



SHANTI JOURNAL : A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal  
 Print ISSN: 2961x1601; E-ISSN: 2961-161x  
 ejournal Site: [www.nepjol.info/index.php/shantij](http://www.nepjol.info/index.php/shantij)  
 • Peer-Reviewed, Open access Journal  
 • Indexed in Nepjol



BISHWA SHANTI  
 CHIRAN-MILAN CAMPUS  
 URL:  
[www.bishwashanticampus.edu.np](http://www.bishwashanticampus.edu.np)

## Trump's advocacy of nationalism: A rhetorical analysis of selected speech

Shunil Rayamajhi

GT 'A' at Sainik

Awasiya Mahavidyalaya, Dharan, Nepal

**Article History:** Submitted 15 January Reviewed 10 February Revised 8 March  
**Corresponding Author:** Shunil Rayamajhi E-mail: [shunilrayamajhi082@gmail.com](mailto:shunilrayamajhi082@gmail.com)

Copyright 2023 © The Author(s). The publisher may reuse published articles with prior permission of the concerned author(s). The work is licensed a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License . [www.nepjol.info/index.php/shantij](http://www.nepjol.info/index.php/shantij)



### Abstract

*This paper examines the political persuasion strategies employed by Donald Trump in his speech at the United Nations General Assembly on September 24, 2019. The qualitative study explores the reality and authenticity behind Trump's claim "nationalism, not globalism, promotes peace, prosperity and economic growth of a sovereign nation like the US". He attempted to persuade Americans to work for the prosperity of a nation; not for globalism. The study analyzes the ways to project political ideologies of Trump through the propagation of self-presentation and political persuasion. As the world leader with enormous political power wielded by the US, Trump's speech under reference provides valuable insights into the ways how rhetoric links with power. This paper focuses on Trump's nationalism which he exploited to motivate the Americans being ex-prince as the losers of globalization to give him their vote in the next election. Toulmin's model of sound argumentation has been employed as the qualitative interpretative method in the study to analyze the rhetorical elements of political persuasion contained in the speech. Trump's behavior and speeches are full of contradictions. He held the populist political agenda of anti-globalization to appear as a true nationalist leader amongst the working-class American voters who could contribute to re-elect him as the President of the USA. However, his political rhetoric did not work as the majority of American voters cast their votes against him in the 2020 Presidential election.*

**Keywords:** Anti-globalization, fallacies, nationalism, political persuasion, rhetorical devices

## Introduction

The 45<sup>th</sup> President of the USA, Donald J Trump, used contradictory political rhetoric during his tenure. He appeared as the hardliner politician with purely nationalist agenda in response to globalism, his stand to construct border-walls to Mexico, foreign trade policy and aggressive tone towards Islamic countries. His spectacular victory as the President of the super-power America drew much attention in the world politics as his personality traits and foreign policy would affect the existing world order. He had been using various world forums such as NATO and the UNO to promote his political agenda and the foreign policy of his administration. In due course, he addressed the UN General Assembly (UNGA) on September 24, 2019 highlighting his intended political agenda of nationalism. He stated that as the President of USA an economically sound peace-loving sovereign country, he wished to work together with other countries and their leaders for world peace. At the same time, he attempted to establish his agenda of nationalism by reflecting the American dreams and warned the world that anything harmful or objectionable to America and its citizens would not be tolerated. On the one hand, he tried to threaten the world leaders using UN forum not to go against the will of his administration. In fact, he gave a clear message to the American people that their President was doing the best for the sake of their nation and its citizens.

As the president of the US and holding enormous political powers in the international arena, Trump could play a vital role is the maintenance of world peace and the subsequent betterment of the people at large. As a leader of the top world power, he tried to make the world realize that Americans could rule and guide the world in a better way and a better manner. Whatever he argued can be interpreted and deconstructed well through rhetorical analysis of his speech, which may highlight the perspectives of the goals he wanted to achieve. As Trump's speech in the UNGA 74th session has been subjected to analysis, it shows the element of pretentiousness as one of the marked features of his rhetoric, and this aspect may be viewed as a dual personality of the speaker. Although he also tried to become a hero and tried to prove himself as a well-wisher for the underdeveloped nations and developing communities owing to their backwardness in most of the fields of life; yet he seemed helpless to back up the endeavor because of the US role seemingly distinct from Trump's character. In fact, political leaders try to establish themselves and their intentions right through persuasion and Trump too seems to employ the same strategy to convince his intended audiences- the world leaders and the American voters.

