



**College of Graduate Studies
Applied Linguistics and Teaching English**

**A Critical Discourse Analysis of Wilders and Trump's Populism
According to Van Dijk's Argumentation Strategies and Sperber
and Wilson's Relevance Theory**

By:

Reham Mahmoud AbuAli

Supervisor:

Dr. Hazem Bader

**This Thesis is Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Master's Degree in Applied Linguistics and
the Teaching of English, College of Graduate Studies, Hebron
University. Hebron, Palestine**

2024

Hebron University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Wilders and Trump's Populism According to Van Dijk's
Argumentation Strategies and Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory

Hebron University


By:Reham Abu Ali

This thesis was successfully defended on April, 18, 2024 and approved by:

Committee Members:

Signature

Dr. Hazem Bader

Supervisor. .....

Dr. Mahmoud Tmeizeh

External Examiner .....

Dr. Salah Shrouf

Internal Examiner .....

Declaration

I confirm that this dissertation is the outcome of my independent research, conducted under the guidance of Dr. Hazem Bader. I have duly acknowledged and referenced all information and ideas incorporated in this thesis. I adhered to ethical standards throughout the research and refrained from any form of academic dishonesty or plagiarism. Furthermore, this work has not been previously presented for a degree or examination elsewhere.

Dedication

I dedicate this achievement to myself first and foremost

To the impenetrable dam and protector after Allah, my father

To the warm embrace and source of strength, my dear mother

To my fortified army and unbreakable wings, my brother

To the source of happiness, my loving sister

To my understanding partner and his family

To those who made the hardship of

the path easy, my friends and

colleagues

To the pure souls who sacrificed for our

beloved homeland, to the brave prisoners,

and the steadfast fortress of Gaza

Acknowledgment

In the name of Allah, the most gracious and merciful, and all praise is due to Almighty Allah for his boundless blessings. My sincere appreciation to my parents whose unwavering support and encouragement sustained me through this spectacular journey. For my father, the solid base and unwavering strength. My mother, my sweetheart whose prayers and words supported and motivated me throughout the process of accomplishing this invaluable experience.

I would like to express my gratitude to my brothers for making my dreams come true. A huge thank you to my sisters for their patience and help. My gratitude to my life partner and his family for their understanding and support. Not to mention, my friends and colleagues for helping me during the process of accomplishing this thesis.

I am truly grateful to Dr. Hazem Bader for his assistance and guidance throughout conducting this dissertation. His contribution, insights, and encouragement were invaluable. In addition, I would like to acknowledge my supervisor's support and guidance through the last three semesters.

I wish to thank the committee members who were more than generous and willing to share their expertise and precious time. Finally, I thank the place that allowed me to have this splendid opportunity to learn from the best in the field; thank you Hebron University.

Table of Content _Toc153918322

SUBJECT	PAGE
DECLARATION.....	II
DEDICATION	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	IV
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	V
ABSTRACT	VII
المُلخَص	IX
INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Types Of Populism.....	2
1.2. Statement Of The Problem	5
1.3 Research Questions.....	6
1.4. The Hypothesis Of Study	6
1.5. Significance Of The Study	7
1.6. Limitations Of The Study	7
1.7. Research Design.....	8
LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1. Definitions Of Populism.....	11
2.2. Who Is A Populist?	13
2.3. Populist Figures From The World	14
2.4. Types Of Populism.....	15
2.5. Characteristics Of Populism.....	15
2.6. Features Of Populism	17
2.7. Islamophobia The Identifying Feature Of Populism.....	18
2.8. The Role Of Media In Populism	20
2.9. Populism And Political Discourse	21
2.10. Discourse Analysis	23
2.11. Relevance Theory.....	31
2.12. Related Studies	32
METHODOLOGY	
3.1. Data Sources	34
3.2. Sample Of The Study.....	34
3.3. Instrument Of The Research	36
3.4. Data Analysis	37
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	
A. Wilders’s Freedom And Islam Speech (2019).....	39
B. Trump’s Announcement Speech (2015).....	63
C. Trump’s Nomination Acceptance Speech (2016).....	72
D. Trump’s Inauguration Speech (2017)	83

DISCUSSION.....	92
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Summary Of Results	110
Conclusion	112
Recommendations	117
REFERENCES	118
APPENDIX A: FREEDOM AND ISLAM SPEECH.....	125
APPENDIX B.....	138
APPENDIX C	160
APPENDIX D: INAUGURATION SPEECH	177

Abstract

Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their populist ideology; they use different strategies to increase their credibility and trustworthiness from the people's point of view, attract votes, and attack the elite. Thereby, the researcher analyzed Wilders's Freedom and Islam (2019) and Trump's announcement speech (2015), nomination acceptance speech (2016), and inauguration speech (2017) speech. The analysis is done in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis (argumentation strategies) and the relevance theory of communication strategies produced by Sperber and Wilson (1986). Investigating whether the targeted persons' ideology is reflected in their speeches. In addition, the researcher analyzed Wilders & Trump's body language during their speeches. Henceforth, the researcher considered the following dimensions in the analysis: Islamophobia, racism, white man superiority, illusion, fear and brainwashing, and religion. Further, the researcher interpreted the role of the media in the expansion of populism. The findings first revealed that Wilders and Trump are populists, which is evident in their speeches; their ideologies seek authority, attack and criticize the elite, and centralize people. Second, Wilders and Trump's argumentations reflected their ideology; they utilized several argumentation strategies, allowing them to neglect the elite and the outgroup, represent them negatively, and ruin their reputation. Third, they utilized communication strategies of the relevance theory that fostered and facilitated the delivery of their speeches. Fourth, their styles are similar; they use colloquial language to create an authentic and close relationship with their audiences; the more genuine the speeches are, the more

they are believable. Fifth, they purposefully generated racism, islamophobia, fear, illusion, white man's supremacy, brainwashing, and enemies.

Sixth, Wilders and Trump are Islamophobes; they used Muslims, Islam, and Arabs as scapegoats to distract people's attention from their political failure, and creating enemies makes them heroes who would stop those intruders and enemies at any cost to take back their stolen freedom.

Keywords: Discourse analysis, Populism, Populist, Van Dijk's argumentation strategies, Relevance theory communication strategies, Ideology, Islamophobia.

المخلص

تعكس خطابات فيلدرز وترامب أيديولوجيتهما الشعبوية؛ حيث يستخدمان استراتيجيات مختلفة لزيادة مصداقيتهم وكسب الثقة من وجهة نظر الناس، وجذب الأصوات، ومهاجمة النخبة الحاكمة. ومن هنا قام الباحث بتحليل خطاب الحرية والإسلام (2019) لفيلدرز، وخطاب ترامب لإعلان الترشح (2015)، وخطاب قبول الترشح (2016)، وخطاب التصيب (2017) في ضوء تحليل الخطاب النقدي لفان دايك (استراتيجيات الجدل) ونظرية الملاءمة لاستراتيجيات الاتصال لسبيربر وويلسون (1986) للتحقق مما إذا كانت أيديولوجية الأشخاص المستهدفين تنعكس في خطاباتهم. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، قام الباحث بتحليل لغة جسد فيلدرز وترامب خلال خطابتهما. ومن ثم تناول الباحث الأبعاد التالية في التحليل: الإسلاموفوبيا والعنصرية وتفوق العرق الأبيض والوهم، والخوف وغسل الدماغ والدين. كما قام الباحث بتفسير دور الإعلام في توسع الشعبوية. وكشفت النتائج أولاً أن فيلدرز وترامب شعبيان، وهو ما ظهر بوضوح في خطابتهما؛ حيث تسعى أيديولوجياتهم إلى التفرّد بالسلطة، ومهاجمة وانتقاد السلطة الحاكمة.

ثانياً، عكست حجج فيلدرز وترامب أيديولوجيتهما؛ لقد استخدموا العديد من استراتيجيات الجدل التي سمحت لفيلدرز وترامب بإهمال وتحييد السلطة الحاكمة، وتمثيلهم بشكل سلبي، وتشويه سمعتهم. ثالثاً، وظفو نظرية الملاءمة لاستراتيجيات الاتصال التي عززت وسهلت إلقاء خطاباتهم. رابعاً، أسلوب فيلدرز وترامب متشابهان؛ فقد استخدموا اللغة العامية لخلق علاقة حقيقية ووثيقة مع جمهورهم؛ كلما كانت الخطب صادقة، كلما كانت قابلة للتصديق. خامساً، نشر العنصرية و الإسلاموفوبيا، والخوف، والوهم، وتفوق العرق الأبيض، وغسل الدماغ، والاعداء بشكل متعمد. سادساً، إن ويلدرز وترامب إسلاموفوبيان (كارهان وعنصريان) للإسلام وقد استخدموا المسلمين والإسلام والعرب ككبش فداء لـصرف انتباه الشعب عن الفشل السياسي وخلق الاعداء يجعل منهم ابطالا قادرين على ايقاف الدخلاء والاعداء باي ثمن لاستعادة حريتهم المسلوبة.

الكلمات المفتاحية

تحليل الخطابات، الشعبوية، شعبي، استراتيجيات فان دايك الجدلية، الإسلاموفوبيا، إيديولوجية، إستراتيجيات التواصل.

Introduction

Language is indispensable for successful communication; people use language to communicate, interact, and interpret. It has two functions: transactional and interactional functions. Using language to transfer genuine or hypothetical data and generate concepts of culture, literature, thoughts, and feelings is transactional. An interactional function utilizes language for creating and sustaining interpersonal relationships. Discourse is the spoken or written context between the parties of conversation or a communication process; it could be verbal or nonverbal communication and may occur in different styles.

Over the past few decades, the world has witnessed the emergence of a dominant power of populism. Nowadays, the world faces populism, a mindset-changing ideology; furthermore, it is a political strategy that allows politicians to sway people's minds and gain support and justification for their actions.

Populism is the deep belief of suspicion in the credibility of the current and previous governments' actions or decisions. Suppose that they plot conspiracies for their interest. Populists admire their people and believe the government should always seek the people's welfare. They tend to be suspicious of foreigners and have white man superiority; they believe other nations are inferior to them regarding aspects of culture, capabilities, etc.

The Latin populous, which means "the people," gave rise to their name "Populists," and their platform was to "install the people in power, get rid of 'the plutocrats, the aristocrats, and all the other rats, and all would be well.'" (Kyle. J. & Gultchin. L., 2018).

The term "populism" was initially applied to political movements during the 1800s. First, there was the "agrarian movement" in the United States in the 1890s, which gave rise to the People's Party. The movement's goals were to stop the

demonetization of silver and to promote doubt about banks, railroads, and political elites.

The idea of a pure people up against a corrupt elite and the conviction that politics should be an expression of the people's will be the two elements of populism, according to Mudde, who called it a "thin ideology." (Mudde, 2004.)

The Russian Narodnichestvo movement, which emerged in the 1860s and 1870s, was the second movement associated with populism. This group of revolutionary intellectuals and peasants felt they should be the cornerstone of a revolution aimed at overthrowing tsarist rule. Even though the backgrounds of these movements differed significantly, they shared the conviction that the urban elite was not the rightful owner of power but the agricultural workers. (Kyle. J. & Gultchin. L., 2018)

The 1950s witnessed the emergence of populism's expansion into different settings. It evolved to be associated with various occurrences, including politics in the US, Africa, and Latin America supporting charismatic leaders—the notion of populism as a response to the modernization movement. Seymour Martin Lipset (a leading modernization theorist) defined populism as a "political manifestation of the concerns and rage of people who are eager and desire a more straightforward, pre-modernization era" (Lipset 1963, as cited in Kyle & Gulchin 2018).

1.1 Types of Populism

Across the history of populism, several scholars endorsed that populism can't always remain the same. Mudde & Kaltwasser (2013) categorized populism as 'inclusionary' and 'exclusionary,' Inclusionary populism promotes the political integration of marginalized people; it is often associated with left-wing populism. Exclusionary populism excludes

people and social groups for (racist\nativist) reasons, seeking an ethnic or cultural homogeneousness in its people that is often associated with radical right parties.

"The people" refers to the nation in exclusionary populism, whereas in inclusionary populism, "the people" is an "empty signifier." Inclusionary populism is structured along a horizontal axis (inside/outside), while exclusionary populism is organized along a vertical axis (down/up, high/low). Both ideologies are related to power and socio-cultural and/or socioeconomic status. Nationalism is the main topic of conversation from the moment "the people" manifest as a nation in exclusionary populism and are directed horizontally (inside and out), with populism emerging as a secondary phenomenon (Stavrakakis 2017b).

A populist tells lies to convince particular facts that may not be true to what serves to accomplish their goals. Populism is a propaganda that aims to discriminate against other countries and promote hatred, islamophobia, inequality, white man superiority, fear, and illusion. Populism creates enemies and provides a scapegoat to blame when the wind does not blow the ship's desire.

Politicians use populism as a strategy to be elected, remain in power, and always have the upper hand. Lying is something intrinsic in populism; it reflects political and religious orientation. A populist is mostly a racist who aims to spread racism and hatred towards weaker nations and foreigners.

There are leading populists, such as Geert Wilders, Emmanuel Macron, and Donald Trump. These characters are known for their racial, controversial, and Islamophobic ideologies and speeches. Populists employ the media skillfully to demonstrate their thoughts and ideologies to the audience to be more credible, believable, and trustworthy.

Populism has many characteristics, including racism and Islamophobia. The latter demonstrates the unwavering hatred and unjustified fear of Muslims and Islam and the urgent desire to fight them. While the former interprets white men as superior, racial discrimination depends on culture, gender, and color. Populists target Arabs and Muslims verbally and non-verbally. Wilders is known for his great hate for Muslims “The biggest problem in this country is Islamization,” “Moroccans are scum,” and many controversial statements and speeches.

Furthermore, Macron was criticized for the Mohammed (peace be upon him) cartoon crisis. Moreover, Trump is no less a racial politician during an interview with the BBC, he claimed, “Islam is a problem,” and the list goes on.

Discourse analysis is a linguistic field that examines and investigates language (as a context of communication) and analyzes how people communicate and employ language to express thoughts and ideas and how they use it (techniques, strategies, etc...) Discourse analysis involves different branches of analyses, Fairclough, van Dijk, and Wodak.

In 2015, Donald Trump announced that he was joining the presidential race in Trump Tower. Later, in (2016), he gave a speech accepting the nomination with 14 million votes. In 2017, he won the elections, became the president of the United States, and gave the inauguration speech.

Dutch politician Geert Wilders in the Netherlands. His main worry is the "Islamization" of the Netherlands, which encouraged de-Islamization and a ban on the Qur'an. Rather than being a religion, he views Islam as a murderous and autocratic ideology. According to Wilders, Muslims are aggressive people who want to conquer Western nations.

Many scholars have critically analyzed Wilders' and Trump's speeches, statements, and actions throughout the past few years due to their controversial personal and tricky political lives. What makes them populists, and how did they employ such a strategy, and why? Using different techniques in speech production and populist characteristics made them well-known populist leaders internationally. In addition, their speeches became a rich resource for critical discourse analysis researchers from different parts of the world.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Populism is a political strategy that sways people's minds; populists use populism to be elected and remain in power. Trump and Wilders are populists who employ populism to be the upper hand, the only Alfa, to own the world and achieve their populist ideology goals. Their populist speeches reflect their ideology; they use different strategies to increase their credibility from the people's point of view and attract votes and supportive people to protect them.

The researcher analyzes Wilders & Trump's speeches in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis (argumentation strategies) and the relevance theory produced by Sperber and Wilson to investigate the communication strategies they used in their speeches that created a huge fan base for them and how it reflected their ideology. Moreover, the researcher will analyze Wilders & Trump's body language and interjections. Furthermore, the researcher considers the following dimensions in the analysis: Islamophobic dimension, racism dimension, white man superiority dimension, illusion dimension, fear and brainwashing dimension, and religious dimension. In addition, the researcher interprets the role of media in the expansion of populism.

1.3 Research Questions

1. Taking populism as a definition, can we consider Wilders & Trump populists, and why?
2. How do Wilders & Trump's speeches reflect their populist ideology?
 - A. How do Wilders & Trump's speeches reflect populism in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (2001) and the argumentation strategies?
 - B. How do Wilders & Trump's speeches reflect populism in light of the relevance theory produced by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and communication strategies?

1.4. The Hypotheses of Study

1. Geert Wilders and Donald Trump are well-known populists; they used populism to brainwash people's minds and gain votes.
2. Wilders & Trump's speeches reflect their populist ideology. Trump once clearly stated, "Yes, yes, I am a populist." Conversely, Wilders created an enemy over the past few years, which is "Islamophobia" which shows his populist ideology.
3. Wilders & Trump's speeches are a rich resource of argumentation and communication strategies that foster credibility and the chances of winning the elections.
4. Their speeches reflect their populist ideology; utilizing communication strategies allowed them to reflect their ideology and facilitated winning the elections.

1.5. Significance of The Study

This study investigates Wilders and Trump's populist ideologies. It analyzes their populism in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (argumentation strategies) and Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory. Moreover, this study investigates whether Trump and Wilders are populists and what makes them so. Since there is not enough attention given to this phenomenon; the researcher conducted this research to increase awareness about populism and how it is reflected in speech to achieve certain goals.

This study analyzes Trump's announcement speech (2015), nomination acceptance speech (2016), and inauguration speech (2017) in light of Van Dijk's CDA (2001) and Sperber's & Wilson's (1986) relevance theory.

Moreover, the researcher will analyze Wilders's statements and the (2019) speech at the David Horowitz Freedom Center in America, uploaded to the PVV YouTube channel on the 12th of December 2019. In addition, the researcher analyzes Wilders & Trump's argumentation strategies and communication relevance theory strategies to figure out their ideologies, how populism is reflected in their speeches, and why they used populism.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

1. This thesis is limited only to three speeches: Trump's nomination announcement speech (2015), the nomination acceptance speech (2016), and the inauguration speech (2017).
2. This thesis is limited to one speech by Wilders (2019) at the David Horowitz Freedom Center in America that was uploaded to the PVV YouTube channel on the December 12th 2019 and randomly collected statements.

3. This thesis is limited to using Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis and the relevance theory produced by Sperber and Wilson (1986) in data analysis.

1.7. Research Design

This thesis is qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research in the discourse analysis field and will target Geert Wilders and Donald Trump's populist speeches.

The researcher raises two primary and two secondary questions: (1) Taking populism as a definition, can we consider Wilders and Trump populists, and why?

(2) How do Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their populist ideology?

(a) How do Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect populism in light of van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (2001) and the argumentation strategies? And

(b) How do Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect populism in light of the relevance theory produced by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and communication strategies?

This study investigates Wilders and Trump's populist ideologies and analyzes their populism in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (argumentation strategies) and Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory. Moreover, this study investigates whether Wilders and Trump are populists and what makes them so.

This study analyzes Trump's announcement speech (2015), nomination acceptance speech (2016), and inauguration speech (2017) in light of Van Dijk's CDA (2001) and Sperber's & Wilson's (1986) relevance theory. Moreover, the researcher will analyze Wilders's statements and the (2019) speech at the David Horowitz Freedom Center in America, which was uploaded to the PVV YouTube channel on the 12th of December 2019.

In addition, the researcher analyzes Wilders & Trump's argumentation strategies and communication relevance theory strategies to figure out their ideologies, how populism is reflected in their speeches, and why they used populism. Furthermore, the researcher analyzes Wilders and Trump's body language and interjections and how they affect communication.

Literature Review

This section of the paper presents a concise and fundamental literature review of populism, its definition, characteristics, features, islamophobia, the role of media, an introduction to populists, discourse analysis, and its aspects and approaches.

Recently, populism has become a trending concept in the past few years in Western media and politics in the United States, Germany, France, Belgium, India, and Holland. The term 'populism' emerged, particularly after 'Brexit' Britain leaving the European Union, the Dutch presidential elections, and during the 2016 US presidential campaign.

It is worth differentiating between 'Populism' and 'Popularity.' The former is a political phenomenon, style, strategy, or movement that claims they are the voice of people, and they are for people; they defend people's needs, interests, and capabilities against the 'elite' or the administration or work for personal reasons and not for the country's sake. The latter (popularity) indicates true love, respect, and appreciation for something or someone.

Populism is a risky agenda that fosters internal and external strife or disagreements. The Free Dictionary states that populism is a political philosophy supporting the rights and power of the people against the wicked elite.' Populism is a device political leaders use to sway people's minds, gain support, and remain in authority. The term populism is traced back to the Latin word "Populus." meaning "the people." (n.d. as cited in Palano. D. 2022).

Populism is trying to steer human beings and influence them, especially in politics; politicians try to affect people, attract them, gain votes, and rebel against and criticize the current and previous administrations.

2.1. Definitions of Populism

It has always been challenging to pinpoint a precise definition of populism among the various definitions. (Weyland 2001) stated that populism is a political strategy that charismatic leaders use to reach authority and remain in power. The ideology of populism is self-centered and categorizes the community into "the pure people" and "the corrupt elite." It makes the case that the people's collective will must be reflected in politics. Populism is a political strategy that aims to win people over by giving them what they want but not what they need and consoling them with lovely lies rather than shocking them with the truth (Mudde. 2007).

Populism is a political rhetoric that indicates fighting and rebelling against the corrupt elites, known as self-centered, selfish, and undemocratic. Subsequently, populism declares that elites destroy the collective will, seeking to challenge and change the leaders and administration and give voice to ordinary people (Moffitt, 2015).

Populism is a broad term that may mean "bringing politics to people " and "bringing people to politics." Populism is a set of well-structured, touching, and persuasive discourses, especially using communication techniques and strategies to influence a group of people to get support, gather followers as much as possible, eliminate the current administration, and take over the authority.

Furthermore, it is the strategic usage of linguistic tropes and styles to state power and establish political agendas and ideologies of some characters recognized as populists seeking power, control, and authorization (Canovan, 2002).

Shils (1956) characterized populism as an ideology of public dissatisfaction against the corrupt ruling elite, monopolizing power, properties, cultivation, and

heritage. In such scenarios, populism is dangerous to the values of liberal democracy based on the separation of powers.

Populism leaves an imprint on critical political phenomena (Hawkins, 2010). By classifying political actors as either populist or not and thus treating populism as relatively stable, those who define populism as an ideology typically measure the phenomenon at the level of individual and collective political actors (Ivarsflaten, 2008).

Conversely, academics who characterize populism as a discourse form are unsure about the durability of populist assertions within actors since they usually operationalize populism at the level of specific speech acts (as cited in Bonikowski & Gidron. n: d.).

The populist ideology conceives society as two opposites: the thoroughbred people and the double-dealing and corrupt politics or elite. Moreover, it holds the allegation that people's well is beyond all means and should be fought for dominance (as cited in SEVÜK & AYDIN, 2020).

Populism is the political tendency of the Royal Spanish Academy and the Association of Academies of the Spanish Language to attract people to gain and achieve personal goals (as cited in Del Rocio Flores Hinojosa, N. 2021). Populism is a political tactic that self-centered leaders use to gain control over authority through straightforward and spontaneous support from a broad spectrum of followers. (Weyland, 2001.)

In South America, populism is viewed as a much more positive phenomenon than in Europe, where it is recognized negatively; it is characterized as a democratizing and equalizing movement (Ostiguy, 2017.)

2.2. Who is a Populist?

Populists are intrinsically patriotic, highly motivated, authoritarian, and charismatic figures who are ‘anti-elitism’ with a deep suspicion that the elite (leaders and administration) are corrupt. They seek power and authority, consider themselves as the voice of the people who share the same opinion, and only populists can make changes. Populists are soft-spoken, use simplistic and understandable language, and use their position to sway people's minds, shift them to their side, and convince them of their populist ideology.

Charisma is the glue that holds together the strict and solid relationship between leaders and their followers; it gives them a deep connection and a sense of unwavering belief and trust. (Hirschl & Spisak, 2020). Populists want to combine the three dominant branches of power in their countries: the executive, the congress, and the judiciary. In this way, they concentrate all power on themselves (Colomer, 1999).

Populist strategies emphasize resolving specific societal issues and ensure that spreading this fact to people results in the populist leaders taking on the role of a nation's healer. Typically, populists enhance public spending, creating more jobs and increasing financial donations to industry, commerce, and agriculture.

Seemingly, populism generates an unbridgeable division between the people and outsiders. The people are described as “the true people” and the “morally decent . . . economically struggling, hard-working, family-oriented, plainspoken, and endowed with common sense”, according to the sociologist Rogers Brubaker in his study “Why Populism?” (Brubaker, 2017, p:357-385). While the outsiders include

the elite, immigrants, refugees, religious minorities, non-citizens, and criminals.

Populists employ three primary tactics to reinforce the divide between insiders and outsiders:

1. a political stance that allows them to identify with insiders;
2. an endeavor to characterize and undermine outsiders; and
3. crisis rhetoric that intensifies the rivalry between insiders. (As cited in Kyle. J, & Gulchin. L, 2018).

