A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Inaugural Address in 2017

Ameer Ali
University of Sindh, Pakistan
ameer7037@gmail.com

Mohammad Ibrahim
University of Sindh, Pakistan
ibrahimsoomrogic@gmail.com

Abstract

The current research work is a critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's Inaugural Address (2017). The researcher has made use of Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004) to study the inaugural address. Moreover, the current research work is qualitative in its approach and analysis, as it answers the research questions in accordance with Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004). Furthermore, research design used in this research is both descriptive and explanatory; and, it also contains purposive sampling as a data collection method. Although much CDA research has been already carried out on Trump's speeches, the current research studies Trump's speech in the context of history and power using Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004). The researcher has focused lexical and syntactic items in Trump's speech. Besides, the researcher has found out that power relations, historical norms, ideological constraints, and American values have played a significant role in the discursive construction of Trump's Inaugural address (2017). Finally, the current research convincingly achieves its objectives and answers its questions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The roots of Critical Discourse Analysis lie in many fields of study: Philosophy, Rhetoric, Text Linguistics, Anthropology, Socio-Psychology, Cognitive Science, Pragmatics, Applied Linguistics, as well as Sociolinguistics (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). This field is also famously known as Critical Discourse Studies (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). Moreover, the field actually emerged in 1960s (Van Dijk, 2007). Its ability to draw upon the diversity of its manifold roots, in fact, renders it to adopt a problem-oriented, interdisciplinary approach to study a phenomenon in its context. Besides, the emergence of Critical Discourse Analysis, as an interdisciplinary field during 1960s, brought significant changes in the field of Linguistics. Furthermore, the broader approach of Critical Discourse Analysis has also enhanced the scope of Linguistics; speaking precisely, Critical Discourse Analysis or Critical Discourse Studies really extends the study of language structure to the social, historical, political, cultural, religious, and ideological investigation of the language in a specific context. In a nutshell, Critical Discourse Analysis approaches a written or a spoken text by taking into systematic consideration the role of power relations in the restrained production of language.

About the origins of Critical Discourse Analysis, there is another commonly held opinion that maintains that the field actually came into being in the University of Amsterdam

(Wodak, 2008); it was in the year 1991 that critical discourse analysts and scholars, such as Ruth Wodak, Theo van Leeuwen, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, and Teun van Dijk spent about two days together in the university and availed themselves of a much-needed opportunity of discussing theories and methods related to the field of critical discourse analysis (Wodak, 2008). In their prolonged discussions based upon theoretical, methodological differences and similarities, the scholars consented to recognize Critical Discourse Analysis as an interdisciplinary field of research and investigation (Wodak, 2008). Besides, some of the Critical Discourse Analysis frameworks that the scholars added in the field have been either adapted to suit the changing times or discarded from the field (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). Thus, the general opinion advocates the fact that the field of Critical Discourse Analysis was systematically brought forth in the year 1991 (Wodak and Meyer, 2008).

The field of Critical Discourse Analysis is actually characterized by many principles that challenge the established discourses of power (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). Moreover, all approaches of CDA are problem-oriented and eclectic. CDA systematically deals with the semiotic data by demystifying ideologies and power while simultaneously taking into consideration the common interests (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). However, the critical discourse analysts actually stick to their intellectual interests, but they also systematically manage to retain their respective, scientific methodologies and their self-reflective research process (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). Furthermore, the self-reflective research process in fact brings about subjectivity and discontinuity in critical discourse analysis and thereby this approach usually succeeds in countering the discursive dynasty created through power relations. Hence, the Critical Discourse Analysis field counters discursive dynasties in their every form and genre.

1.1. The Critical Discourse Analysis Approach to the Speech Genre

The genre of speech is tactically employed by politicians to perpetuate their political interests and agendas. The speech genre in fact serves as a rhetorical tool for politicians to exploit the emotions of common people in their favour. Similarly, speech is a communicative event that always happens in specific circumstances that subordinate its production to specific, political interests or ideologies. Thus, the aim of critical discourse analysis is also to approach the speech as a specific communicative, political undertaking. Besides, the job of critical discourse analysts is also to expose the regulating mechanisms such as, political ideologies, power relations, religious ideologies, economic interests, or gendered mindsets which systematically influence the emergence of a speech act (Austin). In this way, critical discourse analysts must systematically question the supposed 'truths' claimed by specific, political speeches that exclude the other side of truth.