## Research Questions

1. In what ways did Donald Trump use rhetorical devices in the speech delivered in the UN General Assembly on September 24, 2019?
2. Why did he employ nationalism as a win political rhetoric in the speech in the UNGA?

## Literature Review

Donald Trump, the 45<sup>th</sup> President of the superpower US, appeared as a controversial figure during his tenure from 2017 to 2021 for a number of reasons such as his anti-globalization move in favour of nationalist agenda, anti-Islam stand calling them terrorists, construction of border-walls with Mexico, and blaming on China for spreading corona virus. He used the UN and other forums to persuade his intended audience with his political agenda and foreign policies of his administration. Although a number of studies have been carried out regarding Trump's behavior,

political rise and his political rhetoric, a scanty number of literatures are available about his rhetorical move with the agenda of nationalism as a counter to globalism. Trump considers others just terrorists and harmful as he possesses more power than other leaders of the world and claims himself as a nationalist stressing the progress and safety of his own country.

The speech in the UNGA on 24 September 2019 contains emotional fallacies to take the world leaders on board to support the US politically in its moves to anti-globalization to end terrorism referring to American patriotism when he argues that globalists would be pushed back in the coming times (Qasim & Aslam, 2020). Trump's UN address reflected a postmodern view of international politics despite the fact he has emergence from one of the most commended constitutional systems in the world. His attack on globalism perpetuates his nationalistic war on the political establishment, the judiciary, the media, intellectuals, and all critical civil society. His notions of 'sovereignty', 'patriotism', and other loaded concepts could be misleading. They are the selling points of his agenda of nationalism and economic protectionism (Cherkaoui, 2018). Trump as the figure of anti-globalism appeared to be popular among American voters establishing his ethos as the real President concerning the issues of America and the Americans. Similarly, Blanke and Aradau (2021) found Trump's rhetoric to be distinct not so much from his direct Democrat predecessors, but from Republicans. While Trump might have been perceived as "weird" by his compatriots, his speech highlights a struggle within the Republican Party that culminates in his presence and the disappearance of Eisenhower's ideas. The trend to Trump is most influenced by Reagan's conservatism and Republican ultra-nationalism (Blanke & Aradau, 2021). It seems that Trump holds the hardline nationalistic agenda of Ronald Regan and the Republicans.

Steiner's (2020) recent study pointed out that Trump was making virulent anti-immigrant sentiment more popular, attracting the support of far-right online political movements, and refusing to credibly disavow Arabs, Muslims, asylum seekers, and other groups. The Trump administration has practiced "a politics of intolerance for diversity". This is dangerous because the attacks on some minority groups, such as Jews, threaten the safety of other minority groups (Steiner, 2020). In fact, Trump attempted to win the hearts of the American people who seemed to be deceived by the diversity and immigration policies of the former Presidents of the US. However, Brandt (2020) claimed that the Trump discourse emulates key elements of entertainment culture, especially from reality television, in its emphasis on dramatization, emotional effect, and spectacle. More than any of his contenders in U.S. politics, Trump plays the whole gamut of the media spectacle, turning his appearances in the public limelight into performances that, while perhaps blunt and loaded with pathos, seem entertaining, measured by the standards of commercial television. It seemed that his political move with nationalist image had been popularized among Americans just as a popular television show.

Sugino (2020) in his study indicated the need for skepticism in the face of state-sanctioned anti-racism under Trump administration. People need to ask the question – not only of conservative but liberal discourses as well – if purported claims to incorporation truly reflect a dismantling of the status quo. Racial violence produces flexible discourses that, on their face, present as inclusive but work in reality to dislodge anti-racist critique (Sugino, 2020). Trump's position regarding white supremacy appeared to be controversial which might lead to racial violence. On the other hand, Herrmann (2021) argued that nationalists of all stripes tend toward authoritarianism. Christian nationalism provides a metanarrative for a religiously distinct national identity, and Americans who embrace this narrative and perceive threats to that identity overwhelmingly voted

for Trump. White evangelicals view Trump as a necessary autocrat, and anyone who challenges his authority is a threat to Christianity and to the “foundation of America and American society”. Sexism, misogyny, racism, making fun of the disabled, business swindling, the spouting of daily lies, and adultery can all be overlooked. Trump is useful to the cause. Trump is useful to the Christian nationalist program. Appointing conservative judges, including on the Supreme Court to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, is one aspect. His policies promote unabashed capitalism and deregulation, including environmental deregulation, which will assist in furthering the coming of Armageddon. This is also why many fully support Trump’s move of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem. Trump is the penultimate achievement for fundamental Evangelicals; a desired harbinger of the end times; the dream president for Christian nationalists (Herrmann, 2021). In other words, Trump tried to establish himself as the true Christian nationalist President tending towards authoritarianism.