2.3. Populist Figures from the World

Populist characters are quite famous nowadays; there are many populists worldwide: Geert Wilders in Holland, Macron in France, Modi in India, and, second to none, Donald Trump in the United States. These characters share their ideology and engrave it in people's minds, and are known for their controversial comments, decisions, and policies. Undoubtedly, all of these populists are racist and Islamophobic and share the unjustified heat for immigrants, Islam, Muslims, Arab people, and anyone except pure citizens.

Populists are rivals of both the elite discourse and the corrupt political system that their community has imposed. They allege that the country's political elites are corrupt and uninterested in solving issues that affect the general public and public services. They frequently employ friendly-hostile arguments and grossly simplify political issues to polarize further and personalize politics. On the other hand, the opposition parties explicitly support more robust democratic components through their populist rhetoric, using common sense as a justification for rejecting the existing institutional framework (Mudde, 2004).

2.4. Types of Populism

It was believed that populism only has the claims above; however, it can vary in forms depending on the different contexts. According to the “Populists in Power Around the World” report, there are three types of populism, discriminated by the manner populist heads exemplify the strife between the corrupt elite or the outsiders, and the "pure people":

- A. **Cultural populism** claims that immigrants, criminals, members of racial and religious minorities, and cosmopolitan elites are examples of outsiders. In contrast, the real people are the indigenous citizens of the country. Cultural populism frequently highlights that political leaders cannot start putting out genuine and credible alternatives until they have a thorough and methodical grasp of the populism phenomenon.
- B. **Socio-economic populism asserts** that the real people are sincere, devoted workers in the working class and that outsiders are groups like large corporations, capital owners, and those seen as supporting a global capitalist system.
- C. **Anti-establishment populism** identifies outsiders as political elites and real people who are tireless victims of a state controlled by special interests. While all populism criticizes political elites, anti-establishment populism sets itself apart by seeing establishment elites as the people's main enemy. It does not create as many societal rifts (Kyle & Gulchin, 2018).

2.5. Pillars of Populism

Despite the struggle to generate a precise definition of populism, researchers figured out three core characteristics of it: these are people, the elite, and

charismatic leaders. Abraham Lincoln once said: "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." Painstakingly, this explains why most scholars refer to "People" as a core characteristic of populism. Populists consider themselves as the speaking voice of people, stand up for the people, and make decisions on behalf of people.

The populist ideology assumes that the pure people confront the intruders and the corrupt elite and that nothing can restrict people's will and everything as well as everyone must undergo fulfilling people's will, needs, and interests.

Populists worship people and deem them the center of political life. Populists represent people in politics; they work for people and share the same opinions, values, and ideologies. Some think that "people " include everyone living within the country. However, it does not apply to the case of populism; the people in populism are the electorate. Most populist leaders offer an ideal version of people who think the same way and are ready to sacrifice themselves and their freedom to the case.

Populists and their followers are the pure people of the country, passionate, patriotic citizens and landlords. Populist leaders proclaim themselves as the people's voice, the wise and capable ones of making the decisions they share with people. They seem to be the only knowledgeable ones who have the right point of view and the right to make their dreams come true.

Accordingly, "the elite " and the second core characteristic of populism are the corrupt and dictatorial leaders and administrations monopolizing power, property, and authority (Mudde,2004).

From a populist point of view, these should be uprooted for a peaceful, shining, and luxurious life. Populists believe they should have the upper hand; they criticize the

administration, seek to make changes that suit them, and cut off unnecessary relations. Trump (2017), in his inauguration speech, stated that America's capabilities will only be for Americans. Populism is associated with “anti-elitism.” Populists proclaim that the elite is pervertible and neglect the people's needs, interests, and thoughts.

The third characteristic is charismatic leaders; populists are known for their charming, influencing, and charismatic personalities; they use simple and understandable language to dig deep into people's hearts and sway their minds. The fourth and most critical characteristic is racism; populists seem to be racists and attack the inferior (Arabs, Muslims, African, Mexican, and Asian people) to the sublime race (USA and Western Countries.)

2.6. Features of Populism

1. Populism often criticizes corrupt political leaders, changes the administration, and seeks power and authority. It is a sarcastic term to describe politicians who govern people's fear, determination, trust, and enthusiasm in what benefits them the most despite their needs.

2. Populism is a wide-spreading term in media and political fields; populism is infectious. It is increasing and harms human rights and countries' unity.

3. They are creating an enemy. Populists tend to make an enemy to blame and fight against to distract people's attention from populists' actions and to engrave fear in people's hearts.

4. Islamophobia is a fundamental feature of populism; populists like Wilders and Trump are Islamophobic anti-Islam and Muslims. They continuously show hate, prejudice, stereotypes, and fear of Islam.

5. Populism is the centrality of people; they are from people, for people, and by the people. Moreover, they are ‘anti-elitism’; they fight and attack current corrupt authorities.

6. Populists are authoritarian and eager to have the upper hand and remain in power.

7. The style of populists is surprisingly simple and understandable to ease affecting people's hearts and minds since they are the center of populism. Populists are charismatic, soft-spoken, and can easily influence people. Moreover, they can manipulate language in the way they like.

8. Populism is a political gamble populists use to win hearts, gather followers, succeed, be elected and re-elected, and remain in power.

9. Populism is not an organization or a movement; more likely, it is an ideology reflecting populist leaders' orientation.

10. Populism frequently threatens the impartial, independent institutions necessary for democracy. When populists first emerge, they highlight the shortcomings of the current political order flaws that mainstream parties might have been covering up for years—and offer comprehensive fixes. (Kyle & Gulchin 2018.)

11. Populism creates a direct connection with people, allowing little room for debate about policy ideas.

2.7. Islamophobia The Identifying Feature of Populism

The emergence of Islamophobia is coupled with populism. Vividly, the anti-Islam political parties witnessed a vast growth in votes; these political parties demonstrated Islam and Muslims negatively and as a threat to European values.

Right-wing parties utilize islamophobia as an efficient weapon to gather followers, especially in Europe. Islamophobia is a form of racism and the ethnocentric elections during the eighteenth century; Islamophobic populism is mainly used by right-wing extremists (Hafez, 2012).

People become biased and discriminatory as a result of Islamophobia's widespread adoption. The fear or hate of Islam and Muslims is known as Islamophobia. Regarding this matter, the media has been invaluable. In their speeches, politicians express their beliefs and points of view regarding Islam and Muslims. Populists use social media to spread their message and guarantee that the public believes them regardless of their veracity. Among these politicians are Donald Trump and Geert Wilders.

Islamophobia is a crystal-clear form of populism. People always express their ideologies, beliefs, feelings, and thoughts, trying to deliver their ideas and convince others. Unfortunately, expressing hatred is the dominant one.

Islamic news is unpleasant; Islam is negatively portrayed more than anything else in the world. However, those negative images do not coincide with Islam but correspond with some countries' leaders or distinguished institutions. Leaders have the power and authority to create and promote political propaganda about Islam and Muslims. Therefore, this image prevails among people and sheds light on Muslims and Islam more than other parties. (Pratt & Woodlock, 2016).

Racism towards some nations, groups, and religions is widely spreading nowadays. For example, race in the United States towards African American citizens and the hatred towards Muslims is widely known as 'Islamophobia.' Racism emerges through an inequity of intolerance between the majority and the minority.

The United States witnessed high levels of social discrimination between races, which led to a gap between white and black people, as visible nowadays.

The evident targeting of Muslims and Arabs reflects the populist ideology of the West. They use Islam as a black horse in winning the elections and sometimes use it as a distraction from internal or external crises.

2.8. The Role of Media in Populism

Media plays a significant role nowadays; it affects our daily lives and is irreplaceable. Media delivers all kinds of news in the blink of an eye; it eases reaching news websites and channels. Media is a double-edged sword; it makes life easier, happier, and, to some extent, beneficial in terms of education and employment. However, it may cause unimaginable damage to people's minds, thoughts, and lives. Populists use the media skillfully to spread their ideologies to others; they share statements about specific events, seek support, post faulty information to distract the audience from some conflicts or mistakes, etc.

Donald Trump is an active Twitter user who regularly posts tweets about different topics, issues, and events. Trump employed media and Twitter, especially in the 2016 campaign elections, to gain support, attack his parties, and stay active to adopt his strategies based on the audience's reactions and comments to achieve the intended results.

Wilders strategically employed social media to establish his populist ideology, regularly posting and commenting on internal and external topics to guarantee that people stay tuned for updates.

Surprisingly, populism is comparable to the novel "Animal Farm" by George Orwell, published in (1945). It tells the story of a group of animals who rebel

against their human farmer “Mr. Jones.” They wanted to create an equal, independent, and happy society. However, the leaders betrayed the rebellion, and the farm ended up in a bad state as before, under the dictatorship of a pig named Napoleon.

Populists deceive people by joining their fight for justice, fair life, and unity, telling pretty and comforting lies, giving them promises, and giving them what they want. When the corrupt leaders leave, populists take over the authority. Ultimately, those little lies vanish, the masks fall off, and the story repeats itself.

Donald Trump is the big dog known for his populist ideology and controversial statements. The features of populism apply to Trump; he is a populist who successfully used populism as a political strategy to win the 2016 elections. Wilders ‘the Dutch Donald Trump’ continuously targeted Islam, Muslims, and Arabs, reflecting his populism. Using the same cards to sway people's minds, win votes, and remain in power vividly represents their populist ideology.

Wilders and Trump are populists who seek power and authority, gain votes, and be elected.

They share the same ideology and use carbon-copy words to trick people and manipulate them. Their speeches and statements reflect their populism; they use Islamophobia as a tool to win elections, spread fear, hatred, stereotypes, and prejudice, and create an enemy to use as a scapegoat.

2.9. Populism and Political Discourse

Discourse demonstrates the social, political, and cultural features of those who generated it, offering scholars the chance to pinpoint the most important aspects of a people's perspectives (Whorf, 1956). Discourse tackles every aspect of our lives, from

culture to politics. The necessity to analyze and interpret these aspects has increased through the past few decades; scholars worldwide have investigated thoroughly different areas in discourse, and recently, the center of attention became political discourse, especially after the emergence of populism and political movements.

One type of populism that can be used as an aesthetic designation rather than a political category is a politician's populism. Thus, populism in politics refers to a political stance that asserts the voice or representation of marginalized groups and 'the people' (Canovan, 1981).

The "ordinary" people are portrayed as a good, ascendant unity in populist discourse (Taggart, 2004, p: 269-288). On the other hand, the elites are portrayed as a corrupt and "evil" outgroup incapable of speaking for the people's collective will (Canovan, 1999).

Although members of populist movements, and especially their leaders, see themselves as the true defenders of democracy, these movements are frequently portrayed as posing a threat to democratic values (Canovan 1999). This is due to their assertion that they speak for the common people who have been disregarded by the media, the government, and mainstream parties (Canovan 1999: 2).

"The discursive construction of an enemy" and "the dichotomous construction of the social around an internal frontier" are the definitions of populism. According to some academics, populism combines external and internal forces; it spreads its ideas and ideologies while inciting conflict with the government and causing division among the neighboring nations (Laclau, 2005).

Some view populism as an "irrational phenomenon" and a threat to democracy. The self-evident Richard Hofstadter attacked the American populism of his day by associating it with traditionalism, nativism, and "moral absolutism." (Hofstadter, 1955).

2.10. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis examines how different language types produce meaning by investigating written and spoken language regarding its context. The French theorist Michel Foucault has contributed to the development of discourse analysis. According to Foucault, a discourse is "redundant declarations deemed as being crucial among a given society."

Discourse analysis aims to ascertain the significance of specific social "scripts" or systems and provides evidence for their benefits to improve our understanding of the world. Discourse analysis examines the language in use based on the fundamentals necessary for understanding any language.

According to most discourse analysts, discourse is an actual instance of language use. (Johnstone 2002). There are several approaches to discourse analysis, among them pragmatics and speech act theory.

Discourse analysis's CDA subfield goes beyond explaining how and why discourse ultimately facilitates the replication of macrostructures to concentrate on the traces of cultural and ideological meaning. The term "critical" in discourse has been approached in various ways concerning language use and power distribution in society. In various linguistic fields, criticality specifically addresses the subject of power, hegemony, and resistance.

It is crucial to examine and understand how the dominant group uses power to impact the oppressed (Mahboob & Paltridge, 2013). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) introduces the critical tradition of social analysis into language studies while adding a particular focus on discourse and the relationships between discourse and other social

elements (e.g., power dynamics, ideologies, institutions, social identities, etc.) to critical social analysis (as cited in Al-Jundi 2023).

2.10.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

Given the range of options available, CDA explains why and what effects writers of a text may experience when they choose a particular language style or do not." Both the data's presence and absence are taken into consideration by critical discourse analysis. (KhosraviNik, 2015, p. 52.)

CDA is labeled as a specific approach for studying and investigating text and talk (Van Dijk, 1995). Critical discourse analysis provides an in-depth investigation of how power, authority, and dominance are presented in language. Moreover, it investigates and interprets how politicians utilize language to benefit political contexts. (Tenorio, 2011 & Paltridge, 2012). Critical discourse analysis is a branch of discourse analysis oriented toward analyzing social power abuse, dominance, and inequality in political texts as speeches (Van Dijk, 2004).

CDA is an approach of discourse analysis that mainly focuses on power, dominance, inequality, and authority abuse merged in spoken and written discourse in political, social, and cultural contexts. Critical discourse analysis aims to foster the understanding of such a process, expose such strategies, and how they are formulated and used to produce certain discourses.

Critical Discourse Analysis is related to social issues such as war, racism, Islamophobia, populism, discrimination, and stereotypes, particularly in political contexts. Critical discourse analysis has another function; it criticizes social facts, seeking changes and solutions.

The following is a summary of the core principles of CDA by Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271–80):

1. CDA deals with societal issues.
2. Power dynamics are conversational.
3. Conversations make up society and culture.
4. Discourse carries out ideological tasks.
5. Conversation has a past.
6. Text and society are mediated in ways similar to
7. Discourse analysis provides explanation and interpretation.
8. Social action takes the form of discourse.

A. Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis

Early CDA research integrated social and linguistic theories. Fairclough recognized that language is a part of society, that linguistic phenomena are a particular kind of social phenomenon, and that social phenomena are partially linguistic to conceptualize discourse as a three-dimensional concept. Utilizing the term "discourse" to encompass the entirety of social interaction, he defined a discursive event as concurrently a text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice. Critical theory, the Frankfurt School, Marxism, and neo-Marxism were all woven into these conceptualizations, which fused Foucault's socio-theoretical understanding of discourse with Halliday's linguistic definitions of discourse (as cited in Al-Jundi, 2023.)

B. Wodak's Critical Discourse Analysis Approach

The purpose of CDA is to "examine, comprehend, and elucidate the intricacy of the objects being studied." (Wodak, 2016.) Explaining discourse analysis and

comprehension is made more accessible by Ruth Wodak. Discourses may transcend boundaries between different domains of activity, but it's essential to recognize the social and political contexts in which they arise.

In addition to recognizing the significance of context and its power dynamics, CDA seeks to identify the simultaneous articulation of various discourses. It makes sense that critical discourse analysis (CDA) has spread like wildfire in the social science field to critique social phenomena and issues and thereby improve social realities. (Carta & Wodak, 2015).

C. Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis

The political context directly affects CDA. Studying how text and talk in social interactions enact and produce abuses of authority, inequality, and social power is what this field does. (Van Dijk, 2001). Discourse analysis relies heavily on written and oral discourse as a fundamental element of the process.

Critical discourse analysis aims to understand, recognize, and expose political issues. Van Dijk developed the Ideological Square in political discourse analysis to examine ideology and the Argumentation Strategy to determine how speakers construct or present speech arguments (as cited in Prayoga, 2021.)

A. Ideology

It is insight or a belief that is propagated by a specific group. The belief comprises information, mindset, culture, and other elements. Ideology is thus the cornerstone of social representation (van Dijk, 2006). Every political group has its ideology and goals. Everything displayed in public can be viewed positively or negatively, depending on the viewer. They make an effort to instill and solidify their

ideology in people. Van Dijk provided an ideological square for determining the ideology of a person or a group.

In politics, analysts separated political groups into two groups: the in-group and the out-group. Speakers (in groups) talk about their accomplishments, actions, and good things. Outgroups, on the other hand, exhibit negative values like racism, discrimination, and war. Thus, speakers frequently talk about positive Speakers (in groups) about their accomplishments, actions, and good things. Outgroups, on the other hand, exhibit negative values like racism, discrimination, and war. Hence, rather than discussing their group's shortcomings, speakers frequently highlight its virtues.

❖ Ideological Square

1. **Emphasize our Good Things:** Speakers on behalf of their group, will typically use positive language (Van Dijk, 2006). Good things are those that are readily accepted by the general public. The person or group does, nevertheless, always have a political interest. Speaking positively, speakers hope to improve their standing in the public eye and win over more fans. Ultimately, speakers can gain the trust of society with ease, and this trust can be a powerful tool.
2. **Emphasize Their bad things:** Negative experiences turn into a group's or individual's weakness. This tactic seeks to defame the opponents in political or racist discourse (Van Dijk, 2006). They will contrast their accomplishments with those of their rivals. As a result, speakers use their opponents' flaws to undermine and damage their reputation. As a result, supporters may start to move toward other groups. Therefore, negative topics are frequently brought up in racist speech and debate to paint a false picture of opposing groups.

3. **De-emphasize Our bad things:** There are many different ways for someone to express their opinion in politics. One item will be deemphasized if speakers emphasize another (Van Dijk, 2006). Bad things used to be considered weaknesses, so speakers would downplay or avoid talking about their bad things. No group or individual will talk about their negative experiences because doing so could make them appear weaker. Thus, by covering negative topics, speakers will appear as a legitimate and equitable group to be selected from.
4. **De-emphasize Their good things:** Speakers will try to portray the opposing groups in the worst possible light. This tactic seeks to highlight their positive attributes. Their benefit may be that it serves as a talking point for speakers, leading them to believe it does not exist or is not discussed (Van Dijk, 2006). Presenters only draw attention to their flaws; in other words, this is the most effective way to hide their strengths. They will be presented as implausible organizations. In conclusion, speakers rarely discuss their positive aspects (as cited in Prayoga, 2021).

B. Argumentation Strategies

1. **Authority:** Because it is their specialization, people tend to believe what experts have to say. It is dependent upon the presence of a significant figure with political influence. Occasionally, speakers may present inaccurate information and adopt an incorrect stance. Nevertheless, by pointing out that a person or organization has authority, speakers can highlight the points they are defending. More objectivity and reliability will be the outcome (Van Dijk, 2000, 2006). To get listeners to believe what speakers are saying, this tactic seeks to support what speakers say.

- 2. Comparison:** The comparison characterizes people or groups differently than similarly in political or racist contexts. There exist in-groups and out-groups; in general, an in-group represents positive attributes, while an out-group denotes negative attributes (Van Dijk, 2006). Stated differently, speakers will consistently portray their group positively based on their accomplishments, whereas opponents or out-groups will do the opposite. By showcasing the accomplishments of speakers and their groups, this tactic seeks to promote positive representation. In conclusion, disparaging portrayals of political figures or groups with differing viewpoints will be made.
- 3. Counterfactuals:** An argumentation technique known as a counterfactual conveys empathy (Van Dijk, 2006). This speech technique tries to get the audience to think about what might happen. Counterfactuals thus require people to perceive challenging circumstances and experience empathy.
- 4. Evidentially:** Regarding immigrants or minorities, different people or groups may hold differing views. They offer proof or evidence from papers, credible witnesses, and observations to support their opinions and make them seem more reasonable (van Dijk, 2000, 2006). There are several ways to gather evidence. Demonstrably demonstrate credibility and dependability. The speaker's reasoning is more trustworthy since it is supported by evidence. Moreover, the evidential approach emphasizes the reliability of speakers' opinions.
- 5. Fallacies:** When speakers present illogical arguments in politics, they may commit fallacies. It suggests that there could be a problem with the speakers' reasoning. Sadly, speakers' arguments might be valid because many people agree with them (van Dijk, 2000). A minor opinion will be marginalized, and it is

referred to as a major opinion. Overall, the assumption and conclusion do not relate correctly.

- 6. Generalization:** Argumentation for generalization is expressed simply. When describing objects or people in general, speakers use a generalization technique. One reference, or a preferred reference, may provide it. Put another way, depending on the situation and context, speakers may characterize objects or people favorably or unfavorably. In the political sphere, speakers only cite one example that boosts their profits and harms the standing of their opponents. Furthermore, it is used to incite prejudice against immigrants or minorities (Van Dijk, 2006). Therefore, the simplest method of creating a negative representation is through the use of generalization.
- 7. Illustration:** This approach is comparable to evidentially, but illustration uses anecdotal evidence in the form of a short story. By crafting a brief narrative to generate tenable general points, illustration seeks to highlight the arguments made by speakers (van Dijk, 2000, 2006). Moreover, when the narrative is based on the speakers' personal experiences, they will identify as the voice of all people, regardless of political affiliation. Speakers' goals are brought to life through the emotional impact of concrete examples. It may be a minority, political, economic, or other issue. In conclusion, giving specific examples strengthens your speech's argument.
- 8. Number Game:** Facts are shown by numbers or statistics rather than opinions. (Dijk, Van; 2000, 2006). Speakers will not always support their arguments with facts and speak from their point of view. The data is reliable research conducted by specialists whose findings can be explained. Because they reflect fact and

objectivity, numbers and statistics are typically regarded with confidence. Every speaker, though, has information of their own to share. Therefore, a number or statistic can draw attention to a point and lend credibility to the speaker's argument.

- 9. Reasonableness:** The speaker usually employs this tactic when their argument is prone to being illogical. Reasonability, then, seeks to demonstrate speakers' effective self-presentation and impression management. (Van Dijk, 2000 as cited in Prayoga. 2021).

2.11. Relevance Theory

Sperber and Wilson introduced relevance theory (1986), the main goal of relevance theory, a framework for studying cognition, is to explain communication in a psychologically plausible way. Relevance theory is a fairly broad framework, or "research program," for the study of cognition. It was mainly developed to offer an empirically and psychologically credible communication account.

The attempt to identify the key components of most human communication, such as intentions, expressions, and communication techniques, is known as relevance theory. It takes communication mechanics into account and is cognition-centered. These include the following strategies: exemplification, explanation, restatement, and sequence (repetition).

Relevance theory has testable consequences, like other psychological theories: it can suggest experimental research and is open to confirmation, disconfirmation, or fine-tuning in light of experimental evidence, asserted Wilson and Sperber. Indirect investigation of claims is the goal of relevance theory. When paired with descriptions of specific cognitive mechanisms, perception, categorization, memory, or inference. For instance, the Cognitive

Principle of Relevance proposes testable predictions. (Wilson & Sperber, 2004, pp. 625–626).

2.12. Related Studies

Boyer (2019). In France during the twenty-first century, there has been a noticeable increase in support for the far-right. This study examined key theories, anxiety-inducing incidents, and reactionary legal actions in France regarding the oppression of Muslims to identify and explain the relationship between the growing influence of the far-right and the populist party in France and the widespread sentiments of Islamophobia.

It examines anti-Muslim rhetoric as a long-term consequence after analyzing the history of French colonization. The study then examines how far-right politicians use terrorism as a manufactured threat to advance their authoritarian agendas. The lack of willingness and incapacity of France to accept Muslim immigrants into French society is then examined, with a focus on the main threats perceived to be connected to Islam and Muslims.

SEVÜK and AYDIN (2020) conducted a study to demonstrate critical discourse analysis of populism as a type of qualitative political communication research between various populist discourse wings in Turkey. The leaders of the Republican People's Party (CHP) and the Justice and Development Party (AKP) served as the model; following the coup attempt on July 15, 2016, their parliamentary speeches were discussed and evaluated. The study concluded that the sample's political discourses had elements of populism.

Brown and Mondon (2020). Nowadays, populism defines politics; it is widely accepted and used in speeches, TV programs, newspapers, and political analysis. employing populism as a means of persuasion to convey a speech's intended meaning to large audiences. The authors contended that there are three main ways in which this phenomenon's widespread association with far-right politics and its application to other

phenomena have helped mainstream the far right: (1) agenda-setting power and deflection; (2) euphemistic and trivialization; and (3) amplification. This article used The Guardian newspaper as a case study to investigate the emergence of the populist hype and the harmful consequences of the logic it has promoted in public discourse using a mixed-methods approach to discourse analysis.

Donath (2021) examined the strategic use of self-presenting discourse on Twitter by former US President Donald Trump as a tool for power politics. Utilizing a combination of quantitative and qualitative discourse analysis to apply the socio-cognitive approach to critical discourse analysis. More than 18,000 Tweets that were posted between July 19, 2016, and January 8, 2021, made up the data. The results demonstrate how Trump has portrayed himself over these periods, suggesting a relationship between the use of populist rhetoric and power struggles. Additionally, the analysis revealed four populist categories, the adoption of which was shown to be both helpful and essential to make the populist discourse's strategic modification apparent.