1.2. Donald Trump's Ideology and the Speech Genre

The current President of the United States of America, Donald Trump, is actually a nationalist in his views and ideas. Since the very beginning of his political career, President Trump has willingly been endorsing right-to-center ideology of nationalism (John Cassidy, 2017). Trump's outspoken rhetoric of 'America First Policy' clearly stands by the factual truth that he is a nationalist politician belonging to America's Republican Party. Additionally, rhetoric of nationalism is easily perceptible even in his *Inaugural Address* that he made in 2017 when he became a president. Much like many opportunist politicians, Trump also abundantly draws upon discourses of populism to advocate his political interests. Besides, Trump's *Inaugural Address* (2017) is a political act that is also subject to social, political, and economic interests that influence its construction, form, ideas, and ambitions. Ideology of nationalism mainly impacts Trump's political, inaugural address that he made when he became America's president in 2017.

1.3. The Application of Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model to Donald Trump's Inaugural Address

Since Donald Trump's speech is a historical, political event, it is no wrong in saying that it plays an effective role in determining policy formulation of the world's most powerful country. Ruth Wodak (2004) actually prefers to approach a specific form of discourse by taking into consideration its norms, values, power relations and conventions both diachronically and synchronically. Moreover, she also engages in a hermeneutic approach to analyse a specific communicative event, such as a political speech (Wodak, 2004). Wodak actually suggests a subjective way of interpreting a text. She argues that interpretation can either be less plausible or more plausible; it is wrong to believe that a specific interpretation is either wrong or right (Wodak, 2004). Similarly, in the current research assignment, the researcher has systematically attempted to employ Ruth Wodak's *Discourse Historical Model* to analyze power relations, norms, values, and historical forces which regulate the construction of Trump's *Inaugural Address* (2017). Moreover, the researcher has also made use of Wodak's hermeneutic method of analysis to interpret the regulatory mechanisms drawn on by Trump in his speech (2017).

Since speeches made by politicians are never neutral in their aims and ambitions, it is always much better to approach these type of speeches from the perspectives upheld by critical discourse analysis. The production of political speeches is always subject to the mechanisms of power relations, norms, and values (Wodak, 2004). Moreover, political speeches play a highly influential role in shaping common people's opinions and constructing foreign policies. Similarly, speeches made by Donald Trump are also characterized by specific political interests and ambitions. *The Inaugural Address* made by Donald Trump also contains his self-interest oriented approach. Besides, Trump's Inaugural Address is actually manifestation of his American nationalism. Hence, his nationalistically inspired speech brings about the birth of some claims which can satisfactorily be countered only through employment of a critical discourse framework. In this regard, the researcher has made use of Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004) to question the claimed truths in Trump's speeches.

The current research assignment draws its significance from its process of countering the claims upheld by Trump in his speech. By countering the claims, the research makes it much easier for a common person to assess validity of Trump's assumptions. Moreover, this research will also play an abundantly significant role in enhancing a commoner's critical consciousness. By doing so, the research will actually help the commoner to guard himself or herself against the emotional exploitation mostly perpetrated by politicians to advocate their own interests. Furthermore, this research assignment will also fulfill the academic requirements. Finally, this research work will also contribute to the field of critical discourse analysis and enable many critical discourse analysts to draw upon the current research assignment in carrying out further research works.

1.4. Research Objective

This research assignment aims to do critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's Inaugural Address in accordance with Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model.