Similarly, Steff and Tidwell (2020) argued that the Trump administration’s decisions in pursuit of its agenda clarify the patterns and priorities which are evident in the decision-making structure of the administration’s foreign policy apparatus. In view of the several policy priorities which the Administration has articulated and pursued over its time in office and the various frameworks it has offered to Trump and his team to be viewed through, the tension between foreign policy goals and domestic political interests is clear. The policies which the Administration has pursued in accordance with its objectives on issues such as trade and migration have largely, though not completely, been unable to execute their objectives when viewed through the lens of foreign policy priorities. Analyzing these policies with an eye to domestic politics forces a reframing of the discussion on the Administration’s strategy as it becomes clear that the face-value success of the policy might not be the only, or even the primary, criteria for success as defined on the administration’s terms (Steff & Tidwell, 2020). Trump’s foreign trade policy and domestic political priorities seemed to be contradictory during his presidency. Another study (Restad, 2020) pointed out that in legitimizing politics based on ethno-religious nationalism, Trump has shown the continued strength of the second American nationalist tradition, and undermined U.S. liberal values-based leadership abroad. If it is one of liberal progress at home and promotion of a liberal international order abroad, then Trump is change of a profound nature (Restad, 2020). It is indicative that Trump embraced the nationalism as a political tool to win the hearts of certain ethnic and religious groups such as Americans and Christians discarding multiplicity and diversity.

Regarding the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, Trump has defended his use of ‘Chinese Virus’ by saying “it comes from China, that’s why. I want to be accurate.” This reasoning runs in direct contrast to the WHO’s naming convention, which aims not to stigmatize communities. Prefacing COVID-19 with either ‘Chinese’ or ‘Wuhan’ also has the purpose of deflecting blame away from Trump as it presents the COVID-19 as a problem someone else caused. Deflecting blame means that Trump can create his own political cover on how he has handled the spread of COVID-19 throughout the US (Cherry-Smith, 2020). In fact, Trump attacked intentionally on China which seemed to challenge the economy of the USA in recent years. He presented himself superior to any norms and blamed China overtly for spreading corona virus without giving any reliable proofs.

According to Andrews (2014), Aristotle defined rhetoric as “the art of persuasion” designed for public engagement and debate in an Athenian society. He posited three types of rhetoric: appeal to the audience’s feelings (pathos), appeal to the speaker’s character or set of values (ethos), and argumentational proof (logos). However, it as the art of discourse is particularly appropriate for global use in the twenty-first century because of the increased communicational

possibilities, increased chance of misunderstanding, increasingly fast pace of interaction and increased democratization of societies. The latter point is the most pertinent in terms of the socio-political nature of rhetoric. As social and political structures change, so do rhetorical possibilities. What we might term the rhetorical imperative is the need to make sure that communicational possibilities are up to speed with social and demographic change. When they fall behind, and people call on outmoded types of communication to bring about transaction, the process of change is slowed or does not take place. Fast capitalism brings about fast rhetorical responses and a need for a critical take on these (Andrews, 2014). It indicates that rhetoric is not the servant of capitalism, but that it can and should respond to change in the balance of relations between people at work and in domestic and public spaces.

On the other hand, Bieber (2018) argued that nationalism is both common and slippery just like air. It penetrates the global system, states, and people's behavior and can be seen as both conservative and revolutionary forces, threatening the status quo. The end of nationalism has been predicted multiple times. Yet, nationalism seems notoriously difficult to measure. First, attitudes and their social and political manifestations can differ. Second, in most countries, nationalism has a negative association, thus measuring nationalism requires proxies. These will differ around the world. The fear of immigrants is more salient in post-industrial societies, but less in others. The desire for homogeneity is an important dimension of nationalism in countries that have a dominant core nation, but not necessarily in very diverse societies (Bieber, 2018). Nationalism in many countries appears in different forms but in most cases, it rejects multiplicity and diversity of any community or society or country at large. It desires for the supremacy and promotion of one nation or ethnic group over others which sometimes turns out to be negative. Yet, some political leaders take the nationalism as the powerful political weapon to divide and rule.

