The Structures of Trump's Political Discourse

Rini Anggraini[1], Sawirman[2] & Rina Marnita[3]
[1-2-3]Universitas Andalas
Kampus Unand Limau Manih Pauh Padang, Indonesia
[1]rini.anggraini98@yahoo.com, [2]drsawirman@gmail.com,
[3]rinam.sasingunand@gmail.com

Abstract
This study explains the discourse structure of antagonism in one of Trump's political speeches. The analysis also describes the function of antagonistic discourse for Trump's political purposes against his opponents from the Democratic Party like Joe Biden and Elizabeth Warren. CDA is the approach used in this research. The theories of political frontier antagonism from Malmberg, Howarth, and Stravakakis supported by the annihilating dynamics of meaning from O'Dawyer are applied to the data taken from the transcription of Trump's political speeches. The findings show that Trump utilizes specific nouns modified by adjectives to form a political barrier of antagonism between him against the opponents of the Democratic Party. The structure of discourse found in this study shows that Trump uses antagonism in his political speech to inflict a heavy blow to his opponents' political image.

Keyword: Political Frontier of Antagonism, Trump, CDA, Discourse Structures, Annihilating Dynamics of Meaning

Anggraini, Rini Sawirman & Marnita, Rina. (2021). The Structure of Trump's Political Discourse.
IJOTL-TL, 6(1), 55-72. DOI: 10.30957/ijotl-tl.v6i1.650.

1. INTRODUCTION

The object of this study is the discourse structures of antagonisms against the Democratic Party's figures in Trump's speeches. The main theory used in this research is Howarth's and Stravakakis' political frontier of antagonism in discourse supported by other theories of discourse, ideology, and power from CDA theorists like Fairclough and Wodak.

The problems studied in this research are the discourse structures, the political functions, and the political meanings of the discourse of antagonism used by Trump in his political speeches. Moreover, this study uses a qualitative research method in a critical discourse analytical framework. According to Hart (2010:23), CDA investigates how ideology is encoded in language use and explains the process of discourse production and consumption involving the cognitive approach on meaning construction in its ends (purpose) and discourse process. Hart defines this cognition aspect as the cognitive approach as the basis of CDA since the critical analysis of discourse focuses on the effects of discourse on human cognition affected by power, control, and ideology.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Antagonism in discourse has destructive effects. O'Dwayer (2003: 2) explains that the meaning can empower but it can also annihilate. She defines meaning as empowering and annihilating dynamics. In this research, the antagonism belongs to these annihilating dynamics. For example, Trump uses the adjective **fake** modifying the noun **Pocahontas** as a reference to Elizabeth Warren. This noun phrase shows the annihilating dynamics, destroying Warren's political image. The antagonism is categorized as the annihilating dynamics of meaning according to O'Dwayer because of its political use to destroy the image of the opponents.

O'Dwayer (2003:2) also states that meaning involves the operation of power and control or more specifically cognitive control. For example, Trump's political speeches are a political discourse involving the operation or the function of Trump's political power to destroy the credibility of his rivals. The aspects of cognitive control are the process of controlling people's understanding and agreement with Trump's point. The structure of antagonism in discourse involves the process of cognitive control. This is the theoretical relationship between the theory of antagonism (Howarth, Stravakakis, and Malmberg) with O'Dawyer's meaning dynamics and cognitive control in discourse.

According to O'Dawyer (2003:15), meaning can be orchestrated by the power of language and its authorial administration. This is the explanation of why the meaning of Trump's political discourse can be destructive to his rivals' image and standing. The practice of antagonism in discourse done by Trump is the process of orchestrating the meaning of discourse to attack his political opponent.

O'Dawyer (2003:108) also explains that relating meaning to antagonism and its repetition involves the engagements of power which includes the practice of victimizing and negative association. O'Dawyer describes the aspects and the process of meaning in the antagonism as well.

The next theoretical explanation of O'Dawyer's theory is about the subject and object of meaning is seen to be destructive (2003:41). Trump did that by destroying the political credibility of his opponent as a subject and object in his political discourse. According to O'Dawyer (2003:51), the meaning has a destructive capacity as the potential annihilating force by bedeviling its path and causing the demise of the other. This explanation is a mechanism of meaning in the antagonism. The practice of antagonism in discourse is a literal attack of meaning on the other, Trump's opponent in this case.