1.5. Research Questions

The current research assignment will address the following research questions:

1. How do power relations, norms, and values influence the construction of Trump's *Inaugural Address?*

2. How does Trump achieve his political ambitions by using specific lexical and syntactic items?

1.6. Research Delimitation

The current research assignment is delimited to textual analysis (lexical and syntactic contents) of Donald Trump's Inaugural Address.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Speeches of Donald J. Trump have actually been studied using different theoretical frameworks of Critical Discourse Analysis. S. N. Rohmah (2018) has studied speeches of Donald Trump with wonderful vividness and unsparing honesty. She has systematically drawn upon Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Discourse Model to investigate the speeches of Trump both at micro level and macro level. Moreover, her research thesis approaches Trump's speeches by making use of descriptive-qualitative research method (Rohmah, 2018). Similarly, she also manages to expose the positive self-representation and negative-other representation strategies as employed by Trump in his speeches (Rohmah, 2018). Her research work interestingly reveals that Trump mostly embarks upon the strategies of irony and repetition to construct his speeches (Rohmah, 2018). Although Rohmah's research attempt (2018) is highly contributive to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis, but her approach gives little space to the role of power mechanisms in the construction of Trump's speeches.

Apart from Rohmah's thesis, Wen Chen's research work (2018) also deals with Donald Trump's Inaugural Address (2017). Chen (2018) makes use of Halliday's Theory of Functional Grammar in order to investigate the political ambitions as selectively employed by Trump in his *Inaugural Address* (2017). Moreover, his research article utilizes both qualitative approach and quantitative method to study the functional aspects of Trump's presidential speech. Chen, in fact, attempts to mix up the functionality of discourse and the criticality of discourse. In this regard, the known research article is much more delimited to the functional categories of Trump's speech. However, the researcher has successfully analysed the functionality of Trump's speech, but what he has unfortunately left out is the systematic, critical discourse analysis of the known inaugural address. So, his research attempt is much more discourse analysis oriented rather than critical discourse oriented approach.

Much Like Chen's research approach to Trump's speeches, Erika Sabrina Quiñonez (2018) also employs critical discourse analysis method to study strategies of positive self-representation and negative-other representation as used by Trump in his speeches to create xenophobia among the Americans about the non-Americans. Moreover, the research work also makes use of a corpus based approach to collect data and analyse that data in accordance with the principles of critical discourse analysis (Quinonez, 2018). Similarly, the researcher has actually adopted a corpus based approach to expose systematically the metaphorical constructions employed by Trump in order to stoke fear and anti-immigration sentiment among Americans. Besides, the researcher also succeeds in pointing out Trump's political ambitions that mostly draw upon nationalism, populism, and patriotism. Even though Quinonez's research (2018) systematically analyses Trump's speeches, but it assimilates no any synchronic or diachronic assessments to counter Trump's speeches as discussed by Wodak (2004).

In addition to Quinonez's research thesis (2018), Nagham Ali's research attempt (2018) also makes use of Norman Fairclough's Three Dimensional Model to do the critical discourse analysis of Trump's Inaugural Address. Ali (2018) in fact analyses Trump's speech both at micro-level and macro-level. In other words, his research actually describes, interprets, and explains Trump's speeches using the three dimensional method as given by Norman Fairclough; besides, the research also critically exposes the discursive strategies, such as repetition, the use of pronoun 'we', and the usage of future tense in order to exploit the emotions and opinions of common Americans. The employment of Fairclough's model is quite helpful in exposing the power mechanisms operating within discourse. However, the

research conducted by Nagham Ali (2018) adopts no any properly driven, systematic critical discourse analysis as suggested by Fairclough to bring out the role played by power in the restrained construction of discourse. In summary, this research has dealt with Trump's Inaugural Address by making use of Norman Fairclough's Three Dimensional Method.

Much like Nagham Ali's research article, Mena Garcia's research attempt (2018) also deals with Trump's discourse styles. Garcia's research essay is actually divided into three parts which are characterized by methodological congruence; the first part in fact gives a general overview of Trump's discursive styles. Afterwards, the second part describes George Lakoff's Family Model to critically discuss 'father patterns' embedded in Trump's speeches. Moreover, the third part actually analyses the mechanisms of otherness employed by Donald Trump in his speeches. Similarly, immigration and racism themes have also been tackled critically in the concerned research article written by Garcia (2018). Garcia persuasively carries out the analysis using Lakoff's model of critical discourse analysis, and comes up with relevant findings(Garcia, 2018). However, the research work undertaken by Garcia (2018) is highly contributive to the field of critical discourse analysis, but it unfortunately delimits the concerned analysis to the family-sort-of confinement. Thus, Garcia has attempted to study Trump's addresses by utilizing Lakoff's Family Model.