Commenting on democracy, Martin (2013a) argued that a rhetorical democracy offers ways of forming public judgments through numerous practices of persuasion and, in so doing, exposes politics to the uncertainty and riskiness of the dimension of the political. That may entail a wide variety of institutional forms, including those suggested by deliberative democrats, but also the non-formal and controversial types of intervention including protest and dissent that polemically challenge social and political customs. Whether it is directed at producing agreement or cultivating and sharpening areas of disagreement, rhetorical persuasion involves mobilizing both reason and emotions, in order to constantly renew the terms of our allegiance to democracy (Martin, 2013a). Likewise, he claimed that democratic politics is awash with rhetorical strategies – not all of which succeed – competing to shape public perceptions of people, events and policies. In so doing, such strategies blend politics and the political – the struggles for advantage and the higher principles that govern spaces of conflict – through the medium of speech and argument (Martin, 2013b). A rhetorical approach to politics allows us to disassemble these strategies and to identify how they work.

On the other hand, Charteris-Black (2011) argued that to persuade an audience a politician has to demonstrate that he or she is right and a prerequisite of being right is that a politician is interpreted as 'having the right intentions', for without these he or she will have no legitimacy in the first place. Persuasion requires 'right thinking' based on appeals to reason; it also requires a politician to 'sound right' through appeals to emotion; persuasion relies on a combination of appeals to the head and to the heart (Charteris-Black, 2011). It shows that a political leader requires winning the head and heart of the public for being successful in leadership. In other words, the politician must establish his ethos and credibility among the people and needs to respect people's sentiments and emotions.

## Significance of the Study

The 45<sup>th</sup> President of the US Donald Trump exploited political persuasion in his UNGA speech to win the American voters' mind and heart so that he could be re-elected as the President. Although many studies have been carried out in relation to other themes and political agenda of Trump's various speeches, no research work is carried out from the analytical viewpoint of political rhetoric in his selected speech till date. As this study explores the rhetorical devices employed in Trump's political persuasion in terms of Toulmin's model of sound argumentation, it will help the future scholars to conduct other studies on his speeches employing different lens. It will pave a way for more studies on other world leaders' speeches in terms of their rhetoric. The study will chiefly analyze Trump's endeavors in the use of nationalism as political persuasion in his speech under Toulmin's proposal of sound argument. Likewise, the study will help different researchers to examine Trump's speech with new dimensions. This will be an instrument for the common readers to study other leaders' speeches from Toulmin's proposed model of good argument in future. Thus, the rhetorical study will contribute in the research and criticism of world leaders' political speeches.

## Methodology

It is very important to bear in mind from the outset that fallacies may be either honest or dishonest mistakes. A sound argument of a good rhetor has the coherence among claim, backing, warrant, rebuttal, qualifier and conclusion (Toulmin et al., 1984). The study uses Toulmin's model of sound argumentation to analyze Trump's speech at the UN General Assembly on September 24, 2019 and how these rhetorical devices contribute to make his arguments stronger to establish his agenda of nationalism. The speech provides primary data for this qualitative study. Qualitative interpretative research design proposed by Toulmin provides the theoretical lens to analyze the elements of political ideology and fallacies contained in the speech.

## Results and Discussion

On the basis of research questions, results of this paper are categorized into five major themes: eye on next presidential election, "the future belongs to the patriots", populist politics and the beginning of Americanism, preaching peace but building stronger army and "make America great again".

### Eye on next presidential election

Although the available previous studies were carried out on various aspects of Donald Trump's political speech and behavior, this study analyzes how he employed the rhetorical elements in the speech at the UN General Assembly on September 24, 2019 and how these rhetorical devices contribute to make his arguments stronger to establish his agenda of nationalism. The speech provides primary data for this qualitative study. The study critically analyzes the ways to project political ideologies through the propagation of self-presentation and political persuasion, more specifically, the pretentious and fallacious use of language to garner support from the masses by Trump's speech. As a world leader, due to enormous political power wielded by the US, the



speech under reference provides valuable insights into the ways how rhetoric is linked with power. Trump primarily focused on the agenda of nationalism to motivate the American people who feel like they are the losers of globalization to give him their vote in the next election. Qualitative interpretative research design proposed by Toulmin provides the theoretical framework to analyze the elements of political ideology and fallacies contained in the speech.