Schreurs. (2020) Populist parties, "particularly those on the radical right," are frequently regarded as the quintessential expression of nostalgia politics. This study analyzes the electoral discourse of the Sweden Democrats, the Freedom Party of Austria, and the Dutch Party for Freedom between 2008 and 2018 to close that gap. Their dedication to welfare chauvinism is evident in their shared repertoire of "Welfare nostalgia," which takes the form of various forms of "reaction," "conservation," and "Modernization."

This section discussed a variety of topics concerning populism in detail, discourse analysis, and related studies to the research problem.

Methodology

This thesis is a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research in the discourse analysis field targeting Geert Wilders and Donald Trump's populist speeches.

3.1. Data sources

The researcher collected Trump's videos and transcriptions of the announcement of the candidacy speech, nomination acceptance speech, and inauguration speech from BBC and CNN channels, Time, C-SPAN, ABC News, and the POLITICO website.

- Trump's inauguration speech is retrieved from ABC News YouTube Channel: [Trump Inauguration Speech \(FULL\) | ABC News](https://youtu.be/sRBsJNdK1t0) <https://youtu.be/sRBsJNdK1t0>.
- The nomination speech is retrieved from the POLITICO website: <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974>
- The campaign announcement speech is retrieved from the C-SPAN YouTube channel: <https://youtu.be/apjNfkysjbM>

The researcher gathered random quotes from Wilders and his speech from the 2019 David Horowitz freedom Center in America from the PVV YouTube channel on December 12, 2019. Thus, the screenplay was obtained from the unofficial website, <https://www.yousubtitles.com/> on January 23, 2020, and the researcher transcribed the text to gain valid text of Wilder's.

3.2. Sample of The Study

Donald Trump, the famous businessman known for his catchphrase 'you are fired' in comic shows and TV shows, announced that he was a candidate for the Republican nomination in the 2016 presidential elections. He delivered the announcement of a candidacy speech at the Trump Tower in New York City on June 16, 2015; he attacked

Mexican, Arab, and Muslim immigrants. In addition, he promised American citizens he would provide a better and safer life, getting rid of the criminals disturbing the American dream. Moreover, he attacked the previous leader's policies for being sympathetic to non-American people.

In 2016, Trump declared himself “the voice of people” and stated that "in this race for the white house, I am the law and order and candidate." Trump accepted his party's presidential nomination on Tuesday and gave a long speech at the Republican convention in Ohio. The nomination acceptance speech showed his authoritarian and populist ideology. Trump promised that ' safety will be obtained once he becomes president.' He declared that he would fight terrorism in the USA, put a pan on illegal immigration to the states, and mocked the other candidate, Hillary Clinton, with chants like ‘lock her up.’

After winning the campaign, Trump became the new president of the United States and delivered the inauguration speech in his swearing-in ceremony on January 20th, 2017, at the Capitol in Washington DC, in front of a plentiful crowd with the presence of former President Barack Obama and other politicians.

Trump claimed that he would determine the course of America and the world for the following years. Trump implicitly harassed previous leaders and administration's policies, promised a better and stronger America, and revitalized the dead American dream.

Dutch politician Geert Wilders was born on September 6, 1963 (Vossen, 2017). He resided in the southern province of Limburg in the Catholic regency of Venlo. Catholics began criticizing Islam in the seventh century, and this criticism has persisted to this day. Given his racist remarks about Muslims and Islam Wilders is a Catholic who has a religious orientation. The press refers to Geert Wilders as "the Dutch Donald Trump."

Politically, in 1998, Wilders was elected to the national parliament of the Netherlands (BBC News, 2011). In the Netherlands, the Party of Freedom, or PVV, is led by him. It is well known that Wilders denigrates Muslims and Islam in his hate speech and racist remarks. Wilders opposes Islam; in 2008, he stated in an interview with Guardian News, "I have nothing against Muslims. I detest Islam. This suggests that he is politically oriented as well. "Wilders joined politics because he hates Islam; Wilders just wanted to get rid of it once and for all," according to Wilders's secretary. Given that Islamophobia is a populist trait, Wilders can be classified as a populist.

At David Horowitz's Freedom Center in the United States, Geert Wilder gave a speech on December 12, 2019, the speech (which had as its main topics Islam and freedom) was posted to the PVV YouTube channel. An organization that defends American values and ideals against radical Leftists and Islam is the David Horowitz Freedom Center. Put differently, it is an anti-Islamic group similar to Wilder. Wilder's populism is reflected in and represented by the speech. Trump and Wilders both adhere to the same "populism" philosophy. Additionally, the researcher will haphazardly gather statements from various publications and web pages.

3.3. Instrument of The Research

The researcher employs Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (2001) concerning the argumentation strategies. Making the connection between language and context clearer illustrates the value of CDA. According to Van Dijk (2001), critical discourse analysis is only relevant to the political environment that addresses issues of inequality, authority, and misuse of social power. Authority, comparison, counterfactuals, Evidentially, Fallacies, Generalization, Illustration, Number Game, and Reasonableness are some of the argumentation strategies that Van Dijk suggested. These techniques seek to

pinpoint the ideologies and methods used by speakers to construct or formulate speech arguments.

Additionally, Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory will be applied in the study (1986). It takes communication mechanics into account and is cognition-centered. These include the following strategies:

exemplification, explanation, restatement, and sequence (repetition). Additionally, the researcher will examine the facial expressions and body language of Trump and Wilders.

The researcher will use Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach concerning the argumentation strategies and Sperber & Wilson's relevance theory. Because both of them transact with communication strategies and techniques to elaborate and deliver the intended meaning, using different styles to foster the message, assist in getting more support, increase credibility, and enhance winning chances. The analytical approaches indicate that people use different strategies in speech production and communication to consider the diverse audience.

3.4. Data Analysis

This thesis is a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research in the discourse analysis field. It analyzes Wilders and Trump's argumentation strategies and communication relevance theory strategies to figure out their ideologies, how populism is reflected in their speeches, and why they used populism.

The research analyzes extracts from the various samples of the study. Then it analyzes each in detail firstly, in light of the argumentation strategies, ideology square, and finally through relevance theory. This technique is fruitful and concise in data analysis; it helps keep parts together. Importantly, the researcher is not analyzing the whole speech of the

sample, but taking quotations is better since not the entire speech serves the objectives of the study.

The researcher is exposing the populist characteristics of Trump and Wilders, their ideology, and how they manipulate language in what serves their populism. The analysis includes different dimensions such as the Islamophobic dimension, racism dimension, white man superiority dimension, illusion dimension, fear and brainwashing dimension, and religious dimension. In addition, the researcher interprets the role of media in populism expansion.

This section discussed and presented in detail the methodology of the thesis; the data sources, the sample of the study, and the instruments of the study, and provided a glimpse of the data analysis process in the following section.

Analysis and Discussion

This section will present the analysis findings, interpret the research questions, critically analysis the speeches, and provide a thorough analysis in different dimensions. The research will analyze each quotation in light of argumentation strategies and relevance theory communication strategies and then provide an in-depth analysis of each extract. The analysis of the speeches is conducted to answer the research questions, starting with extracts of Wilders's speech; the two main and two secondary questions will be answered in analyzing each quotation. Then, the research will analyze Trump's speeches:

nomination announcement speech, nomination acceptance speech, and inaugural speech, following the same analysis methodology. Later, the researcher will interpret the research question and the analysis in the summary of findings.

A. Wilders's Freedom and Islam Speech (2019)

"We also share our future because we share the same values. We believe in freedom, we believe in justice, we believe in Liberty."

Wilders indicates that America and the Dutchland share their beliefs, values, and freedom. He hopes that their similar red, white, and blue flag flies up high, covering the world with their massive wings and accomplishing their common goals.

Regarding the relevance theory, Wilders uses a restatement strategy that aims to formulate a statement differently yet have the same meaning; this strategy emphasizes the meaning and grabs listeners' attention, making Wilders more reasonable and credible. He used this strategy concerning reformulating his words to strike the American people's hearts and gather sympathy.

In terms of argumentation strategies, Wilders uses the generalization strategy by generalizing America and Dutchland positively. Moreover, he used a counterfactual strategy to persuade the audience and gather sympathy and empathy.

Wilders strongly emphasized the common values the US and Dutchland share, and their ultimate fight for freedom and justice. Here, it is visible that he is a populist and uses populism to achieve his unwavering ideology.

“Unfortunately most of the European leaders do not don’t protect our freedom. The freedom, that American soldiers fought for and sacrificed their life for. After Nazism, after communism was defeated, they fail to stop Islamism today.”

Wilders attacks the “elite” known as the other European leaders in Wilders's case for their sympathetic policies with Muslims by allowing the immigrants to settle in and enter America. He also criticizes them for creating economic and political relationships with Islamic countries which he refuses disagree with.

Wilders’s populism strikes again, but more evidently; his populist self could not hide any longer. He starts by criticizing the European leaders who are against their policies and political strategies. He uses several argumentation strategies; he uses authority, basically using his political position and authority to convey people and strengthen his words.

Moreover, he uses Counterfactuals to express his deep compassion and sympathy for the late American soldiers who lost their lives fighting for freedom, and now their sacrifice is gone by the wind because of some European leader's policies.

Furthermore, Wilders provided evidence about some extreme movements that were demolished, but the most critical evidence is Islam. Illustration seeks to highlight the arguments made by speakers by crafting a brief narrative that yields tenable

generalizations (van Dijk, 2000, 2006). That is often used to make illustrations more objective, reasonable, and credible.

Regarding the relevance theory, Wilders uses different communication strategies; for example, he uses exemplification, giving examples to strengthen his speech. Exemplification is also similar to evidentially; providing examples is a successful strategy that makes the speaker reasonable.

“They fail to subscribe to the view to the truth that Islam and freedom are incompatible. As we can see in any country in the world, Islam is already dominant today. Everywhere Islam hoots, freedom dies. Stop the beating Islam.”

In his remarks, Wilders disparages Islam and Muslims. According to him, there is a severe threat posed by the spread of Islam and the rise in Muslim immigration to Europe, and this threat needs to be eliminated. Furthermore, he paints a negative picture of European leaders because they permit Muslim immigration, let them reside in their nations, and do not erect obstacles or limitations on immigration.

With his views on Islam and Muslims, Wilder desires to persuade other influential figures that these groups are dangerous, out to conquer the West, and destructive to the nations in which they reside. In this statement, Wilders employs the generalization technique, assuming that all Muslims are terrorists and that they are all violent, dangerous people.

For Wilders, there is a slight distinction between Muslims inside and outside the Dutchland. According to Wilder, no Muslim should be permitted to reside in or even travel to any Western nation, including the US or any European nation. Both his and Trump's ideologies despise Muslims and work to incite

animosity toward Islam and Muslims. In contrast, Wilders is more hostile and violent toward the Dutch Muslim minority.

The essence of Wilders' reasoning is to portray Islam and Muslims in general as a threat to the US and the Netherlands. He asserts that Muslims are influential individuals who are capable of conquering any nation they call home and that Islam is a powerful religion. That is the primary cause of his racism. According to Wilders, freedom perishes whenever Islam endures; therefore, to regain their presumed freedom, they must eradicate both Islam and Muslims. Wilder's reasoning is imprecise and unclear. lack data and proof to support its veracity and credibility. Wilders employed the following techniques concerning the relevance theory:

exemplification, sequence (repetition), and explanation.

Respectively, Wilders accuses the European leaders of being failures and unable to defeat Islam. He believes they are soft-hearted with Islam and Muslims; he strongly emphasizes the importance of demolishing Islam and creating an Islam-free world.

Populism creates an enemy to fight and attract people's attention, hide their mistakes, and avoid being criticized by them. That is the cruciality of evidently targeting Islam and Muslims in every international or national forum or congregation.

Islamophobia is a core feature of populism, and Wilders is famous for his Islamophobic statements, speeches, and activities. He is always targeting Islam whenever he has a chance; he is using the fear dimension by spreading fear amongst people not just in America but around the globe.

“Neutrality in the face of evil is evil but appeasement is downright suicide. And here in America, your president, Donald J Trump, proves to be a very wise and a very brave man.... He fought the Islamic State and rightfully ordered their leaders to be killed. He built a wall at your southern border and introduced travel bans from Islamic countries such as Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen.”

Wilders expresses his shared ideology with Trump, fighting Islam everywhere. That is the biggest concern of populists, especially Wilders. He is eager to eliminate Muslims and Islam.

Populism attacks immigrants evidently; Wilders believes that European leaders must follow in Trump’s footsteps in fighting Islam and Muslims, ban immigration, and commit assassinations against Islamic leaders.

Wilders emphasizes his group’s (the supporters of his ideology like Trump and Israel) good things by providing several shreds of evidence. Wilders uses the word “evil” to refer to Islam and terrorism that is attached to it. Wilders provides a set of examples to support Trump, like assassinating the ISIS leader. Trump, since the very beginning, promised to stop immigration, and he managed to do so; he built a wall on the border with Mexico to stop illegal immigrants from stealing American land and established a ban on several Islamic countries from immigration.

Mentioning those political examples indicates that Wilders has a similar political ideology that refuses the existence of Islam in the Dutchland. Mentioning those policies implies that Islam is a dangerous ideology and its terrorism must be

destroyed. Wilders's argumentation strategies provide a trustworthy shred of evidence to support his argumentation and aim to make credibility and objectivity.

Wilders uses different argumentation strategies like authority. People believe every word comes out of politicians, and evidentially, providing examples and shreds of evidence strengthens the speaker's view and argumentation. Moreover, he uses Reasonableness to show the speaker positively. He aims to represent people and represent the other parties, Muslims, Islam, immigrants, and European leaders negatively.

Wilders also uses communication strategies to illustrate his point of view regarding relevance theory; he uses exemplification by mentioning different examples about the areas in which Trump fought against Islam. Wilders believes and urges European leaders to stop their policies against Muslims and immigrants.

Wilders praises Trump's actions and statements and urges everyone to do like him; targeting Muslims and Islam, banning immigrants, and restricting international relations is the right thing to do, according to Wilders.

Wilders addresses the elite Islam and non-citizens negatively. All these categories must be fought and changed for a better world: corruption, Islam, and immigration. Wilders supports Trump's actions (moving the embassy to Jerusalem), a part of the occupied territories and the center of conflict between Palestinians and Israelis.

Wilders's argumentation is derived from reality, and providing such evidence made him more credible and reasonable to the audience. Wilders's argumentation encourages Trump in supporting the Israeli policy; he is on the Israeli side clearly and was not neutral at all in the hot conflict.

“He is focusing on the real important issues like security, economy, and terrorism. And believe me, for somebody who is coming from Europe this is all historic it is legendary to have a president like that. I wish we had such brave leaders in Europe. People who put our people and nation first as President Trump put America first.....I say to my colleagues in your house for all your president Donald Trump has done for your country. He does.... He deserves the Nobel Peace Prize.”

Wilders's argumentation uses the comparison strategy between Trump, “the brave leader,” and the weak European leaders who must change their policy and ideology and put their people and country first as Donald Trump does. Doing so represents that Wilders and Trump are for the people and other leaders are corrupt and must change or leave politics to those like Wilders and Trump to achieve what must be achieved.

Wilders uses plenty of argumentation strategies to convey his ideology to the audience, such as an illustration that seeks to highlight the arguments made by speakers by crafting a brief narrative that yields tenable generalizations. Wilders illustrates his story about Trump’s achievements and European leaders. Wilders tries to decrease political opponents' reputations and create prejudice between minorities like Muslims and immigrants, as seen in the following quotations. This is the most straightforward and commonly used strategy to represent someone or something negatively.

Moreover, a fallacy strategy is used when a speaker’s argument is false or illogical, and the counterfactuals strategy expresses empathy and aims to persuade the audience of what is to be said. Regarding relevance theory, Wilders uses strategies like repetition, reformulation, and exemplification in his speech, making him more trustworthy.

“I also admire President Trump's unwavering support for the State of Israel. He made America first men and women are fighting for our freedom, our civilization, for our values, and they deserve our utmost respect. So, I believe we all must stand strong with Israel. We have to stand strong with Israel”

Once again, Wilders expresses his sympathy and compassion for other oppressed leaders and countries like America and Israel. Wilders uses different argumentation strategies as authority; his claims are trustworthy due to his position, evidently providing evidence, and the speaker's argumentation is reliable.

It emphasizes speakers' opinions to be trusted. The illustration gives extra support to the provided evidence regarding the argument. Reasonableness positively shows the speaker and his argument and gives him a good impression.

Regarding the relevance theory, Wilders uses repetition a lot in his speech, the reformulation strategy represents the wide range of language and the ability to manipulate it as he pleases, and exemplification represents support to provided assumptions.

“We stand strong with Israel when they triumph, and we stand strong with Israel in the hours of need. When dark Islamic forces rain rockets upon its citizens of Israel, we stand strong with Israel. And just this week, we saw again rockets of hatred pouring down on innocent Israeli citizens.”

In his appeal for support, Wilders refers to the Palestinian revolutionary forces and the Arab nations that back Palestine as "Dark Islamic forces" and calls on others to side with Israel against them. According to him, Israel is the innocent party in the conflict, and the Palestinians are the bad guys. He is looking for political backing to oppose Islam and Muslims.

Wilders repeated "We stand strong with Israel" more than twice which implies that he is attempting to persuade the audience to back Israel. Here, Wilders appeals to authority to convince people to believe what he is saying.

In this statement, he employed repetition to confirm his arguments, show empathy and support for Israel, solidify his stance, win over the Israelis, and influence others to side with Israel. More significantly, though, it paints Muslims and Palestinians in a negative light.

"Dark Islamic forces" is the metaphor that Wilders used. Darkness has a negative connotation; it is associated with evil, perilous, and damaging individuals who adhere to the allegedly dangerous Islamic ideology. Furthermore, he used the word "rain" to imply that Islamic forces' actions are legitimate and that they are firing an excessive number of rockets at what he described as "Israeli innocent people" to destroy and kill them.

By presenting proof that Islamic forces fired numerous rockets at defenseless Israel, Wilders hopes to demonize Muslims and foment hatred toward Islam and Muslims. By speaking poorly of Muslims and Islam and placing all the blame on them, he persuades people to support Israel, which is how his ideology is represented. Thus, the primary cause of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, as well as the dominant power and violent force, is opposition to Muslims.

In this statement, Wilders employed the exemplification technique to establish the validity and dependability of his claim. He addressed the idea that Muslims are dangerous, evil people who want to rule the world by using the metaphor of "rockets of hatred."

Wilders utilized restatement, repetition, reformulation, and explanation techniques about the relevance theory. This declaration demonstrates unequivocally the hatred of Muslims that all three parties hold in common. Islam and non-residents.

“And just this week we saw again rockets of hatred pouring down on innocent Israeli citizens. But remember my friends ‘Am Yisrael Chai’, the Jewish nation leaves, the Jewish nation leaves, is resilient and will defeat its fish's enemies. When the evil empire of Iran threatens to wipe Israel off the map. We stand strong with Israel and we stand strong with Israel in their quest for peace and justice. In the fight against the anti-semitic BDS movements.”

Wilders’s argumentation uses repetition thoroughly; he tends to repeat some phrases or expressions to make the audience focus more on his words and believe his ideology. Wilders talks about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and continuously asks the audience to support Israel in their fight for “freedom” against Islam and terrorist Muslims in Palestine and Iran.

Wilders here uses the generalization strategy and generalizes that all Muslims are terrorists and seek to restrict European, American, and Israeli freedom and take over their holy lands. Wilders uses this again and specifically mentions Iran as a threat to Israel and America because Iran provides financial and military support to the revolution in Palestine and especially Gaza.

However, Wilders did not mention any Israeli attack against Palestinians; this makes him controversial, but he provides such evidence regarding Iran and the oppressed Israel. Wilders blamed and formed Palestinians and Iran negatively; this move simply emphasizes Wilders group's good things and de-emphasizes

their group's bad things, and on the contrary, he emphasizes their (the other parties like Islam, Muslims, and Palestinians) bad things and de-emphasizes their good things.

Wilders's argumentation puts the blame on the Palestinians, hides the Israeli actions, and forms it as the victim in this hot conflict. Wilder describes individuals or groups "the BDS and "Iran" who harm Israel negatively, and those who harm Israel directly harm America and its pros.

Wilders provides evidence to convince the audience that Israel is a victim of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. BDS is represented negatively as the perpetrator in this conflict, and Israel must be supported and protected by America.

Wilders used different strategies like authority, generalization, illustration, fallacies, reasonableness, counterfactuals, and evidentially to strongly emphasize his argumentation and gain support for Israel and blame and fight Palestinians. Moreover, he uses exemplification and repetition a lot. "We stand strong with Israel" is again repeated here to emphasize his point. The explicit targeting of Muslims and Islam is evident here; Wilders and his group mainly fight non-citizens.

"But my friends, those are not occupied territories. These are liberated territories. I lived and worked in Judea for almost a year. It's the heartland of the Jewish States. And today today, we see the Jews leaving Europe. Unfortunately, Jews are leaving Europe today because of the Islamic and the left anti-semitism."

Wilders's argumentation compassions with the oppressed Jews who were forced to leave Europe because of the Islamic expansion. Wilders argues that

Israel does not occupy Palestine, but on the contrary, Israel liberated it from those uncultured terrorist groups and individuals. Wilders's argument claims that Israelis took back what belonged to them in the first place. He strongly assumes that Palestine is "*the heartland of the Jewish States*" and doesn't have anything to do with Islam.

Wilders blames Islam and Muslims for the conflict in the world, he created an enemy to blame. He continuously attacks the minority people, individuals, and religions. Wilders made Muslims the scapegoat to blame and sacrifice when politicians needed to hide the mistakes, they made either internally or externally.

Wilders uses several argumentation strategies such as illustration which provides a story to foster the evidence he provided (*I lived and worked in Judea for almost a year. It is the heartland of the Jewish States*) when the story is a self-experience of populists, they place themselves as a representation of the audience. In addition, counterfactuals express his empathy with Jews and Israel. Regarding relevance theory, Wilders tends to use repetition (repeating his assumptions and words) to emphasize his ideology.

Wilders accuses Muslims, Islam, and left-wing (*anti-semitism*) to be the cause for the Jews' departure. Because he offers no solid proof to support his assertion, it is not rational or reasonable. Prejudice and misconceptions about Islam are expressed by Wilders. Surprisingly, people who oppose Israel will be maligned and assigned blame. Once more, the goal of Wilders's arguments is to portray Islam in a negative light to influence and persuade the audience of his ideology.

“My friends, in Europe most government leaders exactly do the opposite as President Trump. They open the borders to more and more immigrants, most of them from Islamic countries with Islamic values. We are now in the process of being colonized by Islamic colonists”

Wilders's argumentation made a comparison between European leaders and Trump. He claims that they are the opposite of Trump, who bravely fights Islam, Muslims, and immigration in his country and internationally. They open their arms and welcome immigration, especially Muslims, which is entirely against Wilders and Trump's ideology and view of a better world. Wilders attacks and criticizes the “elite” for those policies and urges them to be like President Trump.

Wilders's argumentation uses evidentially to provide false pieces of evidence to frighten and spread fear in people's hearts that unless they change and stop their policies against Muslims, Islam, and immigrants, the country will fail.

Wilders describes the “European leaders” negatively for opening the borders and not closing them in front of immigration. This comparison mainly aimed to represent Islam and groups supporting Muslims negatively. Wilders's argumentation represents Islam as a colonizing group that threatens European land and values.

It frames Islam as a dangerous ideology and wants to spread hatred towards Islam and Muslims. Wilders's hate for Muslims and Islam is the main reason he joined politics, according to his secretary.

“And the truth is once again that the Western civilization, our civilization, based on Humanity on Judaism and Christianity, is the best civilization on earth. It is far superior to the Islamic civilization.”

In contrast to Islam, according to Wilders, Judaism and Christianity are better religions, and Muslims are inferior to those who practice these faiths. Furthermore, he denies that Islam is a religion at all, asserting instead that it is a terrorist organization, a dangerous ideology, and an ideology that seeks to take over the world.

As a result, he uses the pronoun "our" to refer to both Judaism and Christianity favorably and to demonstrate his affiliation to the higher faiths. He saw Islam as inferior and negatively portrayed Muslims, all to reinforce his ideology by demonstrating the positive aspects of Islam to his group.

According to Wilders, the religions of humanity, equality, freedom, and compassion are Judaism and Christianity. Islam, on the other hand, is the religion of inequality, terrorism, and violence.