Then O'Dawyer (2003:3) also states the structure of language and meaning organized in this antagonistic way is based on the difference of identity and is defined against the identities of other subjects. This theoretical explanation defines what Trump did in his discourse on his opponent. The analysis of the main structure of antagonism is also based on this theory and Fairclough's.

According to O'Dawyer (2003:5), the antagonistic basis is the binary opposition between opposing people or party and there is a characteristic of domination in traditional linguistic structure and interpretation. Based on this explanation, the structure of antagonism analyzed in this research includes the structures of phrase and clause. O'Dawyer (2003:51) also states the nucleus of the governing party of the discourse and meaning. This aspect will be one of the core analyses in this research.

The next theory to support O'Dawyer's theory in this research is Trask (2007:76). He also explains that discourse refers more narrowly to the interactive and communicative dimension of language, and involves conversation analysis, semiotics, and the dynamic processes of text production and understanding (consumption). The key concept of discourse from Trask's insight is the use of language involving the aspects of production and understanding. O'Dwayer's theory is related to Trask on the aspects of production and understanding that can be controlled. The antagonism in Trump's speeches involves the process of discourse production and consumption. These theories are related conceptually.

Wodak (2001:1) states that CDA takes a particular interest in the relation between language and power. This is the foundation of CDA stated by one of the founders of CDA herself. Ruth Wodak is the original CDA prominent figure along with Fairclough and Van Dijk. The aspects of antagonism in discourse are one of the phenomena of language-related use of power.

The relationship between language and power has been explained by Foucault twelve years before CDA was founded. According to Foucault (1978:101) discourse is a tactical element operating in the field of force relation; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses. Foucault's key theory wields a strong influence on CDA development in the next decade.

In short, CDA and Foucault share theories on discourse functioning as the instrument of power, including political power. Foucault views discourse of power can exist contradictorily in conflicts. This phenomenon occurs in Trump's discourse of antagonism. However, those antagonistic discourses are not analyzed yet. This point is the significance of this research.

The definition of antagonism in discourse according to Howarth and Stavrakakis is the construction of antagonism and the drawing of political frontiers between 'insiders' and 'outsiders' (Howarth and Stavrakakis in Howarth et al, 2000). The aspects of antagonism are the boundaries formed in discourse or language in use involving political interests to antagonize the opponent.

The structure of antagonism operated in the discourse, Trump uses such an antagonist discourse in his political speeches during the US presidential race and campaign. This process meets Blommaert's definition of discourse as language in action (2005:2). The action of antagonizing political rivals needs the antagonism in language use or discourse as well. This is what Trump does in his speeches.

Moreover, Agha (2007:i) explains that language is not simply a tool of social conduct but the effective means by which human beings formulate models of conduct. This aspect can be observed in Trump's political speeches. He states what kind of conduct got violated by his rivals. So the analysis in this research focuses on what kind of antagonism was used by Trump to destroy the good political image of his rivals.

Furthermore, Carston (2002:1) explains the process of understanding utterance is one kind of belief fixation. Trump uses his political speech to shape the belief of the American people about the clear line of antagonism between him and his opponents. Carston's point meets Parker's theoretical constructs stating that language is organized into discourse, context-dependent, and constructs the objects, subject position (in Willig, 2014:341). These conceptual and theoretical frameworks show that the structure of discourse is the combination of lingual function with the people and reality involved in that discourse.

3. METHODS

This research is a qualitative study focusing on the critical discourse analytical method. The critical aspects of discourse analysis often demand a deep explanation. That is why this type of research of discourse is more explanatory and explorative rather than a descriptive category.

Hooker states method describes a sequence of actions that constitute the most efficient strategy to achieve a given goal; methodology describes the theory of such sequences (in Butts and Hintikka, 1977:1). Phakiti (2014:3) states that research is a form of inquiry that involves questions, answers, goals to achieve, and problems to solve. This is a basic definition or concept of research. Discourse research includes these aspects too and the use of theory helps to analyze the data for solving the research questions or the problems.

According to Todd (1995:5), a linguist aims to be scientific in observing language use, that is systematically and without prejudice. It means observing language use, forming hypotheses about it, testing these hypotheses, and refining them based on evidence collected. This explanation is also the basis of any linguistic and discourse research.

Dixon, (2010:1) explains the task of linguistics is to explain the nature of human language. This point is the main aspect of linguistic research, however, since discourse

has some different concepts on language, the nature of human language here is not mainly about form, but the use of that language for a purpose.