### **“The future belongs to the patriots”**

Donald Trump used the 74<sup>th</sup> UN General Assembly to accentuate his agenda of nationalism, refuting “globalism” and illegal immigration and promoting patriotism as a cure for the world’s ills. Trump’s UN speech seemed as the hardliner political doctrine tending towards authoritarianism. In his address, the US president echoed the rhetoric of far-right nativist groups who argue that citizens with long family history in a country have a more profound grasp of national interests than recent arrivals, and that the established population should be on its guard against forces aimed at its “replacement”. “The free world must embrace its national foundations. It must not attempt to erase them, or replace them,” Trump said. “The true good of the nation, can only be pursued by those who love it, by citizens who are rooted in its history, who are nourished by its culture, committed to its values, attached to his people.” In the course of his 36-minute speech, Trump repeatedly referred to “patriots”, an undefined group of citizens uniquely able to interpret national interest. “Patriots see a nation and its destiny in ways no one else can. Liberty is only preserved, sovereignty is only secure, democracy is only sustained, greatness is only realized by the will and devotion of patriots (McClatchy Washington Bureau, Sep 24, 2019),” he said. He particularly attacked on globalism, which he claimed had “exerted a religious pall over past leaders causing them to ignore their own national interests”. “The future does not belong to the globalists. The future belongs to the patriots,” he said, echoing another consistent theme of the hard right.

“Looking around and all over this large, magnificent planet, the truth is plain to see. If you want freedom, take pride in your country. If you want democracy, hold on to your sovereignty. And if you want peace, love your nation. Wise leaders always put the good of their own people and their own country first (NBC News, Sep 24, 2019).” The resurgent nationalist tone of him was in strong contrast to the UN Secretary General, António Guterres, who appealed for collective action against the threats of the climate crisis and nuclear weapons. In his address, Trump mentioned neither the climate emergency nor arms control. Instead, he began his speech with an ominous reminder of the military power at his disposal. “The United States, after having spent over two and a half trillion dollars since my election to completely rebuild our great military is also by far the world’s most powerful nation,” he said. “Hopefully, it will never have to use this power.” Trump spent some of his speech targeting against US adversaries including China, Cuba, and Venezuela and in particular Iran. But in line with his insistence the US would not respond militarily to the 14 September attacks on Saudi oil infrastructure; his emphasis was on peaceful resolution of the conflict. “Many of America’s closest friends today were once our greatest foes,” he said. “The United States has never believed in permanent enemies. We want partners, not adversaries. America knows that well; anyone can make war. Only the most courageous can choose peace (Global News, Sep 24, 2019).” He threatened the countries not to go against the will of the US if they want peace. Otherwise, he would use his powerful army against any of the countries that are do adversaries to his nation.

## Populist politics and the beginning of Americanism

While many of Trump's talking points were familiar, there were some new elements in his address. While echoing allegations of some social conservatives that "global bureaucrats" at the UN were promoting abortion around the world, Trump broke with that part of his electoral base emphasizing support for other sexual and gender rights. "My administration is working with other nations to stop criminalizing of homosexuality," he declared. "And we stand in solidarity with LGBTQ people who live in countries that punish jail or execute individuals based upon sexual orientation." Political scientists viewed the political victory of Donald Trump as a shift in populist politics and the beginning of Americanism. On the one hand, America wishes to limit her role in international disputes like Afghanistan, but on the other hand, it asserts its powerful and domineering role in the world as the sole superpower. Such two-pronged motives and initiatives in its policy are providing an opportunity to countries like China and India to fill the vacuum created by the US disinclination to lead the world. Trump, in his speech to UNGA, ridiculed the UN calling the spent period in it 'a drama' when he argued that 'this hall sees seventy years of playfulness and dramatic art'. This remark depicts the power of a super nation, Americans, who always considered the UN as a puppet in their hands.

Furthermore, he distinguishes the negative people from the good ones when he argued that the revolution could be brought by the best leaders and saints who arouse a hope for them. Then he mentioned the people who had been proved as rebellious, causing Americans' motivation and inspiration. So far as Americans are concerned, they play a vital role in limiting the part of the UN by the power they have, being a superpower in the world. Trump praised his nation's determination to be peaceful, arguing as he preferred freedom, sovereignty, and the government that was made. He also made the world realize how his government spent trillion dollars on building his army powerful. Further, he tried to convince the nations that his army would never use its power against any other country. However, his statement seems against the realities that have always been proved right to the rest of the world in the form of attacks on the developing nations. Everywhere in the world, American governments have always manipulated the rights of the poorer countries in the name of terrorism. It still gets the advantage of its power of supremacy all over the world. For instance, it attacked Iraq in 1991 and Afghanistan after 9/11 to wipe terrorism and terrorists but could not get any benefit except assassination of its opponents and selling its ammunition.