Concerning the relevance theory, Wilders used several strategies like exemplification (providing examples strengthens the speech), sequence (repetition; repeating certain words or phrases), restatement (reformulating his words in a different way to emphasize their importance and match the different levels of the audience), and explanation strategy (providing explanations or illustrations makes him more reasonable.)

Wilders emphasizes his group's good things and de-emphasizes their bad things by mentioning positive points about them and neglecting the negative ones.

Wilders represents Islam as a dangerous and unwanted religion that must be torn apart.

“It even became worse in Europe when not only the left but also many of the so-called conservatives or conservative liberals, as the German Chancellor Merkel of our own Prime Minister Rutte from the Netherlands, are acting like the left today. They are the ones opening our borders to mass immigration. They are the ones inviting the Islamization of societies, of inviting the culture of hate and submission, of giving away our national security, our freedom of speech, our national sovereignty our cultural identity”.

Wilders’s argumentation creates enemies and internal and external problems. Wilders blames some European leaders for the increasing numbers of Muslims in Europe and not stopping them or fighting them. Wilders uses evidentially by clearly stating the names of those inaction leaders (such as the German Chancellor Merkel or our own Prime Minister Rutte from the Netherlands) because they opened the borders for immigration; this indicates that he has no fear in targeting and criticizing leaders who oppose his populist ideology.

This quotation exemplifies that those leaders are part of the elite; (Wilders's opposition, the out-group, and conservative liberals.) Wilders uses evident and illustrated strategies by mentioning the other leader's policies that he refuses.

Herein, his argumentation involves targeting Islam and representing it as a negative culture that is characterized and recognized as a culture of hate, submission, and dominance. Wilders blames political opponents (leaders who

allow Muslim immigration) or part of the out-group (those who do not support his ideology) because they provide asylum for Muslims or other immigrants, which Wilders refuses.

Wilders rejects Muslims and Islam in Dutchland or any other country. That is why he targets them and any supporters of them. Rejecting Muslim immigration is part of Wilders's political ideology that he wants to convey to people globally.

“Unfortunately, most of our European leaders are weak, chicken-hearted, and afraid. The followers of Islam however are well organized, well-funded, and highly motivated by the dangerous ideology”

Wilders’s argumentation again attacks and criticizes the European leader’s policies and describes them as weak and afraid of Islam and being unable to fight back and stop this dangerous ideology from taking over their countries.

Nevertheless, Wilders deliberately promoted racism, hatred, and stereotype through his words. According to Wilders, Islam is an organization with a violent ideology that seeks to conquer the world, not a religion. He portrays Islam unfavorably and calls it an ideology on multiple occasions.

Wilder's approach rejects the existence of Islam and Muslims in Western nations. As such, he constantly portrays Islam in a negative light and works to persuade European politicians to halt immigration and embrace his philosophy.

The audience was strongly affected by the use of derogatory language in the argument. Wilders claimed that Muslims are terrorists who want to conquer European nations, using the generalization technique. With his argument, Wilders hopes to win over lawmakers to halt Muslim immigration and Islamization.

Wilders's argumentation seems to be personal orientation because there is no clear evidence to support his claims; he just generalizes that Islam and Muslims are dangerous. Wilders uses different communication strategies such as authority, generalization, fallacies, counterfactuals, and reasonableness.

“Unfortunately, if you resist, you will pay a very high price, as I experienced myself as Dr. Bob said I got many fatwas. I'm on the death list of many Islamic terror organizations and I have lived under 24/7 police protection and security and in government safe houses with my wife for more than 15 years now”

Wilders presents a personal experience to get sympathy in representing how oppressed he is and targeted by those uncultured terrorists who are attacking him for saying his opinion. He uses evidentially and illustration to convince the audience with his story; he also uses number games; politicians utilize statistics to have solid and credible arguments (Van Dijk, 2000, 2006).

Using such statistics enhances Wilders's word's credibility; by mentioning how many years he was on the death list and living in the safe house, he manages to gain sympathy and represent Islam and Muslims negatively. By mentioning these data, he emphasizes his argument and represents Islam as a dangerous religion. He considers it a dangerous ideology.

“Twelve years ago, I made a short documentary called ‘Fitna’. About the dark sides of the Quran and Islam. And the Dutch government even at that time tried to stop me from making this movie, for distributing this movie. And they tried to get me convicted for the crime of exposing the truth.”

Wilders again uses evidentially to strengthen his argumentation, and he mentions another concrete example from his personal experience to support his

argument. His controversial film “Fitna” showed the truth Wilders wanted to show other people and convince them with his ideology.

Wilders criticizes the Dutch government for trying to stop producing and releasing that film; he believes that he has the right to use all the means to expose the truth about Islam and how dangerous Muslims are.

Criticizing the current administration is a prominent feature of populism, which Wilders does whenever he can. Wilders uses evidentiality, generalization, and reasonableness. Regarding relevance theory, Wilders uses exemplification by providing examples to strengthen his argumentation.

“... asking a crowd about Moroccans in the Netherlands, the group with one of the highest crime rates. 80 percent, 80 percent of all Dutch Muslims who went to fight in Syria and Iraq for the Islamic State were Moroccans”.

Wilders’s Islamophobic ideology appears by claiming that Moroccans are dangerous and the cause of increasing crimes in the Dutchland. Using evidentially in his argument and number games made his speech more credible. In addition, he used reasonableness, counterfactuals, fallacies, and generalization in his argument.

Providing specific numbers is a good strategy yet illogical; there is no clear evidence to prove his argument, and he mentioned Muslims only but never came across foreigners joining “the Islamic state.” Doing so makes him look controversial. He emphasizes his group's good things, de-emphasizes their bad things (the in-group's bad things) and does the opposite with Muslims and Islam.

He generalizes Moroccan Muslims have the highest crime rates with precisely 80% of crime rates in the Dutchland. This tactic has a strong effect on

the audience, confirming the speaker's accuracy and escalating their animosity and fear of Muslims. Wilder wants to create stereotypes about Moroccans.

So, Moroccan immigrants are perceived as harmful people, and immigrants from Morocco ought not to be permitted to reside. Wilders uses the exemplification relevance theory strategy to foster his claims and to be more credible, reasonable, and trustworthy.

“Unfortunately, in Europe, most men do nothing. They allow our women to be harassed and raped. They allow young Muslim girls to be genitally mutilated. Only in my own country, in Holland, more than 40,000 women have been genitally mutilated, more than 40,000. They allow Pakistani grooming gangs to rape young British girls.”

Wilders skillfully targets the audience's compassion and sympathy using evidently and heartbreaking stories. He criticizes European men for not fighting back against uncivilized Muslims and not protecting their women or land.

Wilders uses number games strategy again by mentioning a concrete statistical number, “40,000,”; he seems more credible and reasonable from the audience's point of view. In addition, Wilders uses repetition; he tends to repeat specific phrases or words and numbers to emphasize the importance of his speech. Regarding relevance theory, Wilders uses restatement, exemplification, and repetition, respectively.

“So, the European elites are also allowing terrorists to kill innocent people, shouting Allahu Akbar. They allow Islamic schools where children like in my own country, Holland are being taught that Christians should be lashed stoned, and beheaded by the sword. They allow Jews wearing a kippah to be beaten up

in our streets. They allow no-go zones where Sharia law is the law of the land or at least a lot of the streets”.

Wilders tends to blame European leaders for allowing terrorists to kill innocent people, Islamic schools, and violating Jews. Wilders’s argumentation strategy tends to describe the out-group (Muslims and European leaders) negatively because they do not follow Wilders’s ideology. On the contrary, Wilders represents the in-group positively (his pros, Jeetc. Etc.). From the above analysis, Trump belongs to Wilder's in-group.

Wilders uses different communication strategies, for example, illustration, evidentially, and generalization. Regarding relevance theory, he tends to use strategies like exemplification and restatement.

“That our values like freedom, the equality between men and women do not exist anymore. That violence rape and intolerant became more dominant and Western values are replaced by values resembling Sharia law”.

Wilders’s argumentation assumes that the existence of their freedom and equality is mortgaged with the end of Islam and Muslims. Wilders highlights the fallout from allowing Muslim immigrants into Europe. He aims to illustrate and demonstrate the adverse effects that Muslim immigrants have had on Western nations, such as America. Wilders generalizes Muslims negatively to spread hate, prejudice, and fear of them. Consequently, the number of Muslim immigrant numbers will decrease, and they will retain their freedom and values.

Wilders uses reasonableness, counterfactuals, fallacies, and generalization to support his argumentation. Moreover, regarding relevance theory

communication strategies, he uses exemplification, restatement, repetition, and reformulation.

“And if we don't fight back, we will lose everything. Indeed, we are facing the first and most major existential threat and the first time since the Second World War. The ancient heritage of our forefathers is under attack. And we have to stand up and defend it... And this is what Abraham Lincoln said in the year 1862: The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy presence. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion”.

Wilders alerts people to the fact that Islam is encroaching on and subjugating Western nations, ideals, ideologies, and civilization. He makes an effort to convince the audience that they must fight Islam if they do not want to lose their freedom, spouse, and country. Wilders represents and considers Islam an “existential threat” to Western societies. Therefore, he aims to represent Islam and Muslims negatively.

Wilders mentioned Abraham Lincoln in (1862) and quoted him to strengthen his argumentation; this move was tricky and successful, using such a figure in his speech on the land Lincoln created and formed. He urges the audience to reject immigrants, whether they are Muslim or not. Western nations and the civilization their ancestors gave their lives to defend are seen as being threatened by Islam.

Wilders’s argumentation seems more of a personal point of view; he is always exaggerating and targeting Islam and Muslims as if he fears them and their expansion around the world, so he employs populism to fight them back and

destroy their existence. Wilders uses evidentially, illustration, and generalization strategies. Moreover, he uses exemplification and reformulation.

“And the truth is once again that the Western civilization, our civilization, based on Humanity on Judaism and Christianity, is the best civilization on earth. It is far superior to the Islamic civilization.”

Judaism and Christianity, according to Wilders, are superior religions to Islam. He also believes that Muslims are inferior to adherents of these religions. Furthermore, he denies Islam even exists as a religion, saying instead that it is an organization that seeks to take over the world, a dangerous ideology, and the source of terrorism.

Thus, he uses the term "our" to refer to Judaism and Christianity favorably and demonstrate his membership in the more prestigious religions. He saw Islam as inferior and painted Muslims in a negative light, all to reinforce his ideology by showing his group positive things.

According to Wilders, the religions of humanity, equality, freedom, and compassion are Judaism and Christianity. Islam, on the other hand, is the religion of inequality, terrorism, and violence. Regarding the relevance theory, Wilders employed several strategies, including restatement, exemplification, sequence (repetition), and explanation strategy. White man superiority is evident in this quotation; according to Wilders, Islam is subordinate to Christianity and Judaism.

“Very many Dutch citizens, Madam Speaker, experience the presence of Islam around them. And I can report that they have had enough of burkas, headscarves, the ritual slaughter of animals, so-called honor revenge, blaring minarets, female circumcision, hymen restoration operations, abuse of

homosexuals, Turkish and Arabic on the buses and trains as well as on town hall leaflets, halal meat at grocery shops and department stores”

Wilders presents a false impression and ignorance about Islam and Muslims. It also symbolizes the inaccurate and deceptive perception of Islam held by Western society. To strengthen his case and accentuate his assertion, Wilders employed evidentially techniques and explanations.

As stated by Wilders, women's freedoms are curtailed by Islam, and they are not allowed to wear or go where they please. They are forced to wear headscarves, and if they defy their families' wishes, they will be killed. He believes that all Muslims pose a threat to Dutch citizens and that Muslims who wander freely throughout Holland annoy and harm Dutch citizens.

To bolster the claim and give his argument greater credibility, Wilders clarified and provided evidence. All of these instances are untrue, deceptive, and unrelated to Islam.

According to Wilder's reasoning, Islam is a highly violent, unjust, and dangerous religion. However, Wilders distinguishes religious freedom and the so-called "democracy" of Western nations. Why doesn't that apply to Muslims, who are a minority? Even so, how fair is that?

It is forbidden for Muslims to practice Islam! They receive different treatment from others and face assaults, abuse, and humiliation. Headscarves are punishable by taxes for women, and certain institutions prohibit Muslims from entering if they display the sign "no Muslims, no dogs."

Inconsistently, Wilders respects people of all races and locations and calls for religious freedom (as long as they refrain from adhering to Islam or Islam). To

highlight his points, Wilders employed various techniques, including exemplification, explanation, and illustration.

“First, stop pretending that Islam is a religion. Islam is not a religion. Islam is a totalitarian ideology based on conquest, submission, and violence. We should not grant them their freedom to rob us of our freedom. So no more Islamic schools, no more mosques for they represent an ideology of hate, of violence, of submission. Third, we should stop the immigration full stop the immigration from Islamic nations. We should immediately deport all immigrants who commit crimes and act according to Sharia law”.

Wilders shares some steps or plans to fight and get rid of Islam and Muslims in Western countries. He first addresses and urges leaders to consider Islam as a dangerous ideology, not a religion. He believes that European leaders should restrict Muslim freedom in Western countries, stop immigration, and ban them.

Then, he illustrates his argumentation by mentioning other steps, such as closing Islamic schools and mosques and prohibiting hijab and burqa in the West. Wilders wants leaders to ban immigration and deport all immigrants from all nationalities because they harm Western civilization and its people.

Wilders's political agenda is to generalize negative portrayals of Islam. Furthermore, according to Wilders, it persuades the audience that Islam is a dangerous totalitarian ideology. In his arguments, Wilders exhorts the audience to reject Islam and its existence in the US and other Western nations.

“The biggest problem in this country is Islamization.”

This famous quotation of Wilders expresses his unwavering hate towards Muslims and Islam; he claims that Islam is the biggest concern in the Dutchland, not corruption, not crimes, not economic issues but Islam.

Through his arguments, Wilder presents Islam in a negative light. The main worry of Wilder is "Islamization," or the conversion of Dutch people to Islam. Islamization, according to him, poses an "existential threat" to "our identity, our freedom., who we are. Everything.” According to Wilder's logic, the Netherlands will never prosper as long as Islam persists.

According to Wilders, the presence of Islam and Muslims alters the identity and poses a threat to the freedom of Dutch citizens. Wilders urged Dutch citizens and European leaders to stop Islamization by using the restatement strategy to express his strong negative feelings toward Muslims and Islam.

Wilders is impolite and conveys his ideology aggressively and directly. Furthermore, he does not care about color; Muslims will always encounter bigotry and hatred, and to Wilders, Muslims in Holland are worse than Muslims outside of it.

B. Trump’s Announcement Speech (2015)

On June 16, 2015, Trump gave an announcement speech from Trump's tower in New York City, marking the start of his campaign. Before harassing other candidates, he greets and thanks the guests for coming to his party.

“Our country is in serious trouble. We don’t have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don’t have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let’s say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time.”

Trump's argumentation criticizes the administration (Obama's government) for not having victories anymore. He also targets China immediately and uses it as an example to strengthen his claims.

Trump's argumentation uses generalization, evidentially, and counterfactual strategies. His argumentation seems illogical and irresponsible; there is now sufficient evidence that his claims are valid. Trump uses exemplification to support and defend his argumentation about American victories; he mentioned several countries the US is in political conflict with (China, Japan, Mexico, etc.) to enhance his reasonableness.

“The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else’s problems... It’s true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people... But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we’re getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They’re sending us, not the right people.”

Trump's argumentation uses evidentially, generalization, illustration, and authority to foster his argument. Mentioning examples or shreds of evidence indeed makes him look credible to the audience. Trump boldly targets and criticizes Mexico and accuses its people or the Mexican immigrants of being the source of drug expansion in the US; he goes on and claims that they are rapists.

Trump often uses repetition in his speeches; he tends to repeat certain expressions, phrases, or words to emphasize their importance and make sure his words convince the audience.

“Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They’ve become rich. I’m in competition with them. They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don’t have to pay interest; because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should’ve taken.”

Here, Trump’s argument attacks Islam and generalizes that all Muslims are terrorists. Then he assumes that the wealth Muslims hold should not be theirs, and he believes the oil and wealth belong to the US only, even if it was actually in the Middle Eastern lands.

Moreover, Trump is an Islamophobe; his speeches spread hate, prejudice, racism, and stereotypes. He believes that Muslims are inferior to white men and that Islam is inferior to American culture and Christianity. He continuously tries to plant fear and hate in American citizen's hearts towards Muslims as a threat to their existence.

Regarding relevance theory, Trump uses repetition, exemplification, and restatement, ensuring his argumentation is believed, credible, and emphasized.

“We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers, who I love — they’re great — all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.”

Trump's argumentation uses the number game strategy; utilizing numbers in political speech enhances the speaker's credibility and makes him trustworthy. Using authority is common since people tend to believe what politicians say or claim without regard for correctness. In addition, he uses illustration; he provides a story about the American-Iraqi war in 2003 when thousands of souls were killed for nothing.

“Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, a horrible labor participation rate. And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it. That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because there are no jobs. After all, China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs. But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense.”

Trump's argumentation uses number games again since using statistical numbers makes the speaker more reliable. Doing so makes the readers shocked and absorbed in the speaker's words from head to toe. Using evidentially and illustration in a raw makes his argument more reasonable and acceptable. He criticizes the former administration for employing non-Americans instead of their citizens.

Trump tends to represent himself positively as the speaking voice of people; he is doing everything he can for people and only for them. On the other hand, he represents the out-group (the administration at that time, China, Mexico.

Immigrants, etc.) negatively. He tries to impact them negatively using statistics, examples, and illustrations.

“Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn’t work. It came out recently that they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don’t know if it worked. And I thought it was horrible when it was broadcast on television, because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, “That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue. They don’t know what they’re doing. They don’t know what they’re doing.”

Trump’s argumentation uses comparison; he compares the increasing power of “their enemies” and the weak US; he uses evidentially by mentioning evidence for their decreasing power: “the nuclear arsenal does not work” and mentioning the equipment that his enemies hold recently.

Moreover, he uses the number game “30 years” to provide evidence that tracks back to the old glory days of America when they were strong and reminds them that they could control everything and dispossess their enemies of the power, wealth, and position they hold nowadays.

Trump uses repetition, exemplification, and reformulation in his speech to increase his reliability and credibility. Using these techniques alongside simple language increased Trump’s popularity and chances of winning the 2016 elections. Moreover, that is what populists do; they use their position, authority, and communication strategies to convince the audience of their ideology, win hearts and votes, and achieve their goals.

“We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare. Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof..... A \$5 billion website. I have so many websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they do a website. It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website.”

Trump’s argumentation criticizes the Obama administration and “Obamacare” for being useless and not being trustworthy. He negatively represents Obama, indicating that he is not part of Trump’s in-group. Trump’s argumentation uses number games, illustration, and generalization to represent Obama negatively and support his argument with statistical numbers, enhancing his credibility and honesty in people's eyes.

Trump uses exemplification in his argumentation; providing concrete numbers always plays in the speaker’s favor; it makes his speech more reasonable for the audience.

“Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing’s gonna get done. They will not bring us “believe me” to the promised land. They will not...And that’s what’s happening. And it’s going to get worse, because remember, Obamacare kicks in in ’16, 2016. Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might be on one of my courses. I would invite him.... If he’d like to play, that’s fine.”

Trump criticizes his party politicians for not acting for the country’s sake; they are only words, no actions at all. Trump’s argumentation uses counterfactuals

to involve people in the difficult situations they might face due to internal or external factors and feel empathy.

Politicians tend to make their opinions more acceptable by providing evidence or proof obtained from paper, reliable spokespersons, and witnesses themselves (Van Dijk, 2000, 2006). Trump negatively represents his parties and makes his words trustworthy.

Trump's argumentation uses evidentially, illustration, and fallacies that occur when politicians provide illogic arguments; this indicates that their arguments may be false. Moreover, Trump de-emphasizes the out-groups (Obama) good things;

Trump's argumentation never addresses the previous authorities, especially Obama, and talks about their achievements; he tends to hide and neglect their existence and fosters and emphasizes their mistakes and negatives. In addition, emphasizing its bad things, he targets Obama by criticizing him and assuming that he only plays golf and never acts or makes decisions for the country's sake.

“Now they’re going militarily. They’re building a military island in the middle of the South China Sea. A military island. Now, our country could never do that because we’d have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalists wouldn’t let our country— we would never build in an ocean. They built it in about one year, this massive military port. They’re building up their military to a point that is very scary.”

Trump's argumentation aims to warn the audience that the rising power of the enemy's power (China) is building its military power in all aspects. He is

exaggerating to create an enemy to blame and cover their mistakes. Fear is a crucial dimension in Populist ideology that enables politicians to achieve their goals. Using expressions that indicate exaggeration makes the speech more frightening for the audience.

Trump's argumentation uses evidentially and illustration to support his argument. Trump emphasizes the enemies' bad things, for example, they built in the ocean, causing pollution and harming the environment, and emphasizes his group's good things by not building in the ocean and ruining the climate and the environment.

Trump uses repetition and exemplification to facilitate accepting his words and believing them without regard to their correctness and credibility.

“their leaders are much smarter than our leaders, and we can't sustain ourselves with that. There's too much—it's like—it's like take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high school football team. That's the difference between China's leaders and our leaders”

Trump's attack on the US negotiators continues by comparing them with the Chinese ones; Trump's argumentation uses comparison to portray the out-group negatively. He also de-emphasizes their good things and represents them as weak and failures.

Trump uses repetition and reformulation to convey the intended message to the audience. He tries to show the negativities of the out-group (China and US

leaders) to create external and internal scapegoats to frighten the audience and make them believe he is the solution.

Trump's attacks on the elite were humorous and sarcastically designed to mock and ridicule those political elite. Trump thinks that those elites are unable to govern the country's success, he also believes they are corrupt and must be changed. Morality is essential because it separates genuine people from the dishonest elite.

Most populists hate the political class but criticize the media, the cultural, and business elites. The 'general will' of the people is opposed by all of these, which are "portrayed as one homogenous corrupt group." (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017: p 11-12)

In his announcement speech, Trump constantly poked fun at and harassed American political figures, accusing them of corruption. He attempts to persuade the audience of this ideology by employing relevance theory and argumentation.

It is crucial to portray oneself as the crisis's solution after a failure has been made spectacular, and a sense of crisis has been stoked and spread. Populist performers can accomplish this through various theatrical techniques, such as advocating for the streamlining of political institutions and procedures, presenting other political actors as foolish and inept, and providing straightforward solutions to the crisis. Trump established a crisis that may encounter the US because of the leaders' mistakes. Herein, Trump created a sense of crisis and blamed the elite; therefore, he represented himself as the solution to that crisis. (Muffit, 2016: p 126-27)

“Sadly, the American dream is dead.... But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.”

Trump uses fallacies, counterfactuals, reasonableness, authority, and illustration to end his argumentation; he claims that the American dream is dead, he exaggerates and manipulates and derives people's emotions and fears and winding it the way he wants to make them fear their present and look up to their future with him. He promises to refresh the American dream and gets rid of all the challenges or slips he may encounter in his plans.

Trump's argumentation uses evidentially, reasonableness, and generalization to foster his ideology in the audience and win their hearts and votes. He also uses repetition and reformulation; he tends to repeat his words or change the wording but keep the same meaning, which ensures the audience will focus on his claims and argumentation.

Trump emphasizes his group's good things by presenting and addressing himself as the unprecedented leader of the US. He promises to make America great again and make all the challenges disappear.

C. Trump's nomination acceptance speech (2016)

Trump delivered his nomination acceptance speech in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 21, 2016. Like the announcement speech, he attacked the elite, centralized people, and attacked immigrants.

“Homicides last year increased by 17% in America’s fifty largest cities. That’s the largest increase in 25 years. In our nation’s capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60% in nearby Baltimore... rising by almost 50% compared to this point last year. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.”

Trump’s argumentation uses number games, evidentially, and illustration to foster his point of view; he mentioned shreds of evidence about the increasing and shocking numbers of homicides, mass shootings, and killings of police officers in the US in the past few years.

He also mentions the number of illegal immigrants who are the reason for the crime in the US and the source of drugs in the country. He tends to de-emphasize the out-group's good things and emphasize their bad things by claiming that the immigrants are the criminals in the US.

Trump uses the generalization strategy; he represents the immigrants negatively and accuses them of being the only criminals in the US without even mentioning that pure American citizens commit the majority of the unfortunate events (killings). He uses authority to ensure people will believe his words without questioning him.

“Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper: Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African-American youth are not employed. 2 million more Latinos are in poverty..... incomes are down more

than \$4,000 since the year 2000. Our manufacturing trade deficit has reached an all-time high – nearly \$800 billion in a single year. The budget is no better.”

Once again, Trump uses number games, illustration, authority, and generalization to emphasize the out-group's bad things and de-emphasize their good things. Trump complains that the jobs in America should be for pure American people only, not immigrants.