The data for this research are Trump's utterances in his political speeches during his campaign and the presidency. The source of the data is the videos on Trump's political speeches against his rivals from the Democratic Party. The videos are downloaded from YouTube but all of them are the recorded versions from US broadcasting channels such as CNBC, CNN, and Fox.

The process of collecting, analyzing the data, and the primary structure of discourse is based on Fairclough's critical discourse analytical frameworks (2003:4) on the structure of social practice or action in language use; (1995:2) on the ideological and political potential of vocabularies and grammars; (2003:25) on the social structure of language; (2003: 133) on nominalized objects, events, purposes that are worded with nouns to classify people and events.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of the data of discourse shows the structure of the political frontier of antagonism in Trump's speech. Trump uses noun phrases and clauses to make his opponent look bad as the antagonist of America's politics. Thus, the discourse used by Trump which includes the noun phrases on his opponent's name or nickname is a political attack. This attack of discourse undergoes the process of antagonism in discourse aiming at controlling peoples' understanding and decision making to favor Trump.

Discourse 1

We have to make a decision, the theme for the next campaign, so we've been here by that time, mmm three, three and a half years we go into a war with some socialists, it looks the only **consort of heavy socialist** he's been taken care very well by the socialist they got to our the former vice president, he's I was gonna call him I don't know him well I was gonna say welcome to the world, Joe, you have it a good time Joe, are you having a good time. My people tell me two years what do you think one week sir, I said general come here to kiss me. I felt like Joe Biden. But I meant it, I meant it, big difference, I meant it.
Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SSp1C8EBIeE

The first part of this discourse "*We have to make a decision, the theme for the next campaign, so we've been here by that time, mmm three, three and a half years we go into a war with some socialists*" consists of some clauses. These clauses function to build up the historical context of this political discourse. That context is the 2016 US presidential race where Trump faced his rivals from Democrat. The clause "*we go into a war with some socialists*" constructs the meaning at the level of discourse about heavy competition and the struggles undergone by the Republicans and Trump against the figures from a democrat. The meaning of this clause formed in the scale of discourse because it has the political and historical meaning components.

The phrase "**some socialists**" here, discourse wise, based on refers to the competitors from democrats such as Hillary Clinton, Berney Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, and Joe Biden including other prominent figures from a democrat. This phrase also has the political meaning of antagonism because the noun **socialist** is used to create the image of antagonist on those democrat figures. This noun does not mean socialist denotatively at the semantic level. The use of this noun as the core structure of antagonism is based on the context of the US's long history of fighting communism for almost half of the 20th century. Socialism is the precursor of communism although both have some differences, not the same ideology, socialism is not something to be accepted in the United States.

President Trump in this discourse shows the antagonism in the form of a noun phrase **non-sort of heavy socialist** referring to his political opponent the former US vice president Joe Biden. This noun phrase is categorized as the antagonism in political discourse because it is used to set up a frontier between Trump and his fellow Americans against Joe Biden the socialist, meaning, Joe Biden is excluded.

This noun phrase is used by Trump to set up a language-based antagonist barrier controlling people's understanding of cognition reflected in the following meaning constructions: **[+Biden is a socialist and therefore he is not one of us], [+Biden is an outsider], [+Biden is different from us].** These meaning constructions of discourse shows a political function to attack Biden's political image so it will hurt his number of votes in the future election. These forms of meaning constructions are humans' cognitive structures projecting the process of controlling people's understanding of Trump's political discourse. These aspects of understanding meet Trask's explanation of discourse effect on understanding (2007:76).

Socialism is not accepted in the United States because the US is a capitalist country. Trump's political discourse in this datum is based on the context of capitalism vs socialism in the US. This phrase functions to hurt Biden's political image based on the US political context which puts no place for socialism. The USA is a capitalist nation, socialism has no place in the US presidential race. That is the political barrier of antagonism formed in this discourse and used by Trump to attack his rivals.

According to O'Dawyer (2003:2), meaning can have destructive dynamics. The noun phrase in this discourse labeling Joe Biden as the socialist forms the meaning of Biden is the antagonist in the next US presidential race. This antagonism has a destructive meaning destroying Biden's image. The socio-political context of the United States as a country doing a long war against communism and its socialist precursor in the past puts the noun **socialist** in a difficult situation. Most Americans are anti-communist although communism and socialism are not the same things, they share some social concepts and approaches. That is why the US presidential candidate who is labeled and pictured as a socialist will not get many votes in the next campaign. At least that is what Trump expecting from the use of this noun phrase of antagonism.