Not only Garcia has contributed to the field of critical discourse analysis but also Benard Otieno (2017) has contributed to the field by studying Trump's Announcement Speech. The researcher actually uses Norman Fairclough's Model to study power relations, power mechanisms, and political ideology in Donald Trump's speeches. Additionally, the researcher has also employed qualitative research method to answer the research questions with respect to power relations from Norman Fairclough's Three Dimensional Model (Otieno, 2017). Moreover, the researcher also relies upon the Functional Grammar Theory as an adjunct for data analysis. Thus, the research contains two theoretical approaches mixed up to do the analysis in a much better way. Besides, the researcher, at textual level, describes the specific choices made by Trump to achieve his political ambitions. At discursive level, the researcher actually interprets the interaction of Trump's speeches with power relations. Finally, Otieno (2017) also relates Trump's Announcement speech with socio-cultural practices and thereby comes up with interesting findings.

There is another research article that comes from two Irani scholars Mohammadi and Javady (2017) who have also carried out the critical discourse analysis of Trump's speech that he made in 2016 during presidential campaign. The researchers actually approach his speech, firstly, from micro level structure. At the micro level structure, the researchers describe the grammatical units, such as words, phrases, and sentences employed by Trump to achieve his campaign goals. At the macro level, the researchers actually relate social practices to the production of Trump's campaign speech. Moreover, their research links the micro level and the macro level through the principles of critical discourse analysis. Although the researchers have had recourse to CDA principles, they have failed to employ a relevant critical discourse analysis framework to analyse the known speech. Thus, Mohammadi and Javady (2017) have studied Trump's campaign speech using principles of critical discourse analysis.

The above reviews of relevant literature have highlighted significance of doing critical discourse analysis of political speeches. All the reviews are actually concerned with Trump's speeches. Most of the research articles are the critical discourse assessments of Trump's speeches from different perspectives. Although many researchers have analysed Trump's speeches using different frameworks of critical discourse analysis, no one has employed Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004) to investigate Trump's *Inaugural Address*. Finally the current research has filled up the research gap by employing Ruth Wodak's Model to study Trump's *Inaugural Address*.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The research design employed in this research assignment is descriptive and explanatory. It both explains and describes Trump's Inaugural Address in accordance with Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Method (2004). Moreover, the current research also employs purposive sampling to collect the most relevant data.

3.2. Research Method

The current research article makes use of qualitative research method to answer the research questions.

3.3. Data Analysis Method

The current research has made use of Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Method to analyse Trump's Inaugural Address. The lexical and syntactic contents from Trump's speech have been extracted to carry out the textual analysis. Moreover, six relevant excerpts have been taken from the speech for the analysis. The reason for purposively choosing the excerpts is precisely that they are highly relevant to research questions and objective.

3.4. Theoretical Framework

Ruth Wodak (2004) has actually given Discourse Historical Method which is precisely described here:

1. Every discourse is actually subject to power relations, ideologies, norms, and values (2004). Ruth Wodak (2004) means to imply that the construction of every discourse is specifically subjected to the mechanisms of power, such as ideologies, norms, and values. Political speeches are thus subordinated to political ideologies, and political interests in the process of their production.
2. Discourse is both synchronically and diachronically regulated (Wodak, 2004). If the former, discourse mainly draws upon other contemporary power discourses. For instance, political speeches are discursively motivated by the political manifestos or other political traditions. If the latter, the discourses derive much of their content from the past discourses. In this case, discourse exists in an environment that is characterized by dynasties of discourse which have roots in past traditions. Thus, discourse is influenced synchronically as well as diachronically (Wodak, 2004).
3. Hermeneutic approach must be employed to interpret every type of discourse in a subjective way (2004). Wodak's emphasis on hermeneutic approach suggests that the process of critical discourse analysis is subjective and different analysts may approach a topic from different standpoints. She further argues that hermeneutic interpretations can either be less plausible or more plausible (2004). Moreover, it is not correct to say that a specific interpretation is right or wrong. Interpretation is subjective and varies from one person to another person.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

