Policy: Past, Present And Future. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Heywood, A. (2021). Political Ideologies. Los Angeles: Bloomsbury Academic Press.
- Jervis, R. (1976). Perception and Misperception in International Politics. Washington: Princeton University Press.
- Johnstone, S. (2017). How NATO adapts Strategy and Organization in the Atlantic Organization since 1950. Chicago: John Hopkins University Press.
- Ostrowski, M. (2022). Ideology (key concepts). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. (2014). The Tragedy of great Power Politics. Chicago: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). Discourse and Discrimination. New York: Routledge.
- Sayle, T. A. (2019). Enduring Alliance: A History of NATO and Postwar Global Order. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Sclafani, J (2018). Talking Donald Trump. New York: Routledge.
- Sloan, S. (2020). Defense of the West. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Zarchan, P. (2013). Tactical and Strategic Missile Guidance. New York: Penguin Random House.
- Wendt, A. (1999). Social Theory of International Politics. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (2010). Theory of International Politics. Washington: Waveland Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. London. SAGE.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Society and Discourse: How Social Context influence Text and Talk. London: Cambridge University Press.