This datum shows the core part of discourse constructing the destructive meaning dynamics which is the noun **socialist**. The use of this word in this phrase functions as a noun, not an adjective because in that phrase there is an adjective **heavy** modifying it. The relationship of this noun functioning as the head or the core of the phrase constructs

the political meaning of Joe Biden being the antagonist and different. Trump's political purpose designed in his discourse shows the process of shaping the American belief system about Biden being a socialist. Jones and Peccei have stated this phenomenon of language being used to shape the belief system (in Thomas et al, 2004:36).

The meaning of the noun **socialist** at the level of discourse, in this case, encompasses the frontier of antagonism because this noun has a related history with communist and the US has great animosity to communism. This context of the history of war and socio-political conflict between the US (Capitalism) against USSR (Communism) is used by Trump in the function of the noun **socialist** to form the political frontier of antagonism. He simply makes the Democrat prominent figures to look like an antagonist during the presidential run.

The noun socialist and its phrases in this discourse has no semantic and pragmatic meaning since those Democrat figures and Joe Biden is not real socialists. The meaning of this noun is neither denotative nor connotative because the components of politics in its meaning construction include the annihilating dynamics since Trump uses this noun in his political discourse to annihilate or destroy the political image of his opponents in the next election. This kind of destructive meaning is just like what O'Dawyer explains in her theory. This is the aspect of meaning at the level of discourse.

The relationship of power, discourse, and ideology in this datum happens through the use of the noun socialist and its phrases for Trump's political interest. Trump's interest in power is to use this noun and its related phrases to destroy the political image of his opponent and therefore this process secures his maximum votes to be higher than the democrat presidential candidate's votes. The aspects of ideology related to the use of the noun **socialist** here are the influence of antagonism in discourse to the voters' belief, meaning, the voters see the rivals of Trump as the antagonist, so they do not vote for them, they vote only Trump.

The meaning of antagonist here at the level of discourse is not equivalent to being evil or bad people. The scale of the meaning of being an antagonist here does not go to that extent. Being an antagonist in the context of this political speech is only about the unworthy of becoming a leader of the United States. The meaning of Trump's political discourse based on the use of the noun **socialist** focuses on controlling the voters' belief or ideology that Trump's rivals are not worthy to lead the United States. Those rivals are not socialists since the ideology and the system of socialism are not accepted in the US, but Trump put the socialist label on to those rivals from democrat to make them look like the antagonist.

The noun **socialist** and its related phrases function as the core structure of discourse in datum 1 which constructs the meaning to damage the image of Trump's rivals and control the voters' belief. This is one of the mechanisms of discourse, power, and ideology in which language is used to control human understanding and belief system, it is no longer about conveying the message for communication. Therefore, the core structure of discourse is the main aspect of the language used for constructing the discourse which has deeper effects on human ideology or belief system.

The process of using this noun and its related phrases in discourse 1 requires other forms of clauses to complete political meaning. It is called political meaning because the meaning of discourse is not about communication but to give a direct influence to other people. Those other clauses are the additional structure of discourse. The context of the conflict between the United States against communism rooted in socialism intensifies the antagonism in discourse one. To give a better understanding of this analysis, the example can be taken from how the majority of Indonesian people view and afraid of communism, similar case to the Americans, they learn that socialism is the root of communism as a larger ideology, therefore, they share the hate and the fear of everything related to communism and socialism. Trump uses this issue and the historical context of the conflict in his political discourse cemented by the use of the noun **socialist** and its phrases as the core structure of discourse in datum 1.

The use of the noun **socialist** also shows it is more cognitively accessible because of the effect of historical context against communism in the past. The US as the capitalist country stands in the opposing position against socialism and its generic ideology such as communism. This context makes it easier for Trump to label his political opponents as the antagonist of capitalism by using the noun socialist and its related phrases in Trump's political discourses.