Moreover, he attacks the elite budget policy and promises those mistakes will never happen again under his government. Trump uses exemplification by providing concrete numbers to enhance his speech credibility that will not allow questioning or doubting.

“President Obama has doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, and is growing. Yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps.”

Trump attacks the elite boldly and tries to emphasize the out-groups' bad things that Obama is not one of them. He uses number games; politicians utilize statistics to have more robust and more credible arguments. Trump de-emphasizes the out-group's good things; he neglects all the good things the Obama administration made to the US and emphasizes specific issues.

Regarding the relevance theory, Trump uses repetition, exemplification, and restatement. He repeats himself a lot; he uses the same claims, the same excuses, and the same arguments repeatedly.

“Not only have our citizens ... This was just before the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran \$150 billion and gave us nothing – it will go down in history as one of In Libya, our consulate ...the symbol of American prestige around the globe – was brought... than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America’s foreign policy.... Let’s review the record. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map. Libya was cooperating. Egypt was peaceful. Iraq was seeing a reduction in violence. Iran was being choked Iraq is in chaos. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons.... the situation is worse than it has ever been before.”

Trump’s argumentation targets the elite, attacks them, criticizes them, and mocks them, and on top of the list is Hillary Clinton, his opponent in the elections. Trump targeted Muslims and Islam in his speech and claimed that Hillary made these countries disobey American policies.

Trump's argumentation uses illustration, evidentially, fallacies, counterfactuals, number games, and reasonableness strategies to appear cheerful and to make his opponent appear negative and as the cause of the current disasters in the US due to her policies as America’s foreign policy in Obama’s era.

Trump’s argumentation uses exemplification, repetition, and restatement to smoothly illustrate his thoughts and convince the audience of his ideology. Therefore, using Hillary’s actions as an example was straight to the point; he managed to make her look like an evil figure, and he appeared positive, and the cure for the diseases caused her.

“The American People will come first once again. My plan will begin with safety at home – which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. There can be no prosperity without law and order. On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.”

Here, Trump's populism appears by centralizing the people; he makes the people the heart of the election process and the true rulers of the country. He represents himself positively by using reasonableness to give the audience a good impression of him.

His argumentation provides promises and plans to fix the past and current administration's mistakes and overcome the disasters they caused to America and its people. He uses evidently, authority and comparison. Trump compares the Obama government's decisions and plans and the plan he will accomplish for the American people and the American dream.

“I AM YOUR VOICE,”

Trump states that he is the voice for the voiceless; he will work for people and make their lives better, safer, and more luxurious. Populism states the centrality of people, and populists tend to use such expressions to win people's hearts and gain supporters and votes.

“I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good. I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, and no

sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens. When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or worse still, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash – I am not able to look the other way.”

Trump's argumentation uses authority, counterfactuals, evidentially, and illustration to convince the audience that his words are unnegotiable. By mentioning real-life examples, he increased his credibility and gained compassion, empathy, and sympathy.

Using this set of argumentation strategies gave him a sense of honesty and reliability. Moreover, Trump's argumentation uses exemplification to illustrate and boost his ideology and claims, which were ultimately rewarded by winning people's hearts and, most importantly, votes.

“I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people who cannot defend themselves. Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it. I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders – he never had a chance.”

Trump's argument attacks the elite and defends the voiceless people. He emphasizes his in-group good things by stating he joined the political arena to be the voice of the voiceless and their power.

He continuously attacks the elite for failing to protect American land and its people from internal (corrupt leaders) and external threats (immigrants and

Muslims). Moreover, he uses restatement and reformulation to emphasize his words greatly and attract people's attention.

Trump claims he is the only one who is capable of fixing the corrupt elite and being in people's service who suffer from neglect and injustice. He will make the system more people-centered and eliminate all the annoyances that face the pure people of America.

“America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were brutally executed. In the days after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan, and Tennessee.”

Trump's argumentation uses real-life examples of terrorist attacks in the US, where officers had been killed, and homicides and killings are increasing under the shadow of Obama's government and their acceptance of illegal immigrants and Muslims.

Trump uses evidentially, illustration, generalization, authority, and counterfactuals to support his argumentation; he represents the out-group negatively for not protecting the American people and officers, and he also blames them for giving asylum to immigrants who are a swamp of crime in the US. Moreover, regarding relevance theory, Trump uses exemplification, reformulation, and repetition in his speeches to convince the audience and confirm his ideas and ideology.

“Only weeks ago, in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorists targeted our LGBT community. As your President, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBT citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology. To protect us from terrorism, we need to focus on three things.”

Trump’s argumentation uses evidentially, authority, number games, generalization, and illustration strategies to accommodate the audience's feelings, fear, and frustration to strengthen his argument. He also generalizes that the elite failed to protect their groups and people from the terrorists who are Muslims. His populism provides concrete examples and promises to protect these oppressed minorities.

Moreover, mentioning specific numbers gives the speaker more credibility and reliability; it also influences the audience's thoughts, sways their minds, and changes their mindset the way he wants for a successful campaign.

Trump targets Muslims and Islam in his speech and generalizes that all Muslims are terrorists and want to destroy America and dispossess the American dream. His Islamophobic statements and actions reflect his populist ideology. Using authority makes the speech and the speaker stronger.

On the other hand, Wilders tend to be more aggressive in his comments towards Muslims and Islam. He clearly targets Islam and accuses Muslims to threaten the Western countries, and considered them to be terrorists.

Using Muslims as scapegoats to cover internal conflicts and issues is a feature of populism and a crime populists commit. In addition, Trump uses reasonableness to have a self-positive presentation and a good impression.

“On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and Jamiel Shaw. They are just three brave representatives of many thousands. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more deeply than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our border.”

Trump’s argumentation uses evidentially, generalization, illustration, and counterfactuals; these strategies support his ideology and convince the audience. Trump generalizes that those names are victims of the immigrants who entered the US illegally. He also used concrete examples (mentioning names) to increase his credibility and make him trustworthy to the audience.

Moreover, using the illustration strategy by providing a story following the evidence plays a vital role in enhancing the speaker’s excellent and positive impression. He mentioned that he spent time with the victims' families and used the counterfactuals to express empathy and compassion, conciliate the audience's hearts, and sway their minds.

Regarding the relevance theory, Trump uses exemplification as in "*we heard from three ... and Jamiel Shaw*", explanation "*Of all my ... across our border.*", and restatement as in "*They are just three brave representatives of*

many thousands." to support his thoughts and ideology; explaining his examples boosts his credibility and reliability.

"On January 21st of 2017, the day after I take the oath of office, Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced. We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone."

Trump's argumentation uses fallacies, evidentially, reasonableness, and counterfactuals to strengthen his claims. Using fallacies by providing illogical assumptions or promises to comfort the audience and win their hearts is a core feature of populism. Populists tend to tell people comforting lies or words to distract them from their flaws and mistakes internally and externally.

Moreover, counterfactuals express empathy; Trump claims he is doing everything for the people, and once he becomes the president, all their problems will be solved, and they will take their land from the intruders (Muslims and immigrants).

Reasonableness presents the speaker positively and gives him a good impression, which increases his supporters and believers and, hence, wins the elections and ensures they will mindlessly follow him and protect him.

Regarding the relevance theory, Trump uses explanation and repetition a lot in his speech, which indicates that he aims to reach every single person in the audience despite their level of age to gain votes and win the elections.

Trump implicitly generalizes the elite negatively, claiming he will accomplish what they could not do, and generalizes himself positively by giving

promises and comforting lies to the oppressed audience who seek change and a better life.

“Remember: all of the people telling you that you can’t have the country you want, are the same people telling you that I wouldn’t be standing here tonight. No longer can we rely on those elites in media, and politics, who will say anything to keep a rigged system in place.”

Trump uses the verb “remember” to emphasize the importance of the following words, assuring the audience to pay attention and believe in him. Trump’s argument purposely targets the elite who will not make changes or adjustments in the system; it will be rigged as long as it benefits them.

Trump's argument promises that he will fix that rigid system that neglects the people's importance, needs, interests, and values. He uses the generalization strategy to represent the elite negatively as the corrupt and unreliable people they are.

“I’M WITH YOU – THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.” “I am your voice.” “We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Proud Again. We Will Make America Safe Again. And We Will Make America Great Again.”

Trump’s argumentation claims that he will be the solution for every issue, the voice of the voiceless. Trump considers himself the only candidate capable of composing a system and fixing it. Trump manipulates the language skillfully to attract people’s hearts and minds by using repetition by repeating certain phrases or words, restatement by paraphrasing his words and repeating them, and

explanation (by explaining how is he going to change the current weak situation) relevance theory strategies that increase the speaker's credibility and represent him positively.

D. Trump's inauguration speech (2017)

Trump's argumentation strategies in past speeches succeeded, and facilitated winning the elections. Donald Trump was sworn in as the 45th President of the United States on Friday, January 20, 2017, at the US Capitol Building's west front in Washington, D.C. (Trump. 2018). Unlike the announcement and nomination acceptance speeches, Trump's language softened, and the intensity of his words decreased.

“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.”

Trump's argumentation uses generalization, reasonableness, and comparison. He compares the traditional ceremonies where the power is transmitted from one party to another, but this ceremony is different because Trump is one of the people; therefore, the power is given back to the ordinary people thanks to the extraordinary Trump.

Trump uses explanation and repetition in his argumentation. He explains his argument about the difference in this ceremony and repeats that all he did and will do is for the people who deserve to hold that power.

“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.”

Trump’s argumentation uses generalizations, fallacies, and authority to support his words and emphasize their importance. He generalizes that the elite, before his appearance, failed to protect and give the people what they wanted and needed; they could not protect their land from intruders, immigrants, and Muslims.

Moreover, he uses authority, indicating that his words are trustworthy and unnegotiable. Fallacies are based on making illogical statements; Trump’s assumptions concerning the previous administration's actions or policies may be wrong when there is no clear evidence to support his claims.

Regarding the relevance theory, he uses explanation, exemplification, repetition, and reformulation; he explains his argument by mentioning examples and repeating the exact words or statements used before in other speeches and the inaugural speech itself. Moreover, he uses reformulation by reformulating the structure of the used sentences, their word order, or word choice but keeping their meaning.

In contrast to the announcement and nomination acceptance speeches, Trump refers to the elite using general terms (politician) not by addressing them, in particular, using their names (Obama, Hillary, etc.).

“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.”

Trump's argumentation uses evidentially, illustration, generalization, and reasonableness to strengthen his argument and support his words. Proving shreds of evidence following it with illustrations shows his understanding of people's minds and how they feel; mentioning real-life examples utilizes manipulating the audience's feelings and comforting them that they made the right choice by choosing him as the president.

Moreover, he generalizes that these internal and external issues occurred because of the weak and corrupt previous administration, and he tries to reassure the audience that he will fix things. Furthermore, reasonableness gives him a positive impression that he is the right choice.

Trump mentions specific internal issues like poverty, education, infrastructure, crime. etc., and blames the previous administration for the existence of these social issues and claims that he is capable of fixing them. Trump's argumentation represents himself positively as the savior or the extraordinary hero for the oppressed people and represents the elite negatively.

Regarding the relevance theory, Trump uses exemplification and explanation to strengthen his claims and argumentation. Mentioning concrete examples and explaining them enhances his credibility and shows his deep compassion for the audience.

“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 nations’ 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 have disappeared over the horizon.”

Trump's argument attacks the previous administration's policies for preferring the outlanders over the needs of pure people. He blames them for saving, protecting, and donating to these efforts, which should be limited and restricted to pure citizens.

Trump’s argumentation uses generalization, authority, and fallacies; he represents the elite negatively, uses his position to convince the audience with his words, claims, and illogical assumptions about the previous government policies with no concrete evidence to support his claims. Representing the elite as negatively as possible shows that his policies will be the opposite of theirs, and he will accomplish what they could not do for the people.

Regarding the relevance theory, Trump uses repetition, explanation, and restatement to support his argumentation, foster his populist ideology, and enhance his credibility from the people's point of view.

“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.”

Trump's argumentation uses evidentially, illustration, counterfactuals, and generalization to support his claims. He reassures the audience that his policies will benefit them only; he will build walls on the borders to stop illegal immigration, put a ban on Muslims, and offer jobs for pure people only. He mentions examples of the adjustments he will make in his era to comfort the audience and convince them to re-elect him and support him.

Using exemplification and making promises alongside unwavering trust and belief, he can only achieve what could not be achieved. The relevance theory strategies ease his communication with the audience, allow him to manipulate the language effectively, and influence the listeners easily.

“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 interests first.”

Populists always declare they work for people's sake with no personal interests. Trump set up two rules for his successful presidential era efforts: for the people and to confine the US possibilities and prosperity will benefit pure American citizens and prohibit immigrants, Muslims, and non-pure citizens.

His argumentation seeks to comfort people that employing US citizens and decreasing unemployment are among his priorities. The solution to that problem starts by rejecting immigration and not providing them with asylums in the US. Moreover, he will focus on developing the US economy and enhancing business relations internally and externally, all for the people's will. Trump's argumentation will strengthen international affairs, seeking to expand American authority, power, and economy and put people's interests first.

Trump's argumentation uses generalization by presenting himself and the in-group positively and implicitly presenting the out-group negatively for their fruitless policies and good-for-nothing talks. In addition, he uses authority to express specific thoughts to people, giving them a future to look up to, a motivation to forget their heart-breaking past, and a hope for a better life.

Moreover, Trump uses reasonableness to make a good impression and fasten it into people's minds and hearts. Trump's populism is reflected in his speeches; he presents himself positively, gives promises, criticizes the elite, promotes his ideology, and gives people what they want.

“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..., there is no room for prejudice...The Bible tells us, “How good and pleasant it is when God’s people live together in unity.”

Trump's argumentation uses generalizations, fallacies, counterfactuals, and authority. He represents that his priorities will refresh the American dream. He generalizes that former presidents were fixed and rigid in their policies and international affairs and they only adopted them for their interests instead of creating a better life for their country and people. Moreover, he implicitly attacks and generalizes that he will achieve what they failed to do and criticizes the elite's decisions.

Furthermore, his argumentation uses counterfactuals to persuade people to imagine possible drawbacks, hurdles, and consequences of turning a blind eye to "Radical Islamic terrorism" and not fighting them and eradicating them from the earth, enabling the US to become strong, united, and unstoppable.

He uses an authority strategy to defend his argumentation to make people believe him and convey his ideology to the audience; using the authority strategy makes the speaker trustworthy and reliable.

Trump targets Muslims and Islam and uses them as a scapegoat to enhance his cards in the political arena. Islamophobia is a critical card for politicians to quiver Islamic existence in the world, portraying Muslims and Islam as a threat, and the black horse allows them to create an enemy to divert people's attention to and distract them from their actual threats (i.e. their politicians). Trump claims that there is "no room for prejudice"; however, his words and actions say the opposite and reflect racist and populist ideology by utilizing communication strategies.

“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.”

Trump’s argumentation uses generalization, authority, and comparison; he generalizes that the elite (the politicians and the out-group) did not fulfill their promises to the people, describing the elite as people of words, not deeds. Trump argues that his “Actions speak louder than words,” trying to persuade people that he is the change, and the hard old days are gone since he became the president.

Trump's argumentation compares the corrupt elite and his faithful and promising policies. He is claiming that the time will not repeat itself. Moreover, he uses authority to defend his argument, support it, and convince people.

Regarding relevance theory, Trump uses repetition in abundance; he repeats the same ideas through his speeches by claiming that the elite won't fix the decayed system. And strongly emphasizing the he will make the American dream alive again. He uses the same words and ideas to spread his ideology and convince people to accept it and believe in him.

“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.”

One could use Donald Trump's inaugural speech to illustrate the core ideas of populism: "People and the establishment are engaged in a political struggle, not parties and ideologies (Pabriks, 2017).

Regarding the relevance theory, Trump uses repetition, he repeats those sets of statements in all of his speeches to emphasize their importance and to gain compassion and support. Trump's argumentation uses counterfactuals to gain empathy and compassion from the audience to make them aware of what is coming.

The researcher combined Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach and Sperber & Wilson's relevance theory in this study. The analytical approaches indicate that people use different strategies in speech production and communication to consider the diverse audience. Because both of them transact with communication strategies and techniques to elaborate and deliver the intended meaning, using different styles to foster the message, assist in getting more support, increase credibility, and enhance winning chances.

However, the argumentation strategies occurred more frequently than the relevance theory strategies in the speeches. In analyzing some extracts there was no enough attention given to the relevance theory strategies because they didn't occur in those extracts. While in other ones the strategies were more apparent consequently, they were discussed more.

Seemingly, the argumentation strategies were used more than the relevance theory since they have clear and direct effect over the listener. However, the relevance theory requires a deep understanding of the context and the communication strategies.

Discussion

Wilders propagates racism, prejudice, and other forms of bigotry against Muslims and Islam by abusing his power and position in politics. In his short film "Fitna," Wilders made a comparison between Nazism and Islam as two harmful ideologies that need to be eradicated.

Respectively, Trump once stated that "Islam is a problem" and "Muslims hate us." Arguing with these claims, they always used Islam as a critical card for creating an enemy, spreading fear and hate, and creating an illusion.

Colors do not matter to Wilders and Trump; all Muslims and immigrants, despite their skin color, must leave Western countries. Immigrants should not be given asylum in America and European countries to stop their increasing numbers and the threat they represent.

Trump and Wilders are Islamophobes; they fear that Muslims will establish an Islamic colony in America and the Netherlands, and they also fear that Islam will spread throughout the world.

Given his racist remarks and speeches about Muslims and Islam, Wilders never travels without security and guards. For some time now, Wilders has been at odds with Muslims and Islam; he fears being killed or attacked by any group, and he has stated that numerous terrorist Islamic organizations have him on their denylist and want him dead.

Trump's argumentation brought up several things in the three speeches, like immigration, Americanism, Islamic Terrorism, the rigged system, the economy, international affairs, the elite, and the people. Trump mentioned concrete and real-life examples and shreds of evidence to emphasize his

argument; he promised that “he will buy American... and he will hire American.” Americanism simply means “America first.” He emphasized patriotism and the importance of focusing all the efforts to make America shine brightly and rule the world again, eradicating Muslims and Islam and banning immigration by all means.

Wilders and Trump’s Ideology

Can we consider Wilders and Trump populists? In light of the above analysis and Van Dijk’s ideological square, the researcher concluded that both are populists. Speaking positively, speakers hope to gain more respect from the public or find allies. Ultimately, speakers can gain the trust of society with ease, and this trust can be a powerful tool. (Van Dijk, 2006). Seemingly, the ideology of Wilders and Trump is individual views, and any hard data do not back up their arguments regarding the in-group and out-group.

In his Islam and Freedom speech (2019), Wilders de-emphasized his in-group bad things and their weakness and minimized them or did not discuss them at all; for example, he made assumptions that crimes are because of Muslims only and neglected the percentage of Dutch people's crimes.

In addition, he emphasized their good things, maximized their advantages and positives, and gave them credibility and power, for example, by mentioning and supporting Donald Trump and describing him positively; using positive words and delivering his speech at the David Horowitz Freedom Center.

On the other hand, Wilders emphasized the out-group bad things, mentioning their disadvantages, pitfalls, and weaknesses to portray the out-group negatively; for example, Wilders characterizes Islam negatively using strong

negative words. Moreover, he de-emphasizes their good things and displays them as negatively as possible; for example, denies and neglects Islam and Muslim's good things.

Trump's speeches respectively emphasized his in-group good things by describing himself positively and portraying that he will make changes and fix the rigid systems. In addition, he de-emphasized their bad things by never mentioning the crisis caused by American citizens.

On the other hand, he emphasized the out-group bad things (the elite) by portraying them negatively and criticizing and blaming them like Obama and Hillary. Moreover, he de-emphasized their good things by not bothering himself to mention any accomplishments of previous politicians.

Wilders and Trump share the same populist ideology; they blamed, criticized, and attacked the elite for not supporting their decisions and values, allowing immigrants to enter their countries, and being “chicken-hearted”. Moreover, they considered people as the heart of the country.

Fear and Brainwashing Dimension

Wilders and Trump's argumentation aimed to spread fear among people to make them fear the unknown and fear what the politicians wanted them to fear. Politicians want people to fear that their dreams, lives, beliefs, values, and countries are threatened by the corrupt elite and their futile and self-centered policies.

Brainwashing changes people's mindsets; populist politicians tend to give illogical facts, shocking lies, and unreasonable claims to make people think whatever benefits them and their policies. They aimed to brainwash people's minds with

assumptions, claims, and arguments to frighten the audience and make them need to change and secure that only they can provide.

Islamophobic Dimension

Islamophobia is a critical card in the political arena; it is a core feature of populism; populists are known for their Islamophobic statements and actions here and there. They spread fear, hate, prejudice, and racism towards Muslims and Islam and represent them negatively in their speeches.

They are afraid of the increasing number of Muslims worldwide, portraying Islam as a dangerous ideology that encourages murder, racism, demolishing white men, suppression of freedom, rape, and all crime. It is considered an “existential threat” to Western countries and America.

They target Muslims, Islam, and Arabs all over the world, not just those who immigrated to Western countries but even those who live in their countries peacefully. They want to eradicate Muslims once and for all.

Wilders's and Trump's arguments incite hatred to halt immigration, de-Islamize, and stop Islamization. They fear Islam's power, the growing Muslim population, and the process of Islamization, which is why they are Islamophobes. Their ideology is a subjective viewpoint derived from their political and religious beliefs.

To propagate their populist ideology and persuade European leaders to have the guts to carry out their schemes, Wilder and Trump use arguments that portray Islam and Muslims negatively. Their ultimate goal is to destroy any power that could stand in the way of their success.

Politicians view Muslims as whiny lunatics who are an embarrassment to civilization. Extremist politicians even think that, given enough time, Muslims would establish an Islamic empire in the West (Allen, 2016).

Creating an Enemy Dimension

Wilders and Trump's argumentation seeks to create an enemy to keep people's minds busy with, distract them from internal and external issues regarding politicians, and shift their focus so that they never question their decisions or policies. Therefore, they continuously targeted immigrants, and Muslims demanded banning migration, stopping political relations with Islamic countries, and preventing them from increasing by eradicating them.

Iran is one of the enemies the Western countries created; they consider it a threat to the world and must end alongside other enemies. In Wilders's case, the biggest enemy of Dutchland is Islam and Muslims. In Trump's case, the enemies of the US are Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Islamic Countries, illegal immigrants, and countries that do not understand or support American propaganda.

Racism Dimension

Racism is a characteristic of populism; populists tend to spread racism and prejudice between the different races in their countries. Wilders believes Muslims are inferior to Dutch people and must be evicted from the Dutchland to make life peaceful and promising. In the same vein, Trump stated that "Islam is a problem" he thinks Muslims are stealing and taking over the world.

Racism against minorities like African Americans, Muslims, Arabs, and immigrants from different countries who sought asylum in the US and the Dutchland is what Wilders's and Trump's populist ideology wants.

Wilders and Trump spread racism and prejudice against minorities by exposing false lies or claims, attacking them, spreading fear, considering them as a threat, and creating an enemy using them that reflects their populist ideology and proves them as POPULISTS.

The White Man's Superiority Dimension

Wilders's and Trump's argumentation declares that Western cultures, Christianity, Jewish, and people are superior to Islam, Arabs, immigrants, and other countries' cultures. Wilders stated that Islam is a dangerous ideology rather than religion; the Islamic culture isn't sufficient or worthy of recognition or respect. They tend to spread racism, inequality, and prejudice towards other nations whose actions and statements are derived from their populist ideology that seeks authoritarianism.

They believe that other colored people are inferior to them and that they do not deserve to exist, respected, or recognized. They are attacking immigrants and demanding the banning of migration, cutting off international affairs with Islamic countries, and disrespecting them and their values, beliefs, and rights.

Illusion Dimension

Populists seem to create an illusion of their policies, statements, and decisions. They attack other politicians, criticize their policies, change people's mindsets, and make them illogical, irresponsible, and unreal enemies and fears.

Wilders and Trump's argumentation continuously propagated fear, racism, Islamophobia, and prejudice and created enemies. Employing such propaganda enables them to be the solution for these issues, the savior and the voice of the voiceless, and capable of changing the current corrupt politicians.

The Religious Dimension

Wilders and Trump's argumentation admires the in-group religions they worship, Christianity and Judaism; they think they are the superior religions. They believe other religions are inferior, and their religions are inferior and unreal.

On the other hand, Islam is considered an ideology, not a religion. They attack, criticize, and fight the followers of Islam with a deep belief that Muslims are dangerous tropes who want to take over the world and build Islamic colonization in Western countries.

Wilders and Trump's Body Language (Non-Verbal) Communication

Wilders and Trump spent years in politics and entertainment, allowing them to control their body gestures and employ them sufficiently to benefit their argumentation. Analyzing their speeches through videos showed their skills in utilizing non-verbal gestures to emphasize their argumentation.