The word 'hopefully' manifests the intentions of Trump against anyone who dares to raise the voice against America. It seems Trump knew the situation of the world and could guess what might happen with him and America in the future due to his aggressive rhetoric might also be considered a fear in his mind. According to him, America possesses richness in traditions and customs that make it a remarkable state to be wealthy, powerful, and passionate. In this statement, Trump tried to be a nationalist and patriot while other leaders and nations seem to be wielding less power as compared to his because he considered others just terrorists and harmful things; that is why he repeatedly stressed the progress and safety of his own country. The speech contains emotional fallacies to take the world leaders to support the US politically in its moves to eliminate terrorism from the world the way it has been doing even without involving the UN which he called a theatre or hall having a small role to play as compared to the actions taken so far by the US. Thus, anti-globalization seems to be the rising sum and substance for him due to his frequent reference to American patriotism when he argues that 'globalists would be pushed back in the



coming times. However, only the patriots who possess the sense of caring and respect for their nations and knowing the following factors would survive'. The use of words such as 'globalists', 'patriots,' progressive factors' and 'survive' has the political orientation as these words may shift the meaning for Americans and non-Americans. In the idea, as mentioned earlier, it can be perceived fully that every country saves its own identity by itself. However, the facts show that the anti-globalism movement or idea can never succeed because, now, it is the age of a powerful communal system that connects the whole world in every aspect, whether it is a social life, technical field, the mechanical or economic field.

### **Preaching peace but building stronger army**

When Trump argued about the power and building of his army, he seemed to depend on others negating his idea of anti-globalization. Furthermore, he explained that he intended to build unmatched military and invoked awe among the coalition partners. Still, on the other side, he made them realize that they had to pay their share to lessen the defense burden, which had been born by the US in the previous years. The question arises as to how to assign the role for being responsible for this said burden. History proves that it has been the superpower USA after the fall of the former USSR that put strain on the other countries by attacking the lands known as terrorist states. In the absence of no balance of power among the nations, there would be extremism to get just rights and to gain equality, the marginalized people may go for wars as a last resort, and that becomes even more destructive to everyone in the world. So, he realized the fact that no single nation can survive alone when he says that 'their target needs balanced trade that would be based on honesty and mutuality'. In his statements, he uses duel posture to show his intentions about the future when he dislikes globalism, but at the same time, he raises his hands of friendship to others. There seems 'irony' in his speech when he argues that the US does not have any dispute with any other state, but they wish to have calmness, alliance, and bilateral relations.

Moreover, at the same time, he tries to shrink for the just benefits and interests of his country, as he said; he would always save and care for America's benefits. Furthermore, in his speech, he condemned Iran regarding its policies, which he perceives threats to the security of the nation that loves peace. He declared Iran as a terrorist state when he commented that death and havoc existed because of Iran and Iran's leaders who were raising deadly wars in Syria and Yemen. He projected himself as a pacifist and maligned his political rival Iran as sabotaging his efforts for world peace. His speech, on the one hand, shows that America is going to mind its own business, and on the other hand, he shows his disposition to get involved in another conflict in the Middle East. He tried to convince the world nations that no nation should favor or support the blood thirsty nature of Iran's government.

Furthermore, he threatened and declared that Iran would be banned, economically, until it ends its annoying attitude because, according to Trump, Iran's leaders do not give attention to public welfare but pursue personal power and wealth. He declared Iran as an extremist country considering that there exists anti-Judaism in Iran's community, particularly in leaders. He warned them by quoting Iran's Supreme Leader's statement in which he said that Iran possessed enmity against Israel, considering it a deadly cancerous neoplasm. However, America would never bear such an act consisting of anti-Judaism hate. The ideology, as mentioned earlier, may depict the discrimination-policy of the American president as he ignored the cruel steps and actions of Israel against Palestine and the merciless massacre of Muslims in the world at large. Wherever they are,

even the minorities of different communities are suffering many issues on the earth, but no one cares for it. This diplomacy cannot inspire any nation that has reservations regarding its liberty and fundamental human rights that have been suppressed by powerful nations. There can be no peace in any part of the world until there is an imperialistic mindset on the part of world political and economic powers, and the same can rightly be termed as the most significant hindrance for nations to seek justice.