In this segment, Donald Trump's *Inaugural Address* (2017) has been analyzed employing Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model. Moreover, the analyses have been based on sub-headings, such as Hermeneutic Analysis of Power Relations in Donald Trump's *Inaugural Address,* Trump's Diachronic, Discursive Interaction with American Pastness, and Trump's Synchronic, Discursive Interaction with Contemporary Affairs.

4.1. Hermeneutic Analysis of Power Relations in Donald Trump's Inaugural Address:

Donald Trump is formatively engaged in constructing social, power relations while making his *Inaugural Address* (2017). Being a president of the world's most powerful

country, Trump constructs his speech in a way that puts him in a leader's place, and simultaneously he assigns the role of 'followers' to his audience. The assumption of a leader's responsibility actually allows Trump to grab a privilege of leading his people by inculcating his opinions in his followers and audience. Moreover, the inculcation of opinions actually renders the commoners' opinions irrelevant which are always easily manipulated. Symbolically speaking, the raised rostrum and standing behind dais with a view of expressing his policies, Trump in fact embarks upon an unceasing process of bringing forth power relations. On one side, Trump is a president who must guide, and on other side almost every American is a passive being who must own, listen, and follow what Trump claims in his Inaugural Address (2017).

The following chunk has actually been taken from Trump's Inaugural Address (2017) which irrefutably stands by the fact stated in the above paragraph:

"Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent" (Trump, 2017).

In this excerpt, Trump clearly refers to the 'norm' of 'transition of power' from one American president to another American president. The noun phrase 'transition of power' in fact entails power relations between the American president and the American people. The power phrase enables Trump to inherit power, whereas it renders common Americans to be audience of the historical drama. Since every norm is both created and followed, it generates power relations. Thus, Trump considers himself one of those powerful leaders and politicians who are involved in making specific norms that safeguard their political interests. In contrast, there are also common people, Trump's addressees, who tend to follow the constructed norms. Similarly, Trump is re-emphasizing the perpetual norm of assuming power, while simultaneously implying that common people must follow the norm of being mere audience every four years as set forth by Wodak (2004).

Other than perpetuation of norms, Trump also tries to deliberately validate power relations by tactically using the adjective "magnificent". The word serves as a rhetorical tool as it is accompanied with the names of powerful people. Additionally, Trump actually means to imply that all the rulers of America, including Barack Obama and his wife, are magnificent, because they make up, propagate norms and values that justify power relations. Simultaneously, Trump constructs a subordinated position for almost all the Americans who are only able to attend the magnificent leaders' ceremonial transition of power. Besides, the use of the word also indicates to the fact that the American people cannot achieve the certain degree of magnificence as obtained by their capable, magnificent leaders. Hence, this political discourse of magnificence actually both reflects and entails power relations in which Trumps holds a much higher position of leadership, while the rest of Americans stand much lower at the stage of their importance and significance. Thus, Trump subjects his address to the mechanism of power relations as manifested by Wodak (2004).

Much more importantly, Trump's above given chunk also justifies Wodak's synchronic aspects and diachronic aspects of discourse (Wodak, 2004). Speaking diachronically, Trump's discursive act actually relies upon the ages old tradition of power transition. His political discourse in fact draws upon American past history of norms and values adhered to by America's former presidents. The historical pastness actually characterizes Donald Trump's political, discursive attempt. He draws upon the power relations, the heritage of American presidents, to achieve his political goals. The norms, values, and power relations diachronically regulate the construction of Trump's Inaugural Address. Moreover, Trump's discursive act also interacts synchronically with existing norms, values, and power relations. For instance, he strategically mentions the names of the former presidents, who are present in the ceremony, along with positive adjectives like 'magnificent' to suggest that current norms,

and values also play a vital role in justifying what Wodak calls 'power relations' (Wodak, 2004).