Wilders and Trump know their body language and gestures due to their long years of experience in the political arena, entertainment field, and industry. Self-awareness of gestures and amazing ability to control body language represent them as rugged, confident, and reliable politicians. They tried to leave no room for the out-group and opponents and those who underestimated them to use simple details against them.

1. Quick hand movements, for example, shaking their hand furiously, especially when they want support or applause from the audience.
2. They used hand signals such as victory, and lifting their fists to express unity and victory.

3. They were Pointing to the audience and themselves to emphasize the audience's understanding and attention.
4. Joining the hands together (like shaking hands with someone), lift them, and shake them to express compassion, unity, and strength with the audience.
5. Rolling their eyes and making weird faces whenever they talked or mocked the elite showed their sarcastic side.
6. They kept raising their shoulders to express carelessness.
7. Raising their eyebrows expresses the confidence of their claims;
8. Closing their eyes frequently, indicating they are hiding something.
9. They were pointing using the index finger to show dominance.

Media and Populism

Media plays a crucial role in enhancing a populist's accessibility to the audience. Leaders make people well-informed, increase their credibility, and strengthen their relationships. Moreover, it makes the populists trustworthy and reliable.

Wilders and Trump employ the media, especially Twitter; they account on tweets to contact, post, inform, and update the audience. They spread and share their populist ideology, increase their followers, and comment on hot issues. Moreover, they use the media to be flexible and adaptable in political strategies so that they leave no room for luck or criticism.

Similarities in Wilders and Trump's Populist Style

Wilders and Trump are charismatic leaders who can easily influence and affect the audience due to their style. The following points demonstrate their style and compare it to populism:

- Demonstrate closeness to people and centrality of people.
- Attacking and criticizing the elite and blaming them for cultural, political, economic, and social pitfalls.
- Bad manners (i.e., being disrespectful and mocking others.)
- The simplicity of their language: they use understandable and everyday language to show that they are part of people. In addition, they use short sentences and words.
- They use colloquial language to fasten their relationship with the audience.
- presenting themselves as a spokesperson for the public, a member of the people, and an advocate of the people.
- Sense of humor and sarcasm: Wilders and Trump tend to joke and mock other leaders (the elite and the out-group.)
- Storytelling: They tell stories to demonstrate the situation and influence people's emotions and feelings.
- Dramatizing and exaggerating situations to spread fear and create illusions and enemies.
- They are eager to present themselves positively and are successful leaders who can make the needed changes, criticizing the elite and shifting the power to the people.

- The creation of crisis, the tendency to mention social, cultural, and political issues and exaggerate and dramatize them to gain compassion, empathy, and solidarity is a core feature of Wilders and Trump's populism.

All in all, the analysis answered the research questions sufficiently and will be concluded as follows:

1. Taking populism as a definition, can we consider Wilders and Trump populists, and why?

Populism is an ideology that reflects personal political and religious orientation that attacks the elite, centralizes the people, and repeals rigid systems. Based on the aforementioned discussion, Wilders and Trump are populists because they continuously criticize the elite explicitly and implicitly and blame them for the cultural, social, economic, and political crisis, in addition to giving asylum to immigrants. They consider themselves as the voice of people; they are from people to people, and for people. They describe them as pure people, and politicians must put them first.

In addition, they portray the out-group (i.e., Islam, Muslims, immigrants, European leaders, Obama, and Hillary) negatively using strong negative expressions. On the contrary, they represent the in-group positively (i.e., themselves and their supporters) using expressions that reflect their positive attitudes.

Wilders and Trump's argumentation represents their populist ideology that seeks authority, power, and dominance. They are leading Islamophobes; they target Muslims and Islam at every possible chance, and they consider the existence of Islam as a problem and a threat that will demolish and take over the world. The endless targeting of Muslims and Islam represents their ideology and identifies them

as Islamophobes and populists. They are using Islam as a scapegoat to hide their failure and deficiency in their people's eyes.

They want to be accountable, trustworthy, and reliable to stay in authority for a long time. Moreover, they use scapegoats (i.e., Muslims, Islam, and immigrants) to create an enemy, an illusion, or a fear; they want people to believe that peace and freedom are dependent on eliminating those terrorists.

Islam and Muslims are the ultimate enemies of Western countries; they are considered the reason for increasing crime and terrorist acts around the world. They accused Muslims of being terrorists who spread terror, fear, crime, and hate. Therefore, Wilders and Trump use these as pretexts for their Islamophobic, racial, and unjustified actions toward Muslims, Islam, and Arab people.

Wilders and Trump created enemies, for example, Arabs, Muslims, Islam, immigrants, and countries who do not support their policies, for example, Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, and Arab countries. They also spread fear among people toward specific groups of people, for example, Muslims or African-Americans, Mexicans, and immigrants. They give promises and solutions to get rid of those groups who destroy and steal their countries by targeting and accusing certain groups and providing concrete numerical examples and real-life examples about the drawbacks of leniency with savages and intruders.

2. How do Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their populist ideology?

Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their populist, autocratic, and Islamophobic ideologies that seek authority, power, and a unipolar world. Their speeches are skillfully written, and the language is manipulated to benefit them.

Remarkably, their ideology is reflected in their speeches through the use of argumentation strategies and communication strategies, criticizing the out-group, de-emphasizing their good things and emphasizing their bad things, targeting previous and other administrations and leaders for their policies and decisions, highlighting the positive aspects of the in-group while downplaying its negative aspects, the continuous attack towards Muslims, Arab, Islam, and immigrants, using illogical statements, and their styles reflect their ideology.

An ideology is a belief set from knowledge, customs, attitudes, etc. Every political group has its ideology and goals. Everything displayed in public can be viewed positively or negatively, depending on the viewer. They make an effort to instill and solidify their ideology in people. Van Dijk provided an ideological square for determining the ideology of a person or a group. Speakers (in groups) talk about their accomplishments, actions, and good things. Numerous benefits come with being a speaker.

On the contrary, outgroups, or opponents, exhibit antiquated beliefs like racism, discrimination, and war. Hence, rather than discussing their group's shortcomings, speakers frequently highlight its virtues. Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis's Ideological Square identifies ideologies by determining whether or not they adhere to the four dimensions of ideology, which are as follows:

(1) *Emphasize our Good Things:* The Wilders and Trump represent their group positively, then mention what is acceptable to society; mentioning the good things increases their public reputation and their supporters; as a result, they gain people's trust, support, power, and votes.

(2) ***Emphasize Their bad things:*** Since weaknesses can become a drawback for their career, Wilders and Trump avoided mentioning any. They aimed to portray their opponents negatively; they compared their achievements with the outgroup. They utilize the outgroup (opponents) bad things to decrease their reputation, convince their point of view, and weaken their image. Consequently, they will increase their followers and decrease the outgroup followers.

(3) ***De-emphasize Our bad things:*** Wilders and Trump tried to convey their opinions and ideologies by minimizing and neglecting their weaknesses and bad things because it may ruin their political image and weaken them. As a result, they will look credible because people will not know about these bad things and will think they do not have any.

(4) ***De-emphasize Their good things:*** Wilders and Trump displayed the outgroups negatively by covering their good things and de-emphasizing them because the good things may threaten the speakers and their ingroup. Therefore, Wilders and Trump only focused in their speeches on presenting their bad things, emphasizing them, and de-emphasizing their good things.

A. How do Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect populism in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (2001) and the argumentation strategies?

In light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis argumentation strategies, Wilders and Trump's argumentation uses a variety of strategies to make themselves more credible, trustworthy, and reliable and to convince their ideology and point of view to the audience. Wilders and Trump's argumentation repeatedly used several strategies; these are generalizations; they generalized the outgroup and their opponents negatively to

shake their image and ruin their reputation, creating fear, illusion, and an enemy that was the most used strategy.

Illustration, Wilders and Trump continuously illustrated their opinions and argumentation by explaining and storytelling to gain empathy from the audience. Evidently, they also provided real-life examples and concrete evidence to support their argumentation and shut down the outgroup and their opponents, leaving no room for criticism.

Number games occurred frequently in Wilders and Trump's argumentations; they provided numbers, for example, Trump's announcement speech: *"People up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof... A \$5 billion web... It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website."* and Wilders Islam and Freedom speech *"Unfortunately in... more than 40,000 women have been genitally mutilated, more than 40,000. They allow Pakistani grooming gangs to rape young British girls."* among other examples. Doing so fosters their argumentation and gives them a sense of credibility and reliability.

Fallacies occurred when Wilders and Trump provided illogical arguments. A few of their arguments appeared to be inadequate. Unfortunately, many people say and believe what they say, so their argumentation may be valid and believable. Like when Trump claimed that the only thing Obama did during his presidential era was playing golf. This claim is illogical, and what is the point of saying so? It seems that Trump wants to represent Obama as a member of the outgroup negatively in any means and possible way. In Wilders's speech, he also provided illogical claims that seek to represent Muslims, Islam, Arabs, European leaders, and immigrants negatively. He claimed that Moroccan immigrants are the reason for the increasing number of crimes in the Netherlands.

Comparison; Wilders's argumentation continuously compared European leaders' policies and Trump's policies, comparing Christianity, Judaism, and Islam by claiming that Islam is inferior to other religions. He was in favor of Trump's policies towards Muslims and Arabs and urged European leaders to follow his remarkable steps. In the same vein, Trump compared previous administrations' policies with his upcoming decisions that will bring the American dream alive again.

Moreover, they used the authority strategy, meaning that people believe experts or politicians' arguments because it is their specialization. Since they are known as famous and well-known characters, their words are believable to people, unnegotiable, reliable, and trustworthy.

Counterfactuals express empathy in political speeches, this tactic aims at convincing the audience to speculate about potential outcomes. Thus, counterfactuals require people to perceive challenging circumstances and experience empathy. Wilders and Trump's argumentation used this strategy to create illusions and fear that if they are not in charge of the country, it will collapse and fall. Intruders will take over their countries and eliminate other religions and opponents. Their freedom and land will be stolen and destroyed.

Reasonableness was typically used by Wilders and Trump when their argument was unreasonable. They aimed to show themselves in positive self-presentation and impression. Wilders and Trump's argumentation was often unreasonable and was not based on solid evidence; they just criticized and targeted the outgroup to present them negatively and create an enemy, fear, and illusion; they also wanted to brainwash people by making them believe that their claims are true and credible.

In light of the argumentation strategies of Van Dijk's critical Discourse Analysis and based on the above analysis demonstrate that Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their populist ideology that purposefully criticized and targeted the outgroup that represented them negatively by trying to ruin their reputation and shake their image, and brainwash people's mind and change their attitudes and thoughts to suit and benefit Wilders and Trump's argumentation and populist ideology.

B. How do Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect populism in light of the relevance theory produced by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and communication strategies?

Relevance theory strategies are a group of communication strategies that foster and are utilized to transfer meaning and themes. Sperber and Wilson (1986) generated that speakers utilize several communication strategies to boost a certain idea they want to convenience and deliver to the audience these strategies: sequence (repetition), explanation, exemplification, and restatement.

Wilders and Trump's argumentation continuously used these strategies to make the language of their speeches understandable for all levels of the audience. They wanted to illustrate their ideology to the audience by simplifying and clarifying their speeches to ensure that every single audience would understand and interpret their speeches.

Sequence or repetition was a pivotal communication strategy in Wilders and Trump's argumentation; they repeated certain words, phrases, or sentences to emphasize their importance and centrality. Wilders repeated some words and facts, as shown before, to foster the centrality of people and attack the elite, which are core characteristics of populism. To emphasize themselves as the sole resolution for the country's concerns and global conflicts. They also used repetition to convince

the audience that they were the only ones to bring back hope, freedom, land, capabilities, solidarity, and unity.

The explanation strategy is quite similar to illustration; explanation provides illustrations and extra explanations to make things look easier and make the communication and delivering the speech smoother. The explanation also depends on storytelling; Wilders and Trump's language was smooth and easy to comprehend with their audience, and they gained support and applause for whatever they said since the language was colloquial and basic.

Exemplification is similar to evidentiality, it depends on providing shreds of evidence to strengthen arguments. Wilders and Trump's argumentation condensed on giving real-life and concrete examples. Doing so allows them to be more credible and trustworthy. Moreover, this shows sympathy and solidarity with the audience.

The restatement strategy was also a crucial communication strategy in Wilders and Trump's argumentation. They used it to match people's minds, souls, individual differences, and educational levels. It depends on forming specific sentences differently to ease delivering the speech. Wilders and Trump's arguments and style depend on colloquial language, which includes slang, chunks, and daily life language. They tend to employ restatement or reformulation to create a more understandable speech considering the audience's different levels.

Utilizing relevance theory communication strategies facilitates the transfer of ideas, feelings, argumentations, and speeches. Wilders and Trump's argumentation utilized different strategies to ensure that they would convince the audience with their populist ideology.

Populists are known for using simple, daily, and colloquial language that suits everyone and ensures they attract people's attention, thoughts, and feelings. Relevance theory strategies foster communication and deliver speeches to the audience sufficiently and easily.

The findings of the study are connected to the current war in Gaza. The Western media and politicians are biased to Israel and blame the Palestinian citizens for what happened since the 7th of October. Trump, Biden, and other political figures attacked the Palestinian Muslims, stopped the financial support for the UNRWA in Gaza, refused and didn't allow for humanitarian and medical aid. Moreover, they didn't stop the genocide in Gaza which resulted in mass destruction and mass murder and loss in souls.

Apparently, the populist ideology of those figures is reflected in their actions, speeches, and statements. The unjustified and clear targeting the out-group members (Palestinian citizens) and supporting their in-group member (Israel) .

Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

The researcher analyzed the data to answer the research's two main and two secondary questions. The researcher will interpret the discussion in this chapter and answer research questions. This chapter will summarize the results, conclusions of the analysis, and further recommendations.

Summary of Results

The Findings revealed that Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their ideology.

1. Wilders and Trump are populists, which is evident in their speeches since they reflect their ideologies that seek authority, attack and criticize the elite, and the centrality of people.
2. Wilders and Trump's argumentations reflected their ideology; argumentation strategies proposed by Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis which indicated that using generalization, illustration, evidently, comparison, authority, number games, fallacies, counterfactuals, and reasonableness allowed Wilders and Trump to neglect the elite and the outgroup and represent the negatively and ruin their reputation. And represent themselves positively to win hearts and votes and accomplish their populist goals.
3. Wilders and Trump's argumentation utilized relevance theory communication strategies to foster and facilitate delivering their speeches and engraving their populist ideology into people's minds and souls. Wilders and Trump's argumentation used strategies like sequence (repetition), explanation, Exemplification, and restatement (reformulation). Those reflected their populist ideology and allowed them to remain in power, be elected, convince the audience with their ideology, and rebel against the elite.

4. Wilders and Trump's style is pretty similar. They use colloquial language that suits everyone and intends to make them look like a part of people and their voice. Moreover, it depends on storytelling and demonstrates closeness to people and the centrality of people, attacking and criticizing the elite and blaming them for cultural, political, economic, and social pitfalls and bad manners (i.e., being disrespectful, rude, and mocking others.)
5. Wilders and Trump utilized the media significantly to facilitate their argumentations; to show solidarity and unity with people, and to stay in contact with their followers.
6. They purposefully created and generated racism, islamophobia, fear, illusion, white man's supremacy, brainwashing, and enemies.
7. Wilders and Trump are Islamophobes who wanted to use Muslims, Islam, and Arabs as scapegoats to distract people's attention from their political failure, and creating enemies makes them heroes who would stop those intruders and enemies at any cost to take back their stolen freedom.
8. Wilders and Trump's ideology is anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant; they continuously attacked and targeted Muslims, Arabs, immigrants, and Islam in their speeches.

Conclusion

This dissertation is a qualitative study investigating populism through an in-depth analysis of Wilders and Trump's speeches. This study investigated Wilders and Trump's populist ideologies and analyzed their populism in light of Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis approach (argumentation strategies) and Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory. Moreover, this study investigated whether Trump and Wilders are populists and what makes them populists. This study analyzed Trump's announcement speech (2015), nomination acceptance speech (2016), and inauguration speech (2017) in light of Van Dijk's CDA (2001) and Sperber and Wilson's (1986) relevance theory.

Moreover, the researcher analyzed Wilders's statements and the (2019) speech "Freedom and Islam" at the David Horowitz Freedom Center in America. In addition, the researcher analyzed Wilders and Trump's argumentation strategies and communication relevance theory strategies to figure out their ideologies, how populism is reflected in their speeches, and why they used populism. Furthermore, the researcher analyzes Wilders and Trump's body language and interjections and how they affect communication.

Moreover, the researcher analyzed Wilders and Trump's body language and interjections. Furthermore, the researcher considered the following dimensions in the analysis: Islamophobic dimension, racism dimension, white man superiority dimension, illusion dimension, fear and brainwashing dimension, and religious dimension. In addition, the researcher interpreted the media's role in expanding populism.

Wilders and Trump's ideology is political and religious orientation. It is a personal point of view that they spread hatred and prejudice, and they represent the elite and the out-group negatively by emphasizing the out-group bad things and de-emphasizing their good things. On the other hand, they positively represent the in-group by emphasizing their good things and de-emphasizing them.

They used miscellaneous (a) argumentation strategies to emphasize, support, and strengthen their argumentation and (b) relevance theory communication strategies to convey their ideology to the audience and represent themselves with a good impression. Moreover, verifying the strategies increases their credibility and accountability amongst people.

Trump and Wilders emphasized and supported their claims with argumentation and the relevance theory tactic. In an attempt to spread their populist ideology among the audience, they attempted to convince other leaders and citizens to halt immigration, stop Islamization, abolish the elite, and reclaim the rights, power, and authority that had been taken from them.

Wilders and Trump used argumentation strategies like generalization, evidently, comparison, authority, number games, illustration, and fallacies. Concerning communication strategies explained in the relevance theory, they frequently used strategies like exemplification, explanation, sequence, and restatement.

Utilizing these strategies intends to generate the elite negatively, the in-group positively, centralize the people, spread racism, stereotypes, fear, and hatred toward Muslims, Islam, and immigrants worldwide, change people's mindsets, create an enemy, create an illusion, convince the audience that non-citizens should

not be allowed to benefit from the American and Dutch prosperity and capabilities and should be limited to the pure citizen's sake.

Furthermore, their argument blames the corrupt elite for putting others first, seeking personal achievements over the people, and seeking to change the corrupt politicians with trustworthy ones like Wilders and Trump.

Wilders represented European leaders negatively for allowing immigrants to access their countries and ruin them; in the same vein, Trump attacks previous administrations and politicians for unjust policies and double standards. They blame and criticize the elite for failing to protect their lands from intruders and illegal immigrants. However, their argumentation lacks evidence, credibility, and responsibility, which makes them controversial.

Wilders's and Trump's styles are genuinely populist; they correspond with the features of populism. Their shared populist ideology unites them as opposing sides of the same coin. They centralize people, attack the elite explicitly and implicitly, and provide comforting lies to reassure the audience that their dreams will come true.

Trump's argumentation of representing the in-group positively by providing examples and illustrations and using different kinds of argumentation strategies and communication strategies made them trustworthy, reliable, and credible. Trump used several argumentation strategies such as Authority, generalization, comparison, number game, fallacies, counterfactuals, reasonableness, illustration, and evidently, to strengthen, support, and emphasize their argumentation and gain the wanted votes.

Wilders and Trump are Islamophobes. They targeted Muslims and Islam at every possible chance and used them as scapegoats to distract people from political failure and drawbacks. Since Islamophobia is a concrete characteristic of populism, Wilders and Trump's argumentation represented Muslims and Islam negatively using different argumentation strategies that aim at targeting Muslims, Islam, and Arabs and assuming that if they do not stop their increasing numbers and dominance, Western countries' lands and freedom will be gone by the wind.

Wilders and Trump's speeches reflect their ideology using different argumentation strategies in their favor to represent the ingroup positively and the outgroup negatively. These strategies aimed to strengthen Wilders and Trump's argumentation, foster their claims, brainwash people's minds, and convince the audience with their populist ideology.

Populism is a detrimental ideology that ruins countries, creates conflicts, and depends on lying.

Populists have recently liked the growing ferment, but nowadays, it seems they are losing their charm. It is formidable to eliminate and free the world from such a dangerous strategy, but with increasing awareness, especially with international conflicts and disasters like the current Gaza war, people are becoming more aware and refuse and neglect populist lies and leaders.

Populism is losing its popularity, and the man who invented "Trumpism," Wilders, is currently in hot water not just with Muslims but also with Dutch citizens because he continuously uses the same pretexts and excuses to destroy the existence of Islam. Respectively, Trump, the self-explanatory, is currently fighting his people for the lies and conflicts he created to fulfill his ideological goals. Wilders and Trump are two

faces of the same coin; they share the same populist ideology that wants to withhold power and authority to themselves and make sure the elite will by criticizing and overturning them to individualize the authority.

Recommendations

The researcher suggests the following recommendations for further research:

The researcher recommends conducting further research about populism by sampling other political characters, using Fairclough's critical discourse analysis model, which would be beneficial, and conducting research comparing Western leaders and Arab ones. Moreover, combining analytical approaches to strengthen the research.

References

- Al-Jundi. B. (2023). A Comparative Discourse Analysis of Articles on the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict. Hebron University. Discourse Analysis M.A. Spring 2023.
- Allen, C. (2016). Islamophobia. University of Birmingham, UK. Ashgate Publishing Limited.
Published by Routledge.
- Benjamin Newman et al. (2021). The Trump Effect: An Experimental Investigation of the Emboldening Effect of Racially Inflammatory Elite Communication. *British Journal of Political Science* (2021), 51, 1138–1159
doi:10.1017/S0007123419000590
- Boyer. E, (2019). "The Rise of Populism in 21st Century France: Normalizing Islamophobia"CMC Senior Theses. 2169.
https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/2169
- Brown. K., Mondon. A., (2020). Populism, the media, and the mainstreaming of the far right: The Guardian’s coverage of populism as a case study. Article reuse guidelines: [sagepub.com/journals-permissions](https://www.sagepub.com/journals-permissions) DOI: 10.1177/0263395720955036 journals.sagepub.com/home/pol.
- Brubaker. R. (2017). “Why Populism?”, *Theory and Society* 46, no. 5 (2017): 357–385.
- Canovan, M. (1981). *Populism*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.
- Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the people! Populism and the two faces of democracy. *Political Studies* 47: 2–16.
- Canovan. M, (2002) “Taking Politics to the People: Populism as the Ideology of Democracy”, in Carta, C., & Wodak, R. (2015). Discourse analysis, policy analysis, and the borders of EU identity. *Discourse Analysis, Policy Analysis,*

and the Borders of EU Identity, 14(1), 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.1.01car>

Colomer, J. M. (1999). Las instituciones del federalismo. *Revista española de ciencia política*, No. 1, 41-54

Danielle Resnick, “Populism in Africa”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, ed. Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser, Paul Taggart, Paulina Ochoa Espejo and Pierre Ostiguy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Deegan-Krause, Kevin, & Haughton, Tim. (2009). Toward a more useful conceptualization of populism: Types and degrees of populist appeals in the case of Slovakia. *Politics & Policy*, 37(4):821–841.

De Lange, Sarah L. (2012). New alliances: Why mainstream parties govern with radical rightwing populist parties. *Political Studies*, 60(4):

Del Rocio Flores Hinojosa, N. (2021). Populist Political, Discursive and Ideological Definitions.

Open Journal of Social Sciences, 9, 387-400. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2021.99027>
Democracies and the Populist Challenge, eds. Yves Mény and Yves Surel (Oxford: Palgrave 2002), 26.

Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction (pp. 258–84). London: Sage.

Donath, L. (2021). *Understanding Populist Leadership: Trump’s Self-Presentation on Twitter*. Ghent University.