A powerful country always tries to dominate and rule over the weak countries to get political and trade advantages from there, as it can be seen in under-developed countries like Iraq, Palestine, and Afghanistan, where the masses suffer only chaos and destruction at the hand of world powers instead of the prosperity which they earlier promised to bring after the change of regime. This attitude of the world in way be justified because the depressed and suppressed communities possess the ability, efficiency, and power to snatch their fundamental rights from the suppressor. The backwardness of such nations in every field of life pushes them back foot, and they cannot compete with the developed nations; that is why the powerful countries get an undue advantage when they rule and try to lead them. Trump employs the phrase 'illegal migration' that seems to him a substantially problematic issue for him, and he argues that illegal migration can never be considered fair, safe, and favorable for the counties that make their people move to other countries and the countries that receive these immigrants.

Trump ignores the ground realities that may go against his self-proclaimed ideology of peace, calm, and prosperity because he seems to violate the international rules of cooperation. Whatever he says about his policies, about his own country and other nations as well, can be seen everywhere in the world. The whole world knows that America, without any solid proof, attacks Iraq in 1991 to wipe out the so-called 'weapon of mass destruction' reported to be possessed by former US ally Saddam Hussain, and then next in Afghanistan in 2001, to uproot terrorism to take the revenge of the 9/11 incident. Hence, when some nations are suppressed by the storm of brutality and persecution, most of the people try to migrate to safer places. Still, the receiving countries consider them illegal immigrants. Also, these immigrants do not get proper survival or safety of their lives, but they are killed or prosecuted. In his speech, Trump also indicates the life of such people, when he argues that immigrants are victimized, murdered, and misused. Although terrorism leaves grave marks on a common man and whole society, yet no one can be held single handedly responsible for it. Somehow, Trump offers to welcome the innovative migrants to his country, when he argues that they want every nation in their region to flourish and its people to thrive in freedom and peace. If his advocacy manifests costiveness on the one hand, then there arises a fair question of why he does not allow the migrants to his state whether they want legal or illegal entry due to unsuitable conditions in their countries where their governments do not reach such talent or do not appreciate them.

### **“Make America Great Again”**

Trump holds his political agenda of nationalism which tends to be authoritarian arguing against globalization because American people, according to him, were badly cheated by the agenda of globalism. He claims that America is under threats of terrorists, smugglers and traders because of the globalism that America embraced earlier; even the real American people were become jobless in their own land due to immigrants. He claims that American people need to be protected from terrorists, smugglers and foreign traders and America needs to be made a safe place

for them. For that reason, he denounces the globalism and embraces nationalism as his political rhetoric to get American people united in his mission of “Make America Great Again” (MAGA). However, political scholars claim that political leaders like Trump try to exhibit their agenda and intentions right with persuasive arguments but in real sense they work for the betterment of their own. They claim that Trump’s agenda of nationalism is purely upheld as a fallacy in the sense that he just wanted to appear as a nationalist and a devotee to the patriots to get sympathy votes from the Americans to be re-elected as the US President. Although Trump addressed the UNGA and the world leaders present there, his intended audiences were there in mind and they were none other than the American nationals whom he intentionally wanted to persuade with his nationalist political rhetoric. He appears to threaten the countries and their leaders through the forum of UNGA not to take America lightly because it is investing a large amount of budget to strengthen its military power which directly wields political power of the USA and its President in the world affairs. His presentation of America as the peace-loving nation seems to be fallacious with his own statement of huge investment on military empowerment. His overall speech in the light of political agenda of nationalism seems to get American people’s sympathy votes in the next presidential election to secure his office for the second tenure.