Thus, the structure of discourse 1 as follows:

1. The noun **socialist** and its phrases function as the core structure of the discourse.
2. The historical context of socialism being the precursor of communism and the United States fighting a long war against communism functions to complete the meaning of antagonism in the use of the noun **socialist.** The political meaning of discourse 1 is used by Trump to control the cognition and the system of belief of the voters to stand against Joe Biden the antagonist.
3. The relationship of the noun **socialist**, the context of conflict against socialism and communism, and Trump's political interest to win the US presidential race in 2020 construct the complete antagonism and its cognitively accessible effects on the understanding and the ideology of the voters.

Discourse 2
Jun 18, 2016

One thing about Bernie, he doesn't give up, this guy doesn't give up, right? **Crazy Bernie** he doesn't give up, you know, **crazy Bernie**, he is crazy as a bad bug, you know, he doesn't quit, he doesn't quit, got a hand to.. and I think Bernie should continue to go forward folk, he should continue to go forward, he should fight to the last end. Well, he's waiting for really...
Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LfPfirzwSQE

The context of discourse is the US presidential race in 2016. The political speech happened on June 18, 2016. The topic of the speech is Trump suggested Bernie Sanders stay in the Democratic race because the FBI would lead to the prosecution of Hillary Clinton over her private email case. The core structure of antagonism occurs in the form of the noun phrase **Crazy Bernie.** Trump used this to make Bernie Sanders look like the

antagonist in the 2016 US presidential race. The noun **Bernie** is modified by the adjective **crazy** to construct the core structure of discourse of antagonism in this datum.

The meaning of this phrase as the core structure of discourse 2 is constructed by Trump to control voters' cognition not to vote for Bernie in the US presidential race. This meaning is destructive to Bernie's political image. However, the topic of the discourse based on the context of this speech is about Trump suggesting Bernie to continue fighting Hillary in the Democratic race. This topic does not undo the destructive political meaning constructed by Trump in the phrase **Crazy Bernie**. Moreover, this phrase does not have a semantic function, meaning, Bernie is not a crazy person. Trump used the adjective *crazy* to modify the noun **Bernie,** the core of this phrase, to complete the destructive meaning dynamics to destroy Bernie Sander's political image.

The political function of this noun phrase as the core structure of antagonism is to control Americans' cognition to believe in Trump's discourse and therefore decide not to vote for Bernie. The other clauses in this discourse like *One thing about Bernie, he doesn't give up, this guy doesn't give up, right?* functions as a secondary structure of the discourse to build up the topic or the narration of discourse because a discourse cannot function properly without the secondary structure. Therefore, although the political meaning of this discourse is controlled by the use of the noun phrase **Crazy Bernie** people need the secondary structure of antagonistic discourse to fully understand the destructive meaning of this phrase which views Bernie as the antagonist in the US presidential race.

The construction of the meaning of antagonism remains: **[do not vote for Bernie]** and this is a form of cognitive control. This meaning does not have semantic components of the adjective **crazy** because the meaning of this phrase operates in discourse as Trump's political component. So the topic of discourse is about supporting Bernie to continue, but the political meaning remains to stop people vote for Bernie.

Discourse 2 shows the political meaning shares a similar aspect with political purpose and function. What makes it different from another form of meaning is its influence which controls peoples' understanding or cognition. Political discourse in a presidential race is all about gaining public support and controlling voters' decisions.

The primary structure of antagonism in this discourse (crazy Bernie) draws a political frontier of antagonism between Trump vs Bernie. This antagonistic boundary is important to control voters' decisions. Trump used this noun phrase (main structure of antagonistic discourse) and the other clauses (secondary structure of antagonistic discourse) to form a political meaning capable of inflicting damage on Bernie's political image. Even though the adjective **crazy** modifying the noun **Bernie** here does not mean insane literally, nor crazy in a bad way, but the construction of meaning is clear: **[do not vote for Bernie].** This meaning construction alone is enough to inflict damage on Bernie's political gain because the American people understand this meaning from this phrase and the clauses in this discourse.

Discourse 2 shows Trump with his political power uses language or discourse as the instrument of power to gain public support, belief, and of course votes, and to hurt the opponent's votes. These functions and purposes happen because people

understand the meaning of construction controlled by the main structure of antagonism in this discourse. This is the main point of using this discourse, to control peoples' understanding and voting decisions.

To answer the question, why antagonism exists in this kind of political discourse. Based on the analysis so far, it is clear the reason for the antagonistic boundary between Trump versus his opponent is all about controlling peoples' understanding and action about who is to vote for. The boundary has to be clear, voting for Trump or voting for his opponent. People cannot choose a similar thing. This is natural in human decisions and actions. We choose it because there is a difference. The Americans vote for different candidates. Voting happens because of that difference. The structure of antagonism in discourse intensifies this difference.