In short, the above given analysis done through Wodak's point of view (2004) clearly shows that Trump's Inaugural Address justifies power relations both diachronically and synchronically. Similarly, he goes ahead:

"Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves" (Trump, 2017).

Much like above given extract, this chunk also justifies 'power relations' through 'norms and values' (Wodak, 2004). The chunk exposes power relations, as it manifests Trump's ideas, intentions, and opinions though the rhetorical use of nouns, such as 'children', 'families', and 'jobs'. By using these positive nouns, he is actually creating discourses of populism to win Americans' hearts. Speaking clearly, Trump discursively constructs Americans' wishes for education, safety, and employment.. He also justifies the historical tradition of educational norms and values; safety norms and values; employment norms and values. Similarly, by exploiting Americans emotionally, Trump is actually creating and justifying power relations. In this regard, Trump presents himself as a guardian of Americans, because he claims to possess the capability of helping Americans get their rights, such as education, safety, and employment. He means to claim that Americans are less educated to develop themselves; they are also vulnerable to terrorism; and, most of the Americans are jobless. Therefore, he indirectly implies that he has much more potential to give education, safety, and employment to Americans. Thereby, creating the binaries of 'the weak' and 'the strong', Trump is not only justifying power relations but also he is validating the relations as Wodak has made it known in her Discourse Historical Model (Wodak, 2004).

Most of the above analysis systematically highlights, through Wodak's model (2004), the factual truth that Trump not only brings forth power relations but also he justifies their emergence. He mostly relies upon discourses of populism, norms, and values to construct power relations. Moreover, he also draws upon the power relations to achieve his political ambitions. Thus, Trump has made use of power relations to justify his unquestioned rule over the common Americans.

4.2. Trump's Diachronic, Discursive Interaction with American Pastness

Apart from discursive construction of power relations through norms and values, Trump's *Inaugural Address* also interacts with America's historical discourses. American pastness, historically, intertwines with Trump's edifice of discursiveness. In other words, Trump's speech actually draws upon historical forces to bring about power relations in a much more systematic way. As Ruth Wodak has clarified that all discourses are historically inspired and motivated, similarly, Donald Trump's *Inaugural Address* is also a restrained construction of historically inspired discourse. The subjective historicity of Trump's discourse is clearly manifested in the following excerpt:

"We've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own;" (Trump, 2017).

The above given statement diachronically interacts with American history by using a finite verb 'defended'. Trump diachronically claims that American rulers have always 'defended' other nations against dangers and threats. It also explains the defensive history of America in which powerful Americans have defended the weaker nations. Trump tries to create, through American history, relation between the defenders and the defended; the linguistic binary that has existed throughout American history is actually based upon power, and it can rightly be called a power relation. Moreover, Trump also out-legitimates, through the use of negative infinite verb 'refusing', his political rivals by suggesting that they are unwilling to defend the common Americans against existential threats. This out-administration on Trump's part also diachronically entails power relations in which Trump is a capable statesman, while his opponents are careless politicians. Hence, power relations are

diachronically engendered by Trump in his Inaugural Address as it has been explained by Wodak (2004).

In a much more similar manner, Trump diachronically goes ahead in validating and relying upon power relations:

"We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon" (Trump, 2017).

In this sentence, Trump is actually creating a power relation between America and other countries of the world by using two finite past participles 'made' and 'disappeared'. He has deliberately placed the former with a positive adjective 'rich', while the latter is used with positive nouns 'wealth', 'strength', 'confidence'. He means to imply that American politicians have always worked for 'other' nations' betterment at the cost of the Americans' welfare. Trump's political discourse also diachronically interacts with American, nationalist narrative. It gathers its strength from American nationalism and power. Speaking in much clearer terms, Trump, relying upon American nationalist pastness, wants to say that other countries have become rich, while America's resources are vanishing. Moreover, this binary relation between America and other countries of the world allows Trump to cash upon Americans' patriotism. Thus, the statement satisfactorily complies with Ruth Wodak's notion that all discourses are based upon power relations, and they are also historically inspired (Wodak, 2004). In this manner, Trump makes use of power relations to perpetuate his political interests.