## Conclusion

Trump’s speech at UNGA contains various elements that point to typical American political ideology and policy matters. The speech under reference reveals fully Trump’s dual policy, where it wants to continue with its hegemonic role in the world but with a different mode other than the previous regimes. It seems to minimize the role of the UN and instead involve like-minded countries as decision makers. The defense and elaboration provided by him raise various concerns among the people of the world, especially those where direct US involvement has been witnessed in the recent past. Be it Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria or Iran, and subsequent refugee crisis in the world calls for a reappraisal of the US policy. The refugees who suffer a lot in these countries due to the US policies in the international political maneuvering look at the content of his speech as a case of pretentiousness and political persuasion to legitimize its past action. He also adopts a discriminatory policy favoring the powerful nations and ignoring the weak states. Most of the immigrants belong to the states which suffer from the US attacks with its allies and their support. Therefore, people move to America or the nearest borders, but there they are pushed back, murdered, or manipulated in every way. So, it remains a question who would take responsibility for peace and economic growth in the world. In fact, Trump’s populist agenda of nationalism seems to cash the sentiments of working-class Americans in the next presidential election in 2020. He knew very well that only the American people could re-elect him as the President; so, he denounced globalism and tried to persuade them that they were the real victims of globalization resulting joblessness, threats of terrorism and smuggling. Although he tried to persuade the countries and their leaders to focus on peace and prosperity of their own nations being true nationalists and patriots, his real intention was to persuade the American voters to re-elect him as their nationalist President in the next election in 2020.

## Future Scope

The selected speech of Trump has provided the data to analyze the rhetorical elements employed. Any other leader’s as of Trump’s win rhetoric can be studied in the light of Toulmin’s

concept of sound argument. Similarly, the same speech or any other rhetorical discourse of the world or national leaders can further be studied using other conceptual frameworks by the researchers in the days to come.

## References

- Andrews, R. (2014). Why rhetoric? In *A Theory of Contemporary Rhetoric* (pp. 16-28). Routledge.
- Bieber, F. (2018). Is nationalism on the rise? Assessing global trends. *Ethnopolitics*, 17(5), 519-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2018.1532633>
- Blanke, T., & Aradau, C. (2021). Computational genealogy: Continuities and discontinuities in the political rhetoric of US presidents. *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History*, 54(1), 29-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01615440.2019.1684859>
- Brandt, S. L. (2020). Donald Trump, the reality show: Populism as performance and spectacle. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 50(2), 303-321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41244-020-00170-3>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). Myth, metaphor and leadership. In *Politicians and Rhetoric* (pp. 311-329). Springer.
- Cherkaoui, M. (2018, October 1). Why Trump remains anti-globalist even inside the United Nations? *Aljazeera Centre For Studies*. <https://studies.aljazeera.net/ar/node/1606>
- Cherry-Smith, B. (2020, April 3). Nationalism and Trump's response to COVID-19. *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/04/03/nationalism-and-trumps-response-to-covid-19/>
- Global News. (Sep 24, 2019). *U.S. President Donald Trump addresses UN General Assembly*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nV2aZC2ySCg&t=1299s>
- Herrmann, A. F. (2021). Purity, nationalism, and whiteness: The fracturing of fundamentalist evangelicalism. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 13(4), 414-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940844720937813>
- Martin, J. (2013a). Democracy, rhetoric and emotions. In *Politics and rhetoric: A critical introduction* (pp. 107-126). Routledge.
- Martin, J. (2013b). Rhetorical political analysis. In *Politics and Rhetoric: A Critical Introduction* (pp. 88-106). Routledge.
- McClatchy Washington Bureau. (Sep 24, 2019). *Trump pitches nationalism in UN speech*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CBIChsxkeak&t=118s>
- NBC News. (Sep 24, 2019). *Watch President Donald Trump's full address to the 2019 United Nations General Assembly*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sC0J1PGauqY>
- Qasim, H. M., & Aslam, M. Z. (2020). A study of rhetorical element and political persuasion in Trump's speech at UNGA 74th session: A political discourse analysis. 472-486. <https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdard-islamicus/>
- Restad, H. E. (2020). What makes America great? Donald Trump, national identity, and US foreign policy. *Global Affairs*, 6(1), 21-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2020.1734955>
- Steff, R., & Tidwell, A. (2020). Understanding and evaluating Trump's foreign policy: A three frame analysis. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 74(4), 394-419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2020.1721431>
- Steiner, R. J. (2020). Contumelious oratory: reflecting on rhetorical forms in the Trump administration. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 28(5), 289-307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2020.1720684>
- Sugino, C. M. (2020). Multicultural incorporation in Donald Trump's political rhetoric. *Southern Communication Journal*, 85(3), 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2020.1780301>
- Toulmin, S. E., Rieke, R. D., & Janik, A. (1984). Fallacies: How arguments go wrong. In *An Introduction to Reasoning* (Second ed., pp. 129-197). Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.