Fairclough, N. L. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), Farid Hafez, Humayun Ansari (Campus, 2012). *From the Far Right to the Mainstream Islamophobia, Party Politics and the Media*, ed. vol. *Islamophobia in Muslim Majority Societies*, ed. vol with Enes Bayrakli, (Routledge, 2019)

- Gidron, N, Bonikowski B. (2013). Varieties of Populism: Literature Review and Research Agenda, in Weatherhead Working Paper Series, No. 13-0004; 2013.
- Golodnov, A. V. (2008). Ritoricheskiy metadiscourse: K opredeleniyu ponyatiya [Rhetorical metadiscourse: Defining the notion]. Pushkin Leningrad State University Bulletin, 2(13), 7-18. Retrieved from https://lib.herzen.spb.ru/text/golodnov_104_77_87.pdf
- Hawkins, Kirk A. (2010). Venezuela's Chavismo and populism in comparative perspective. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirschl, T. A., & Spisak, G. A. (2020). Is a New Structurally Dispossessed Class Developing in the United States? *British Journal of Sociology*, 71, 902-920.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12782>
- Hofstadter, Richard. (1955). *The Age of Reform*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Ivarsflaten, Elisabeth. (2008). What unites right-wing populists in Western Europe? *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(1):3-23.
- Jagers, Jan, & Walgrave, Stefaan. (2007). Populism as political communication style: An empirical study of political parties' discourse in Belgium. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(3):319–345.
- Johnstone, Barbara. (2002) *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- KhosraviNik, M. (2015). Theoretical Background. In M. KhosraviNik, *Discourse, identity and legitimacy: Self and Other in representations of Iran's nuclear program* (pp. 47-79). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kyle, J. & Gultchin, L. (2018). *Populists in Power Around the World*. Downloaded from <http://institute.global/insight/renewing-center/populists-power-around-world> on November 7, 2018.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 2005. "Populism: What's in a Name." In *Populism and the Mirror of*

- Democracy, edited by Panizza Francisco, 32–49. London: Verso.
- Mahboob, A., & Paltridge, B. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis and critical applied linguistics*.
The encyclopedia of applied linguistics. UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Moffitt, Benjamin. (2015). “How to Perform Crisis: A Model for Understanding the Key Role of Crisis in Contemporary Populism.” *Government and Opposition* 50 (2): 189–217.
- Moffitt, B. (2016). *The Global Rise of Populism: Performance, Political Style, and Representation*. Stanford University Press, 2016.
- Mudde C, Rovira Kaltwasser C. (2017) *Populism. A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mudde. C. (2004) “The Populist Zeitgeist”, *Government and Opposition* 39, no. 4 (2004): 542–563.
- Mudde, C. (2007: 23). *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge University Press, Mudde, C. and Kaltwasser. C, (2013). “Exclusionary vs. Inclusionary Populism: Comparing Contemporary Europe and Latin America.” *Government and Opposition* 48(2): 147–74.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2012.11>
- Mudde, C. and Kaltwasser. C, (2017) *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP Ostiguy, P., (2017). *Populism: A Socio-Cultural Approach*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom; New York.
- Pabriks, A. (2017). “Introduction.” *The Rise of Populism: Lessons for the European Union and the United States of America*. Andis Kudors and Artis Pabriks, editors. University of Latvia Press, 2017.

- Palano, D. (2022). Inventing “Populism”: Notes for the Genealogy of a Paranoid Concept. *Genealogy*, 6: 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy6010002>
 Received: 25 October 2021 Accepted: 18 December 2021 Published: 24 December 2021
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Bloomsbury Publishing
- Pratt, D and Woodlock, R, (2016). *Fear of Muslims? International Perspectives on Islamophobia* Retrieved from
<https://books.google.com/books?id=zmpBDAAAQBAJ>
- Prayoga, A. (2021). *The Representation of Islam: A Critical Discourse Analysis on Geert Wilders Speech*. Undergraduate Thesis. Department of English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
- Schreurs, S. (2021). Those were the days: of welfare nostalgia and the populist radical right in the Netherlands, Austria, and Sweden. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy* 37: 128–141. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ics.2020.30>
- Sevuk, T.&. Aydin, O.Ş. (2020). “Populism: The Rising Discourse of Political Language in Turkey”, *İMGELEM*, 4 (7): 299 - 320.
- Seymour. M. L., (2017). *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (New York: Doubleday, 1963).
- Sheri. B. (2017). “Populism Is a Problem: Elite Technocrats Aren’t the Solution”, *Foreign Policy*, 20 December 2017, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/12/20/populism-is-a-problem-elitist-technocrats-aren-t-the-solution/>.
- Shils. E. (1956). *The Torment of Secrecy. The Background and the Consequences of American Security Policies*. New York: The Free Press.

- Sperber, D., & D. Wilson. (1986b). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd Ed. 1995). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sperber, D., & D. Wilson. (1987). Précis of 'Relevance: Communication and Cognition'. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 10, 697–754.
- Stavrakakis, Yannis. (2017b). "Discourse theory in populism research: Three challenges and a dilemma." *Journal of Language and Politics* 16(4): 523–34.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.17025.sta>
- Taggart, P. (2004). Populism and representative politics in contemporary Europe. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 9 (3): 269–288
- Tenorio, E. H. (2011). Critical discourse analysis: An overview. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 183– 210. Retrieved from
<http://ojs.uib.no/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/658/609>
- Trump, D. (2018). *The Inaugural Address of Donald J. Trump*. Create Space Independent Publishing (Trump, 2018) Platform.
https://books.google.ps/books?id=QI_utgEACAAJ
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1(1), 17–28. Retrieved from
<http://discourses.org/OldArticles/Aims%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *The Reality of Racism On analyzing parliamentary debates on immigration*.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Massachusetts: Blackwell.

- Van Dijk. (2004). Critical Discourse Analysis
<http://srihayupku.blogspot.co.id/2016/10/critical-discourse-analysis-fromteun.htm>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. In K. Brown, & K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics 2nd Edition* (2nd ed., pp. 728-740). Boston: Elsevier.
- Vossen, K. (2017). *The Power of Populism*. New York: Routledge
- Weiss. G. & Wodak. R. (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp.1-35). London, UK: Palgrave.
doi:10.1057/9780230288423
- Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics. *Comparative Politics*, 34, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4>
- Wilson, D., & Sperber. D., (2004). Relevance theory. In L. R. Horn, & G. L. Ward (Eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. (pp. 607–632). Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Whorf, B. L. (1956). The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language. In J. B. Carroll (Ed.), *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (pp. 134-159). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wodak, & T. A. van Dijk, *Racism at The Top. Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic Issues in Six European States* (pp. 211-225). Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.
- Wodak, R. (2016). "We have the character of an island nation". A discourse-historical analysis of David Cameron's "Bloomberg Speech" on the European Union. European University Institute

Appendix A

Freedom and Islam Speech

Geert Wilders

Hello America, how are you today? As always it's really such an honor for me to be at restoration weekend. To be amongst friends brave people who are determined to let freedom prevail. People who supported me for so many years like my dear friend and Ally dr. Bob Schulman. Bob, thank you so much for everything you have been doing for us all those years, thank you. Also thank you David Horowitz, for all the inspiration and so many others that I'm seeing here today will help me in any phase of my life or trouble like Nina Rosenwald, Daniel Pipes and so many others thank you all so much. Every time I set foot on American soil. I feel the energy of the country that is characterized by freedom like no other country in the world and where bravery is still being held in high regard. I feel the energy of the country that was established to realize a vision, to realize an ideal, to discover and to maintain Liberty among men.

America was built on courage, on imagination and the undeniable determination which is still very much needed in the world today. I love the United States of America where Old Glory, your flag is always flying high, proud, and bright stars and stripes forever. And I specifically remember a very special moment last July, at the White House a Dutch art collector met with the American commander-in-chief, President Donald Trump, to present him with a very special flag, an American flag. A flag that was proudly held and proudly raised on one of the first ships that landed at the beaches of Normandy in 1944. And that flag that flag graced the landing craft that was commanded by Howard from there baked, an

American of Dutch descent. And at a perilous fight it witnessed how brave young Americans fought and died against the battle, against tyranny. And that beautiful old and battered Scout flag returned home, exactly 75 years after the liberation of Europe. And it's that flag that reminds me how connected how United we are the Americans and the Dutch. It reminds me that though our countries may be an ocean apart in the darkest hour of our history America answered. It reminds me that we share our history, we share the color of our flags, we share the beautiful red white and blue. But we also share our future because we share the same values. We believe in freedom, we believe in justice, we believe in Liberty. And we know that these principles are as valuable as they are vulnerable. May our flags remind us as I quote the great President Ronald Reagan that our freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be thoughtful, it must be protected and handed on to them to do the same.

Unfortunately most of the European leaders do not don't protect our freedom. The freedom, that American soldiers fought for and sacrificed their life for. After Nazism, after communism was defeated, they fail to stop Islamism today. They open our borders to more and more Islam and belief in cultural relativism. In the sickening mantra that all cultures are equal which of course they are not. They fail to subscribe to the view to the truth that Islam and freedom are incompatible. As we can see in any country in the world where Islam is already dominant today.

Everywhere Islam hoots freedom dies. Stop the beating Islam.

Neutrality in the face of evil is evil but appeasement is downright suicide. And here in America your president, Donald J Trump, proves to be a very wise and a very brave man. A very brave man who fights against evil. He fought the Islamic

state and rightfully ordered their leader to be killed. He built a wall at your southern border and he introduced travel bans from Islamic countries such as Iran Libya Somalia Syria and Yemen. He allows very few to zero resettlement of so-called refugees in the United States of America. And he is not sidetracked by the nonsense of the left who are obsessed with fake issues like climate change. He is focusing on the real important issues like security, economy, and terrorism. And believe me, for somebody who is coming from Europe this is all historic it is legendary to have a president like that.

I wish we had such brave leaders in Europe. People who put our own people and nation first as president Trump puts America first. And as a foreign politician I should not interfere in domestic American politics. But allow me as a friend of America to give a message as the leader of the Opposition in the Dutch parliament, to all my colleagues in your House of Representatives, to the Democrats in the house most specifically. For all your president I say to my colleagues in your house for all your president Donald Trump has done for your country. He does not deserve impeachment he deserves the Nobel Peace Prize. I also admire president Trump's unwavering support for the State of Israel. He made America the first nation in the world to move its embassy to Jerusalem. He recognized he recognized the sovereignty of Israel over the Golan Heights. He knows he knows that Israel is one of us that Israel is the first line of defense of a common heritage and culture. That Israel indeed is a beacon of light in an area of total darkness. And just like the American soldiers stormed the Normandy beaches in 1944, today young Israeli men and women are fighting for our freedom, for our civilization, for our values, and they deserve our utmost respect. So, I believe we

all must stand strong with Israel. We have to stand strong with Israel. We stand strong with Israel when they triumph and we stand strong with Israel in the hours of need. we stand strong with Israel in the hours of need. When dark Islamic forces rain rockets upon it citizens of Israel, we stand strong with Israel. And just this week we saw again rockets of hatreds pouring down on innocent Israeli citizens. But remember my friends 'Am Yisrael Chai', the Jewish nation leaves, the Jewish nation leaves, is resilient and will defeat it fish's enemies. When the evil empire of Iran threatens to wipe Israel off the map. We stand strong with Israel and we stand strong with Israel in their quest for peace and justice. In the fight against the anti-semitic BDS movements.

Last week the European Court of Justice ruled that products made in Judea and Samaria can no longer be labeled in Europe as made in Israel. And this kangaroo court describes these territories as occupied territories. But my friends those are not occupied territories. These are liberated territories. I lived and worked in Judea for almost a year. It's the heartland of the Jewish States. And today today, we see the Jews leaving from Europe. Unfortunately, Jews are leaving Europe today because of the Islamic and the left anti-semitism. And Evelyn Marcus a dear friend of mine, where's Evelyn? this Evelyn please Evelyn Marcus who is here she's standing there.

Evelyn Marcus made the documentary called 'Never Again is now', I repeat 'Never Again is Now' exactly about that issue. And I recommend you to watch it to support it. It is important that this film 'Never Again is Now' about Jews leaving Europe because of anti-semitism, is watched by us and elsewhere. Thank you so much Evelyn for making this documentary. My friends, in Europe most

government leaders exactly do the opposite as President Trump. They open the borders to more and more immigrants, most of them from Islamic countries with Islamic values. As a matter of fact we are now in the process of being colonized by Islamic colonists. They dismantle our nation states. They give away our national sovereignty to bureaucratic institutions our leaders like the European Union. They a piece the evil ideology and they facilitate the demise of freedom of speech. Actually, they are the one, not your leaders but our leaders are the ones that deserve to be impeached.

My friends I believe in freedom, I believe in the American dream, a better life for generations to come. Where anyone can obtain their own version of success through sacrifice, through risk taking, through hard work. It's a dream that many European citizens share. But in order to keep that dream alive, we have to stand up for the truth. And the Russian writer and dissident Alexander Solzhenitsyn used to say that the truth is seldom sweet. It's almost always very bitter. And he was right. But the truth should be heard. And the truth is once again that the Western civilization, our civilization, based on Humanity on Judaism and Christianity is the best civilization on earth. It's far superior to the Islamic civilization. And I do believe that the best days lie ahead of us but only if we persevere, no matter what. Only if we resist this totalitarian ideology called Islam that is threatening us. All we have to fight back. And someone who never gave up, someone who never gave up. And I'm sure never will give up is David Horowitz. Somebody who spoke before here, called him a giant, and he really is. David has been an inspiration to me and to many others. Not only in America, but around the world for a very long time. His mission, David's mission and death of his freedom

center, is very clear and very strong. Identify the enemy and devise ways to defeat him. And the collaboration between the political left and America's enemies abroad and criminals at home is not only an American phenomenon, we experience it in Europe. Every day and his David's mission to defend free societies which are under attack from the enemies within and without, is more topical than ever. It even became worse in Europe when not only the left but also many of the so-called conservatives or conservative liberals, as the German Chancellor Merkel of our own Prime Minister Rutte from Netherlands, are acting like the left today. They are the ones opening our borders to mass immigrations. They are the ones inviting the Islamization of societies, of inviting the culture of hate and submission, of giving away our national security, our freedom of speech, our national sovereignty our cultural identity. They believe that issues as climate change are more important than stopping Islamic barbarism. And for that fight and for that resilience that we have, also the people of Europe, have to thank David Horowitz. Thank you David for your inspiration. Unfortunately most of our European leaders are weak, chicken-hearted and afraid. The followers of Islam however are well organized, well-funded, and highly motivated by the dangerous ideology. Unfortunately, they are more often better motivated than the majority of our own people. That the Alliance of the left and the Liberals that they made an alliance with but fortunately these weak politicians don't represent the future. They don't represent hope. More and more Europeans today see the necessity to vote for politicians who are willing and able to stand up against the evil of Islam. To defend our superior culture. To protect our freedom. And in many many European countries we see that patriots are gaining electoral power. In Italy, in

Hungary, in Greece, in Belgium, in France, and last week our friends from the Fox party in Spain doubled their seats. So if we stand up and resist, the future is ours. The future belongs to the Patriots of Europe. But there is no time to wait for future. We need to act today. It is our duty that we push back, that we fight back and defend what our fathers and forefathers fought for. We won't let the progressive and the Islamic allies define our future. We won't let them destroy our prosperity. We won't let them destroy our future. Unfortunately, if you resist, you will pay a very high price, as I experienced myself as dr. Bob said I got many fatwas. I'm on the death list of many Islamic terror organizations and I left under 24/7 police protection and security and in government safe safe houses with my wife for more than 15 years now. But besides that I have been taken to court and threatened to be taken to court in the Netherlands, in Austria, in Pakistan, in Jordan, in the Islamic Republic of Iran, in Saudi Arabia, and I'm a persona non grata for life in Indonesia. It's a legal jihad against the freedom of speech. Not only from Islamic barbaric regimes but also from Western countries. Western governments like my own home country. because indeed for over a decade now the Dutch political establishment and the public prosecutors are hunting me down. They are waging the legal war, the legal jihad against me with the sole purpose for silencing me. Silencing my dissenting opinion. Silencing my and their political opponents.

Twelve years ago, I made a short documentary called 'Fitna'. About the dark sides of the Quran and the Islam. And the Dutch government even at that time tried to stop me from making this movie, for distributing this movie. And they tried to get me convicted for the crime of us exposing the truth. And right after my full

acquittal at that time, the form of Dutch Ministry of justice, was responsible for the Dutch Public Prosecutor's Office set to a senior official that Wilders is getting too much in our way. So the political witch-hunt continued. And since then, since the last five years I am entangled in a second political trial in my home country. Weeks I had to spend in a special secured court room where normally terrorists are being tried. I had to spend my days in that horrific courtroom instead of Parliament's. And what do they claim was my crime? asking a crowd about Moroccans in the Netherlands, the group with one of the highest crime rates. 80 percents, 80 percents of all Dutch Muslims who went to fight to Syria and Iraq for the Islamic state were Moroccans. And now there are solid evidences that the Ministry of Justice has influenced this trial, have tried to steer it. Political settling of scores of the highest order. And indeed, as dr. Bob said, I am the leader of the second biggest party in the Dutch parliament. I'm the leader of the Opposition in the Dutch parliament. But I almost spend more time in courtroom and with lawyers than I debate in Parliament's. And as if that's not enough today, also Austria is considering to prosecute me now for a speech I held in 2015, almost five years ago in Vienna. As a guest of one of the major political parties. I spoke about the dangers of Islam. You can see my speech on YouTube. And in Austria it seems that if a group of people feel offended, it is already punishable by law. And indeed, one Austrian mosque organization one filed a complaint after my speech. And now I could be prosecuted and jailed for two years in Austrian jail. I hope you will all come and visit me by the way.

But whether I end up in jail and not is not the most pressing issue. I gave up my personal freedom years ago. The real question is will free speech will speaking the

truth about Islam be put behind bars? well that's even the larger question, will we leave Europe's children the values of Rome, Athens, and Jerusalem or the values of Mecca, Teheran, and Gaza? what will be the choice? and this legal battle my friends is not over yet. But I tell you that whatever the outcome will be, I will never be silent. I will always speak the truth. I will always discuss issues regarding Islam and mass immigration. For that, it's not only my political mission but it's my mission of my life. It's about freedom. It's the mission to safeguard us from the dangers of Islamization. So we have to never ever give up. Dr. Bob already just quoted Edmund Burke, who said the only thing necessary for triumph, for the triumph of evil, is for good men to do nothing. Unfortunately in Europe, most men do nothing. They allow our women being harassed and raped. They allow young Muslim girls to be genitally mutilated. Only in my own country, in Holland, more than 40.000 women have been genitally mutilated, more than 40.000. They allow Pakistani grooming gangs to rape young British girls. My dear ally Katie Hopkins, I believe spoke about it yesterday. where's Katie Hopkins? can you please stand up? my friends, indeed, let me just say a few words if you allow me about Katie Hopkins. Katie Hopkins is a real brave person. She is the true hero. She is somebody who Europe needs more people about. She's not afraid. She speaks the truth. I recommend that you follow her. She is tougher than Margaret Thatcher and she's braver, braver than president Prime Minister Johnson. She should be the next Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

So, the European elites are also allowing terrorists killing innocent people, shouting Allahu Akbar. They allow Islamic schools where children like in my own country, Holland are being taught that Christians should be lashed stoned and

beheaded by the sword. They allow that Jews wearing a kippah are beaten up in our streets. They allow no-go zones where Sharia law is the law of the land or at least a lot of the streets. In many European cities today, they allow the indigenous people to feel as if they are foreigners in their own land. It's a bloody shame but it is happening today. And the people of Europe the people of Europe have had enough of this treasonous behavior from the elites, who adore multiculturalism and destroy our identity and our traditions. I'm not exaggerating. Parts of Europe resemble war zones today. When you look at major cities in France, in Belgium, in the Netherlands, in the United Kingdom, in Sweden, and anywhere else in Europe, at least not in Eastern Europe with a western part of Europe, you see that it looks like northern Africa or the Middle East. That our values like freedom, the equality between men and women do not exist anymore. That violence rape and intolerant tolerance became more dominant and Western values are replaced by values resembling sharia law. So it's time to say enough is enough. We have to say no more. Please say no more. No more terror, no more Sharia law, no more anti-semitism, no more legal jihad, no more evil, no more political weakness, no more Islam, stop selling us out. My friends the essence of my speech today is that Europe is in the process of being Islamized and it's getting worse by the day. And if we don't fight back, we will lose everything. Indeed, we are facing the first and most major existential threat and the first time since the Second World War. The ancient heritage of our forefathers is under attack. And we have to stand up and defend it. A century and a half ago, here in America a young president said exactly what I mean. And this is what Abraham Lincoln said in the year 1862: 'the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy presence. The occasion is

piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think a new. We must disentrall ourselves and then we shall save our country and of growth'. And I can think of no better moment to defend the freedom than now. And it is up to us to let us many people as possible to realize this.

For we are a free men and women of the West, and freedom is our birthright. And those who want to deny liberty to us, do not belong to our society. It is as simple as that. So this is what I believe, we Europeans, we in Europe should do. And maybe you should do the same but that's up to you. First, stop pretending that Islam is a religion. Islam is not a religion. Islam is a totalitarian ideology based on conquest submission and violence. Islam is not a religion. Second protect our constitutional freedoms by not granting them to a totalitarian ideology that wants to rob us of our freedom. Let them not use our freedoms to rob us of our freedoms. Let us not be too politically correct. We should not grant them their freedom to rob us of our freedom. So no more Islamic schools, no more mosques for they represent an ideology of hate, of violence, of submission.

Third, we should stop the immigration full stop the immigration from Islamic nation. We should immediately deport all immigrants who commit crimes and act according to Sharia law. There is no room for Sharia law in a free society. Fourth, we must all and always support Israel and allow them to protect themselves against vicious enemies like the Islamic Republic of Iran. We Europeans should reintroduce national border control. For we have none at this time. If you enter Greece, you are in Holland. We should reintroduce national border control. We

should introduce like the Israelis do and have administrative detention to detain potential terrorists. This is what we should do.

We should stop Islamic symbolism. I am very proud that since August first the Islamic burqa and the Islamic kneecap is because of the majority of the Dutch parliament supported the motions from me to ban it is outlawed in the Netherlands and public places. And we should of course to be able to speak the truth introduce a European kind of first amendment, so that Islam critics cannot be prosecuted anymore. I believe there are two things that Americans should do. First, learn your lessons from Europe. Learn your lessons for Europe. Islam already arrived at America. We heard speakers before me rightfully saying that but it's just don't think it's a long way before you become the second Europe. Islam will conquer before you know it. Be resilient. stand up and fight for your freedom and against Islam. And second, please second maybe the most important thing I ask Americans to do is, re-elect President Donald J Trump. And let us not be afraid when people are no longer afraid to speak the truth.

Seemingly invincible evil empires begin to crumble. And Islam is one of those evil empires. And it too, I am sure will collapse once people hear and understand the truth about Islam more as they do today. So we have no alternative than to make stand against the enemies of freedom, from within and without. As David taught us. And our enemies should know that we will never, never apologize for being freemen. We will never bow for the combined forces of Mecca and the left.

And we will never surrender. My friends, there is no stronger force than the force of free men, fighting for the great cause of Liberty. And the West indeed is in danger today. But we can still prevail even when we are insulted. Even when we

are harassed and intimidated, even when they take us to court for speaking the truth, even when we are marked for death, even for stating an opinion. We must never be silenced. Never ever be silenced. And I promise you, at the end of the day we will win. Thank you and good luck to you all.

Appendix B

Nomination Announcement Speech

Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands. So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this.

And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.

They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen.

Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time.

When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do? When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time.

When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically.

The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems

Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not

sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.

But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people.

It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin America, and it's coming probably— probably— from the Middle East. But we don't know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don't know what's happening. And it's got to stop and it's got to stop fast.

Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become rich. I'm in competition with them.

They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don't have to pay interest, because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken.

So now ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has. And in 19— and I will tell you this, and I said it very strongly, years ago, I said— and I love the military, and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had, and we need it more now than ever. But I said, "Don't hit Iraq," because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East. Iran is going to take over the Middle East, Iran and somebody else will get the oil, and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq. Think of it. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league.

We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love — they're great — all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.

And we have nothing. We can't even go there. We have nothing. And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it.

Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees— these are big vehicles— were left behind for the enemy. 2,000? You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them.

Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign of strength, right? But not for us. It was below zero. Whoever heard of this? It's never below zero.

Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate. And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it.

That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs.

But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense.

Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work.

It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don't know if it worked. And I thought it was horrible when it was broadcast on television, because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know what they're doing."

We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare.

Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof. You have to be hit by a tractor, literally, a tractor, to use it, because the deductibles are so high, it's virtually useless. It's virtually useless. It is a disaster.

And remember the \$5 billion website? \$5 billion we spent on a website, and to this day it doesn't work. A \$5 billion website.

I have so many websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they do a website. It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website.

Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing's gonna get done.

They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land. They will not.

As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellow Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don't know— "Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do we do? How do we do it?"

I like them. And I hear their speeches. And they don't talk jobs and they don't talk China. When was the last time you heard China is killing us? They're devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe. It makes it impossible for our companies to compete, impossible. They're killing us.

But you don't hear that from anybody else. You don't hear it from anybody else. And I watch the speeches.

I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moon will set, all sorts of wonderful things will happen. And people are saying, "What's

going on? I just want a job. Just get me a job. I don't need the rhetoric. I want a job."

And that's what's happening. And it's going to get worse, because remember, Obamacare really kicks in in '16, 2016. Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might be on one of my courses. I would invite him, I actually would say. I have the best courses in the world, so I'd say, you what, if he wants to— I have one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac. If he'd

like to play, that's fine.

In fact, I'd love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing.

But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league. It is going to be amazingly destructive.