"The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the entire world" (Trump, 2017).

This extract from Trump's speech is actually much more interesting as it has historically dealt with two different dimensions of power relations. The first dimension is actually delimited to America, whereas the other dimension has much more to do with America and the rest of the world. First, Trump wants to suggest by using a dynamic verb 'ripped' that some bad politicians have snatched wealth from Americans who are always vulnerable throughout Trump's supposed historicity. Consequently, it implies the fact that the bad politicians are exploiters, while the common Americans are the exploited. The statement, thus, creates power relations within America between two different groups of Americans. Moreover, the second dimension of power relations deals, through another dynamic verb 'redistribute', with America and the rest of the world. Similarly, Trump, by following historically nationalist discourses, claims that the wealth of Americans has been wrongly redistributed among different, poor countries of the world. It also implies that the Americans are wealthy and innocent, while the non-Americans are poor and lazy. In this way, Trump diachronically draws upon American history to induce the power relations as stated in Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004).

4.3. Trump's Synchronic, Discursive Interaction with Contemporary Affairs:

In addition to diachronic interaction with American pastness, Trump's speech also engages with contemporary affairs in order to validate and entail the power relations. The contemporary state of affairs also influences the construction of Trump's Inaugural Address (2017). According to Ruth Wodak, discourse also synchronically interacts with existing circumstances, and thereby it adopts its form and content (Wodak, 2004). Similarly, Trump's speech also interacts with contemporary affairs and thus comes into being through restrained production. Therefore, in this portion, much of attention is paid to Trump's synchronic interaction with the contemporary affairs.

"We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength" (Trump, 2017).

Much like the previous excerpt, this statement also synchronically deals with the current economic wars waged by America and China. Trump's usage of collective, possessive pronoun 'our' enables him to rhetorically claim that China and other countries are causing harm to America's manufacturing industry. In the current scenario, China and America are engaged in imposing economic sanctions against each other. Trump uses a negative verb 'stealing' to accuse China of an illicit behavior. Hence, he is actually advocating the economic policies of protectionism to counter China's manufacturing industry. Similarly, China has also responded by imposing sanctions on America's products. This economic warfare is also based upon power relations in which Trump assumes the position of an economic lord and describes China as a thief. Similarly, America has been synchronically portrayed through positive terminology as a country that innovates manufacturing industry, whereas China has been misrepresented as a country that lacks innovative, economic ideas. Thus, Trump makes use of power relations to out-legitimate China and achieve his political gains as it has been discussed by Ruth Wodak in her Discourse Historical Model (2004).

Finally, it is sufficed to say that Donald Trump has embarked upon a systematic construction of discourse in a synchronic way to achieve his goals. Moreover, his *Inaugural Address* also contains norms, values, and power relations that subjectively validate Trump's political interests, as it has been systematically explained by Ruth Wodak in her theoretical model which is famously known as Discourse Historical Model (2004).

5. CONCLUSION

Finally, it is concluded that Trump's *Inaugural Address* politically interacts with historical norms, values, and power relations. Moreover, Trump's speech is also synchronically and diachronically inspired. The speech has been analyzed in accordance with Ruth Wodak's Discourse Historical Model (2004). Power relations have been prevalent, as manifested with lexical and syntactic items, throughout Donald Trump's *Inaugural Address.* Besides, the data has been analyzed by making categories based upon coding and constructs. The current research will contribute to the field of CDA and thereby pave the way for many researchers to draw upon it and critically study power discourse. Moreover, the current research will also raise the critical consciousness of a common reader who will be able not to allow himself or herself to take political discourse for granted. Finally, this research is a human creation and thus claims no absolute perfection. It certainly has its gaps which might be filled up by constructive critics.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (n.d.). From the performative to the speech act. *PERFORMATIVITY*, 6-21. doi:10.4324/9780203391280_chapter_1

Chen, W. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's inaugural speech from the perspective of systemic functional grammar. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(8), 966. doi:10.17507/tpls.0808.07

Dijk, R. J. (2007). Robert John van Dijk [entrevistado POR Françoise Terzian]. *GV-executivo*, *6*(2), 10. doi:10.12660/gvexec.v6n2.2007.34545

Erika Sabrina Quinonez. (2018). (Un)Welcome to America: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Anti-immigrant Rhetoric in Trump's Speeches and Conservative Mainstream Media. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/635/

Garcia, T. M. (2018). Donald J. Trump: A critical discourse analysis | Donald J. Trump: UN análisis crítico del discurso. *REVISTA ESTUDIOS INSTITUCIONALES*, *5*(8), 47. doi:10.5944/eeii.vol.5.n.8.2018.21778

Hassan, N. A. (2020). Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Tramp's Inaugural speech. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338540955_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_of_Donald_Tramp's_Inaugural_speech_By_Asst_Prof_Nagham_Ali_Hassan

Mohammadi, M., & Javady, J. (2017). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Language Use in US Presidential Campaign, 2016. DOI: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.5p.1, 6.

Rohmah, S. N. (2018). Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald J. Trump's Speeches. Retrieved from http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/26939/2/Siti%20Nur%20Rohmah_A73214060.pdf

Trump, D. (2017, January 20). The inaugural address. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/the-inaugural-address/

Wodak, R. (2004). 'Us' and 'Them': Inclusion and exclusion – Discrimination via discourse. *Identity, Belonging and Migration*, 54-77. doi:10.5949/liverpool/9781846311185.003.0004

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. doi:10.4135/9780857028020

Author Biodata

Ameer Ali is a research scholar of Applied Linguistics at University of Sindh, Jamshoro. These days he is working there on a research thesis to earn his M.Phil. Applied Linguistics Degree.

Mohammad Ibrahim is a research scholar of Applied Linguistics at University of Sindh, Jamshoro. He is also working as an English lecturer at a government college in Karachi.

APPENDIX
The Inaugural Address (2017)

Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: thank you.
We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people.
Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come.
We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done.

Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent.

Today's ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one Administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American People.

For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost.

Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth.

Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed.

The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country.

Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.

That all changes – starting right here, and right now, because this moment is your moment: it belongs to you.

It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America.

This is your day. This is your celebration.

And this, the United States of America, is your country.

What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people.

January 20th 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again.

The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.

Everyone is listening to you now.

You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before.

At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens.

Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.

These are the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public.

But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential.

This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.

We are one nation – and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams; and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.

The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.

For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry;

Subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military;

We've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own;

And spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay.

We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon.

One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind.

The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the entire world.

But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future.

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.

From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land.

From this moment on, it's going to be America First.

Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families.

We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength.

I will fight for you with every breath in my body – and I will never, ever let you down.

America will start winning again, winning like never before.

We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams.

We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation.

We will get our people off of welfare and back to work – rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor.

We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and Hire American.

We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world – but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first.

We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example for everyone to follow.

We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones – and unite the civilized world against Radical Islamic Terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth.

At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other.

When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice.

The Bible tells us, "how good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity."

We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity.

When America is united, America is totally unstoppable.

There should be no fear – we are protected, and we will always be protected.

We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement and, most importantly, we are protected by God.

Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger.

In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving.

We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action – constantly complaining but never doing anything about it.

The time for empty talk is over.

Now arrives the hour of action.

Do not let anyone tell you it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America.

We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again.

We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries and technologies of tomorrow.

A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions.

It is time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag.

And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator.

So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words:

You will never be ignored again.

Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams, will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.

Together, We Will Make America Strong Again.

We Will Make America Wealthy Again.

We Will Make America Proud Again.

We Will Make America Safe Again.

And, Yes, Together, We Will Make America Great Again. Thank you, God Bless You, And God Bless America.