Doctors are quitting. I have a friend who's a doctor, and he said to me the other day, "Donald, I never saw anything like it. I have more accountants than I have nurses. It's a disaster. My patients are beside themselves. They had a plan that was good. They have no plan now."

We have to repeal Obamacare, and it can be— and— and it can be replaced with something much better for everybody. Let it be for everybody. But much better and much less expensive for people and for the government. And we can do it.

So I've watched the politicians. I've dealt with them all my life. If you can't make a good deal with a politician, then there's something wrong with you. You're certainly not very good. And that's what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don't even have a chance. They're controlled fully— they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully.

Yes, they control them. Hey, I have lobbyists. I have to tell you. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me. They're great. But you know what? it won't

happen. It won't happen. Because we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country, it's destroying our country.

We have to stop, and it has to stop now.

Now, our country needs— our country needs a truly great leader, and we need a truly great leader now. We need a leader that wrote “The Art of the Deal.”

We need a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, can bring back our military, can take care of our vets. Our vets have been abandoned.

And we also need a cheerleader.

You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, “Well, the one thing, I think he'll do well.

I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country. I think he'd be a great spirit.”

He was vibrant. He was young. I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader.

He's not a leader. That's true. You're right about that.

But he wasn't a cheerleader. He's actually a negative force. He's been a negative force. He wasn't a cheerleader; he was the opposite.

We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great again. It's not great again.

We need— we need somebody— we need somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again. We can do that.

And, I will tell you, I love my life. I have a wonderful family. They're saying, “Dad, you're going to do something that's going to be so tough.”

You know, all of my life, I've heard that a truly successful person, a really, really successful person and even modestly successful cannot run for public office. Just can't happen. And yet that's the kind of mindset that you need to make this country great again.

So ladies and gentlemen...I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again.

It can happen. Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people.

We have people that aren't working. We have people that have no incentive to work. But they're going to have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they'll be proud, and they'll love it, and they'll make much more than they would've ever made, and they'll be— they'll be doing so well, and we're going to be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen.

I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that.

I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money.

Right now, think of this: We owe China \$1.3 trillion. We owe Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal's even better.

How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?

I'm going to tell you— thank you. I'm going to tell you a couple of stories about trade, because I'm totally against the trade bill for a number of reasons.

Number one, the people negotiating don't have a clue. Our president doesn't have a clue. He's a bad negotiator.

He's the one that did Bergdahl. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there.

We get Bergdahl. We get a traitor. We get a no-good traitor, and they get the five people that they wanted for years, and those people are now back on the battlefield trying to kill us. That's the negotiator we have.

Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe won't exist very long. It's a disaster, and we have to protect Israel. But...

So we need people— I'm a free trader. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don't have talented people, if you don't have great leadership, if you don't have people that know business, not just a political hack that got the job because he made a contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about, are gotten, free trade terrible.

Free trade can be wonderful if you have smart people, but we have people that are stupid. We have people that aren't smart. And we have people that are controlled by special interests. And it's just not going to work.

So, here's a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again.

But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything— everything, they got away with it again. And it's impossible for our people here to compete.

So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago. He's very upset. I said, "What's your problem?"

He said, "You know, I make great product." And I said, "I know. I know that because I buy the product."

He said, "I can't get it into China. They won't accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it."

So, here's a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again.

But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything—everything, they got away with it again. And it's impossible for our people here to compete.

So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago. He's very upset. I said, "What's your problem?"

He said, "You know, I make great product."

And I said, "I know. I know that because I buy the product."

He said, "I can't get it into China. They won't accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it."

I said, "Oh, wait a minute, that's terrible. Does anyone know this?"

He said, “Yeah, they do it all the time with other people.”

I said, “They send it back?”

“Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They’re not supposed to be doing that. I told them.”

Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there.

Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing’s secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.

Hey, I’m not saying they’re stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for— I just sold an apartment for \$15 million to somebody from China. Am I supposed to dislike them? I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas, that I got from China in a war.

Very valuable.

I love China. The biggest bank in the world is from China. You know where their United States headquarters is located? In this building, in Trump Tower. I love China. People say, “Oh, you don’t like China?”

No, I love them. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders, and we can’t sustain ourself with that. There’s too much— it’s like— it’s like take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high school football team. That’s the difference between China’s leaders and our leaders.

They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China. We’re rebuilding many countries. China, you go there now, roads, bridges, schools, you never saw anything like it. They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes. And they’re all over the place.

We have all the cards, but we don't know how to use them. We don't even know that we have the cards, because our leaders don't understand the game. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly.

Now they're going militarily. They're building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. A military island. Now, our country could never do that because we'd have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalist wouldn't let our country—we would never build in an ocean. They built it in about one year, this massive military port.

They're building up their military to a point that is very scary. You have a problem with ISIS.

You have a bigger problem with China.

And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in terms of trade, is

Mexico. So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, "That's a terrible

story. I hate to hear it." But I have another one, Ford.

So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, rips it out. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the Wall Street Journal recently. Everybody thought it was a done deal. It's going in and that's going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people.

All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign, announces they're not going to Tennessee. They're gonna spend their \$1 billion in Mexico instead. Not good.

Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. \$2.5 billion, it's going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company.

So I announced that I'm running for president. I would...

... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in— and I wouldn't even use— you know, I have— I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.

You get a lot of them that are overrated. They're not good. They think they are. They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffaloes. But they're not good.

But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks.

We will do very, very well, very, very well.

But I wouldn't even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know. If I was president, I'd say, "Congratulations. I understand that you're building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you're going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flow them across the border."

And you say to yourself, "How does that help us," right? "How does that help us? Where is that good"? It's not.

So I would say, "Congratulations. That's the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we're going to charge you a 35-percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that's it.

Now, here's what is going to happen. If it's not me in the position, it's one of these politicians that we're running against, you know, the 400 people that we're (inaudible). And here's what's going to happen. They're not so stupid. They know it's not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford and say, "You

can't do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I take care of you, and you can't do that to Ford."

And guess what? No problem. They're going to build in Mexico. They're going to take away thousands of jobs. It's very bad for us.

So under President Trump, here's what would happen:

The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news. But it could be he'd want to be cool, and he'll wait until the next day. You know, they want to be a little cool.

And he'll say, "Please, please, please." He'll beg for a little while, and I'll say, "No interest." Then he'll call all sorts of political people, and I'll say, "Sorry, fellas. No interest," because I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need anybody's money.

I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich. I (inaudible).

And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country.

So— because we got to make the country rich. It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass. We got \$18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems. We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.

We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bring money in, and we're going to save it.

But here's what's going to happen:

After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns, after I'm called by all of the special interests and by the— the donors and by the lobbyists— and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero— I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say.

“Please reconsider,” I'll say no.

He'll say, “Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico.” That's it. They have no choice. They have no choice.

There are hundreds of things like that. I'll give you another example.

Saudi Arabia, they make \$1 billion a day. \$1 billion a day. I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever they have problems, we send over the ships. We say “we're gonna protect.” What are we doing? They've got nothing but money.

If the right person asked them, they'd pay a fortune. They wouldn't be there except for us.

And believe me, you look at the border with Yemen. You remember Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later, the place was blown up. Everybody got out— and they kept our equipment.

They always keep our equipment. We ought to send used equipment, right? They always keep our equipment. We ought to send some real junk, because, frankly, it would be— we ought to send our surplus. We're always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff.

But look at that border with Saudi Arabia. Do you really think that these people are interested in

Yemen? Saudi Arabia without us is gone. They're gone.

And I'm the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq. You know, all of these politicians that I'm running against now— it's so nice to say I'm running as opposed to if I run, if I run. I'm running.

But all of these politicians that I'm running against now, they're trying to disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq. He couldn't answer the question. He didn't know. I said, "Is he intelligent?"

Then I looked at Rubio. He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good thing or bad thing? He didn't know. He couldn't answer the question.

How are these people gonna lead us? How are we gonna— how are we gonna go back and make it great again? We can't. They don't have a clue. They can't lead us. They can't. They can't even answer simple questions. It was terrible.

But Saudi Arabia is in big, big trouble. Now, thanks to fracking and other things, the oil is all over the place. And I used to say it, there are ships at sea, and this was during the worst crisis, that were loaded up with oil, and the cartel kept the price up, because, again, they were smarter than our leaders. They were smarter than our leaders.

There is so much wealth out there that can make our country so rich again, and therefore make it great again. Because we need money. We're dying. We're dying. We need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people.

So Ford will come back. They'll all come back. And I will say this, this is going to be an election, in my opinion, that's based on competence.

Somebody said — thank you, darlin'.

Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter, “But, Mr. Trump, you’re not a nice person.”

That’s true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that know me, like me. Does my family like me? I think so, right. Look at my family. I’m proud of my family.

By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, Tiffany, Ivanka did a great job. Did she do a great job?

Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I’m very proud of my family. They’re a great family.

So the reporter said to me the other day, “But, Mr. Trump, you’re not a nice person. How can you get people to vote for you?”

I said, “I don’t know.” I said, “I think that number one, I am a nice person. I give a lot of money away to charities and other things. I think I’m actually a very nice person.”

But, I said, “This is going to be an election that’s based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people. And they’re tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world. And they’re tired of spending more money on education than any nation in the world per capita, than any nation in the world, and we are 26th in the world, 25 countries are better than us in education. And some of them are like third world countries. But we’re becoming a third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads, everything. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I’ll do. I’ll do it. Because a lot of people said, “He’ll never run.

Number one, he won’t want to give up his lifestyle.”

They’re right about that, but I’m doing it.

Number two, I'm a private company, so nobody knows what I'm worth. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth.

So I said, "That's OK." I'm proud of my net worth. I've done an amazing job.

I started off— thank you— I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said — and I love my father. I learned so much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But I learned a lot.

But he used to say, "Donald, don't go into Manhattan. That's the big leagues. We don't know anything about that. Don't do it."

I said, "I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gotta do it, Dad. I've gotta do it."

And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan and did a lot of great deals— the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young. And now I'm building all over the world, and I love what I'm doing.

But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks."

So I said to myself, you know, nobody's ever going to know unless I run, because I'm really proud of my success. I really am.

I've employed— I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. That means medical. That means education. That means everything.

So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months, because it's big and complex, and they've put together a statement, a financial

statement, just a summary. But everything will be filed eventually with the government, and we don't [use] extensions or anything. We'll be filing it right on time. We don't need anything.

And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday, because they said, "He had assets of \$9 billion." So I said, "No, that's the wrong number. That's the wrong number. Not assets."

So they put together this. And before I say it, I have to say this. I made it the old-fashioned way.

It's real estate. You know, it's real estate.

It's labor, and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't in unions, and it's all over the place and building all over the world.

And I have assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected— 9 billion 240 million dollars. And I have liabilities of about \$500 million. That's long-term debt, very low interest rates.

In fact, one of the big banks came to me and said, "Donald, you don't have enough borrowings. Could we loan you \$4 billion?" I said, "I don't need it. I don't want it. And I've been there. I don't want it."

But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted. So I have a total net worth, and now with the increase, it'll be well-over \$10 billion. But here, a total net worth of—net worth, not assets, not— a net worth, after all debt, after all expenses, the greatest assets— Trump Tower, 1290

Avenue of the Americas, Bank of America building in San Francisco, 40 Wall Street, sometimes referred to as the Trump building right opposite the New York— many other places all over the world.

So the total is \$8,737,540,00. Now I'm not doing that...

I'm not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don't have to brag. I don't have to, believe it or not. I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs. We need that thinking. We have the opposite thinking.

We have losers. We have losers. We have people that don't have it. We have people that are morally corrupt. We have people that are selling this country down the drain.

So I put together this statement, and the only reason I'm telling you about it today is because we really do have to get going, because if we have another three or four years—you know, we're at \$8 trillion now. We're soon going to be at \$20 trillion.

According to the economists— who I'm not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they're saying— that \$24 trillion— we're very close— that's the point of no return. \$24 trillion. We will be there soon. That's when we become Greece. That's when we become a country that's unsalvageable. And we're gonna be there very soon. We're gonna be there very soon.

So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare.

I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall.

Mark my words.

Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.

I will find — within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.

I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons. And we won't be using a man like Secretary Kerry that has absolutely no concept of negotiation, who's making a horrible and laughable deal, who's just being tapped along as they make weapons right now, and then goes into a bicycle race at 72 years old, and falls and breaks his leg. I won't be doing that. And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race. That I can tell you.

I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately.

Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.

Now, it's very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, "You know,

Mr. Trump," and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn't want guns. And now since this happened"— it's up in the prison area— "my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns.

We now have a gun on every table. We're ready to start shooting."

I said, "Very interesting."

So protect the Second Amendment.

End— end Common Core. Common Core should— it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination. He's weak on immigration. He's in favor of Common Core. How the hell can you vote for this guy? You just can't do it. We have to end education has to be local.

Rebuild the country's infrastructure.

Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.

I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.

You know, we're building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office, we're converting it into one of the world's great hotels. It's gonna be the best hotel in Washington, D.C. We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration. We got it. It was the most highly sought after— or one of them, but I think the most highly sought after project in the history of General Services. We got it. People were shocked, Trump got it.

Well, I got it for two reasons. Number one, we're really good. Number two, we had a really good plan. And I'll add in the third, we had a great financial statement. Because the General Services, who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people, they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure it got built.

So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports. You come into La Guardia Airport, it's like we're in a third world country. You look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor. They throw down asphalt, and they throw.

You look at these airports, we are like a third world country. And I come in from China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, and they have the most incredible airports in the world. You come to back to this country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports. We have to rebuild our infrastructure.

Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it.

Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People have been paying it for years. And now many of these candidates want to cut it. You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost.

Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.

Reduce our \$18 trillion in debt, because, believe me, we're in a bubble. We have artificially low interest rates. We have a stock market that, frankly, has been good to me, but I still hate to see what's happening. We have a stock market that is so bloated.

Be careful of a bubble because what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared to what happens. So be very, very careful.

And strengthen our military and take care of our vets. So, so important.

Sadly, the American dream is dead.

But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Appendix C

Nomination Acceptance Speech

Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States. Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace. We will be a country of generosity and warmth. But we will also be a country of law and order.

Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.

Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally, some have even been its victims.

I have a message for all of you: the crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon come to an end. Beginning on January 20th 2017, safety will be restored.

The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead.

It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation.

I will present the facts plainly and honestly. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore.

So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week.

But here, at our convention, there will be no lies. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else.

These are the facts:

Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this Administration's rollback of criminal enforcement.

Homicides last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years. In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60% in nearby Baltimore.

In the President's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 have been the victims of shootings this year alone. And more than 3,600 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office.

The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50% compared to this point last year. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.

The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total from 2015. They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.

One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root. She was 21 years-old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.

I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this Administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. One more child to sacrifice on the altar of open borders. What about our economy?

Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper: Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African American youth are not employed. 2 million more Latinos are in poverty today than when the President took his oath of office less than eight years ago. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely.

Household incomes are down more than \$4,000 since the year 2000. Our manufacturing trade deficit has reached an all-time high – nearly \$800 billion in a single year. The budget is no better.

President Obama has doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, and growing. Yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps.

Now let us consider the state of affairs abroad.

Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint.

This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran \$150 billion and gave us nothing – it will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever made. Another humiliation came when president Obama drew a red line in Syria – and the whole world knew it meant nothing.

In Libya, our consulate – the symbol of American prestige around the globe – was brought down in flames. America is far less safe – and the world is far less stable – than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America’s foreign policy.

I am certain it is a decision he truly regrets. Her bad instincts and her bad judgment – something pointed out by Bernie Sanders – are what caused the disasters unfolding today. Let’s review the record. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map.

Libya was cooperating. Egypt was peaceful. Iraq was seeing a reduction in violence. Iran was being choked by sanctions. Syria was under control. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have? ISIS has spread across the region, and the world. Libya is in ruins, and our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control. Iraq is in chaos.

Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West. After fifteen years of wars in the

Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before.

This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction and weakness.

But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be America's legacy. The problems we face now – poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad – will last only as long as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them. A change in leadership is required to change these outcomes. Tonight, I will share with you my plan of action for America.

The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents, is that our plan will put America First. Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo. As long as we are led by politicians who will not put America First, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect. This will all change in 2017.

The American People will come first once again. My plan will begin with safety at home – which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. There can be no prosperity without law and order. On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.

A number of these reforms that I will outline tonight will be opposed by some of our nation's most powerful special interests. That is because these interests have rigged our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit.

Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place. They are throwing money at her because they have total control over everything she does. She is their puppet, and they pull the strings.

That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will never change. My message is that things have to change – and they have to change right now. Every day I wake up determined to deliver for the people I have met all across this nation that have been neglected, ignored, and abandoned.

I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country. People who work hard but no longer have a voice.

I AM YOUR VOICE.

I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good. I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens.

When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or worse still, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash – I am not able to look the other way.

And when a Secretary of State illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about it in every different form and faces no consequence – I know that corruption has reached a level like never before.

When the FBI Director says that the Secretary of State was “extremely careless” and “negligent,” in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did. They were just used to save her from facing justice for her terrible crimes.

In fact, her single greatest accomplishment may be committing such an egregious crime and getting away with it – especially when others have paid so dearly. When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers I know the time for action has come.

I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people that cannot defend themselves. Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it. I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders – he never had a chance.

But his supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest issue: trade. Millions of Democrats will join our movement because we are going to fix the system so it works for all Americans. In this cause, I am proud to have at my side the next Vice President of the United States: Governor Mike Pence of Indiana.

We will bring the same economic success to America that Mike brought to Indiana. He is a man of character and accomplishment. He is the right man for the job. The first task for our new Administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime and terrorism and lawlessness that threatens their communities.

America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were brutally executed. In the days after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee.

On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Three were killed, and four were badly injured. An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans. I have a message to every last person threatening the peace on our streets and the safety of our police: when I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order our country.

I will work with, and appoint, the best prosecutors and law enforcement officials in the country to get the job done. In this race for the White House, I am the Law And Order candidate. The irresponsible rhetoric of our President, who has used the pulpit of the presidency to divide us by race and color, has made America a more dangerous environment for everyone.

This Administration has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them at every level.

When I am President, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and protected equally.

Every action I take, I will ask myself: does this make life better for young Americans in Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Ferguson who have as much of a right to live out their dreams as any other child America?

To make life safe in America, we must also address the growing threats we face from outside America: we are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS. Once again, France is the victim of brutal Islamic terrorism.

Men, women and children viciously mowed down. Lives ruined. Families ripped apart. A nation in mourning.

The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been over and over – at the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, and a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Only weeks ago, in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorist targeted our LGBT community. As your President, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBT citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology. To protect us from terrorism, we need to focus on three things.

We must have the best intelligence gathering operation in the world. We must abandon the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, Libya, Egypt and Syria. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terror.

This includes working with our greatest ally in the region, the State of Israel. Lastly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place.

My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country under President Obama. She proposes this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from. I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people.

Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and never will be.

Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers. We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people.

On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and Jamiel Shaw. They are just three brave representatives of many thousands. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more deeply than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our border.

These families have no special interests to represent them. There are no demonstrators to protest on their behalf. My opponent will never meet with them, or share in their pain. Instead, my opponent wants Sanctuary Cities. But where was sanctuary for Kate Steinle? Where was Sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, Sabine and Jamiel? Where was sanctuary for all the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so horribly?

These wounded American families have been alone. But they are alone no longer. Tonight, this candidate and this whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering the same awful fate.

We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.

I have been honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol Agents, and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful immigration system.

By ending catch-and-release on the border, we will stop the cycle of human smuggling and violence. Illegal border crossings will go down. Peace will be restored. By enforcing the rules for the millions who overstay their visas, our laws will finally receive the respect they deserve.

Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied – and every politician who has denied them – to listen very closely to the words I am about to say.

On January 21st of 2017, the day after I take the oath of office, Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced. We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone.

But my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens. My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration. Communities want relief.

Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness. Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from poverty.

I have a different vision for our workers. It begins with a new, fair trade policy that protects our jobs and stands up to countries that cheat. It's been a signature message of my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the moment I take the oath of office.

I have made billions of dollars in business making deals – now I'm going to make our country rich again. I am going to turn our bad trade agreements into great ones. America has lost nearly-one third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997, following the enactment of disastrous trade deals supported by Bill and Hillary Clinton.

Remember, it was Bill Clinton who signed NAFTA, one of the worst economic deals ever made by our country.

Never again.

I am going to bring our jobs back to Ohio and to America – and I am not going to let companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way, without consequences.

My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class. She supported NAFTA, and she supported China's entrance into the

World Trade Organization – another one of her husband’s colossal mistakes.

She supported the job killing trade deal with South Korea. She has supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The TPP will not only destroy our manufacturing, but it will make America subject to the rulings of foreign governments. I pledge to never sign any trade agreement that hurts our workers, or that diminishes our freedom and independence. Instead, I will make individual deals with individual countries.

No longer will we enter into these massive deals, with many countries, that are thousands of pages long – and which no one from our country even reads or understands. We are going to enforce all trade violations, including through the use of taxes and tariffs, against any country that cheats.

This includes stopping China’s outrageous theft of intellectual property, along with their illegal product dumping, and their devastating currency manipulation. Our horrible trade agreements with China and many others, will be totally renegotiated. That includes renegotiating NAFTA to get a much better deal for America – and we’ll walk away if we don’t get the deal that we want.

We are going to start building and making things again.

Next comes the reform of our tax laws, regulations and energy rules. While Hillary Clinton plans a massive tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any candidate who has declared for the presidential race this year – Democrat or Republican. Middle-income Americans will experience profound relief, and taxes will be simplified for everyone.

America is one of the highest-taxed nations in the world. Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come roaring back into our country. Then we are going to deal with the issue of regulation, one of the greatest job-killers of them all. Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year, and we will end it. We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy. This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job creating economic activity over the next four decades.

My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and steel workers of our country out of work – that will never happen when I am President. With these new economic policies, trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country.

This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans – We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of tomorrow. This, in turn, will create millions more jobs. We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their parents send them to a safe school of their choice.

My opponent would rather protect education bureaucrats than serve American children. We will repeal and replace disastrous Obamacare. You will be able to choose your own doctor again. And we will fix TSA at the airports! We will completely rebuild our depleted military, and the countries that we protect, at a massive loss, will be asked to pay their fair share.

We will take care of our great Veterans like they have never been taken care of before. My opponent dismissed the VA scandal as being not widespread – one more sign of how out of touch she really is. We are going to ask every Department

Head in government to provide a list of wasteful spending projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days. The politicians have talked about it, I'm going to do it. We are also going to appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our Constitution.

The replacement for Justice Scalia will be a person of similar views and principles. This will be one of the most important issues decided by this election. My opponent wants to essentially abolish the 2nd amendment. I, on the other hand, received the early and strong endorsement of the National Rifle Association and will protect the right of all Americans to keep their families safe.

At this moment, I would like to thank the evangelical community who have been so good to me and so supportive. You have so much to contribute to our politics, yet our laws prevent you from speaking your minds from your own pulpits.

An amendment, pushed by Lyndon Johnson, many years ago, threatens religious institutions with a loss of their tax-exempt status if they openly advocate their political views.

I am going to work very hard to repeal that language and protect free speech for all Americans. We can accomplish these great things, and so much else – all we need to do is start believing in ourselves and in our country again. It is time to show the whole world that America Is Back – bigger, and better and stronger than ever before.

In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife Melania and my wonderful children, Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany, and Barron: you will always be my greatest source of pride and joy. My Dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and

hardest working man I ever knew. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this tonight.

It's because of him that I learned, from my youngest age, to respect the dignity of work and the dignity of working people. He was a guy most comfortable in the company of bricklayers, carpenters, and electricians and I have a lot of that in me also. Then there's my mother, Mary. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded. She was a truly great mother. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known, and a great judge of character.

To my sisters Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother Robert and my late brother Fred, I will always give you my love you are most special to me. I have loved my life in business.

But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country – to go to work for all of you. It's time to deliver a victory for the American people. But to do that, we must break free from the petty politics of the past.

America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by a group of censors, critics, and cynics.

Remember: all of the people telling you that you can't have the country you want, are the same people telling you that I wouldn't be standing here tonight. No longer can we rely on those elites in media, and politics, who will say anything to keep a rigged system in place.

Instead, we must choose to Believe In America. History is watching us now.

It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that America is still free and independent and strong.

My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge. It reads: "I'm With Her".

I choose to recite a different pledge.

My pledge reads: "I'M WITH YOU – THE AMERICAN PEOPLE." I am your voice.

So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight: I'm With You, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you.

To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and towns, I make this promise: We Will Make America Strong Again.

We Will Make America Proud Again.

We Will Make America Safe Again.

And We Will Make America Great Again.

THANK YOU.

Appendix D

Inauguration Speech

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.