Trump used the phrase **crazy Bernie** as the main structure of antagonism in his political discourse because he intensifies the difference between him (Trump) and Bernie. The main structure of antagonism (crazy Bernie) is supported by the secondary structure of antagonism to complete the destructive and antagonistic meaning constructions. This process completes the political frontier of antagonism between Trump and Bernie. The boundary is clear, then, peoples' understanding of cognition will decide. The main meaning construction **[do not vote for Bernie]** and **[Bernie is crazy, not worthy to be a president]** is understandable and cognitively accessible, or people can understand this meaning and Trump's will in the discourse.

So, based on this analysis, the meaning constructions constructed by both primary and secondary structure of antagonism in discourse shows political function to hurt Bernie's political influence. This can happen if people understand the meaning of constructions. Their cognition has to be accessible for meaning constructions of discourse. The supporting structures of antagonism in this discourse consist of these clauses: *he is crazy as a bad bug, you know, he doesn't quit, he doesn't quit, got a hand to.. and I think Bernie should continue to go forward folk, he should continue to go forward, he should fight to the last end. Well, he's waiting for really.* These clauses control the context of antagonism to intensify the political effects of the main structure of antagonism in this discourse **(Crazy Bernie).**

The topic of these clauses is Trump suggesting Bernie to continue to fight for a presidential candidate from the Democratic party. However, the noun phrase (crazy Bernie) as the primary structure of antagonism is not about semantic and pragmatic meaning construction on how good politician Bernie is. None of that exactly. At the level of critical discourse analysis, this phrase shows political function to influence peoples' understanding and decision not to vote for Bernie if he becomes the candidate from the Democratic Party.

Trump shows the process of language to control peoples' cognition and decision regarding politics and power. He does not communicate, but he uses discourse to control peoples' cognition. He does not convey the message as the common practice in communication, but he uses language to control peoples' opinions.

Trump sets up a clear line of antagonism directly. There is no ambiguity in the whole structure of discourse. Both primary and secondary structures. The political boundary of antagonism is clear and sharp. This is a requirement needed by the people

to understand the meaning construction of antagonism and get affected by that. The analysis of the secondary structures also shows that the process of controlling the context. It happens because of the effect of the theme or topic in the clauses. There is a converging point between context and theme in this discourse which functions to support the Americans to understand and accept the meaning constructions created by the use of the main structure of antagonism **(crazy Bernie).**

Based on the analysis, it is clear that the use of discourse for political function and aims is all about language manipulation to control human cognition or understanding and their decision. The frontier of antagonism in discourse constructed by the structure of antagonism shows this process of manipulation and control. The data in this research show this function of control consistently.

This process of control cannot be explained by describing the meaning. The meaning constructions have to be explored regarding the cognitive effects required by political purpose. In this discourse, it is clear that Trump wants the Americans to vote for him only. That is why he has to describe the meaning of his opponents as the opposition. Trump uses the discourse consisting of the structure of antagonism to describe the reality about him and his opponent on the coalition course, a conflicted path of a political fight. Trump's political discourse shows the Americans this coalition course and the boundary of antagonism.

This condition will naturally make people decide, vote, and choose. The final political function of this discourse of antagonism is to put Trump's opponent in an antagonistic role, making the people decide not to choose them, but vote for Trump instead. Of course, there are people unaffected by discourse.

Furthermore, the primary structure of antagonism in discourse 2, the noun phrase **crazy Bernie,** consists of two words. The noun *Bernie* is the core, or head, the adjective crazy functions as the modifier. This noun phrase does not have a semantic and pragmatic function and meaning because its meaning operates in political antagonism between Trump versus Bernie Sanders.

The noun **Bernie** is the core structure of antagonism in this discourse and functions as the governor. The adjective **crazy** completes the function of governing the whole structure of antagonism and its destructive meaning dynamics. So, this phrase governs all other parts of discourse 2 so-called secondary structures. The secondary structure consists of clauses that function to control the context of antagonism. This process intensifies the political implications of this discourse.

This noun phrase also controls all destructive meaning constructions of discourse 2. Moreover, this finding proves the structure of discourse generally can be categorized as the main structure and the secondary structure. There are many aspects why the noun phrase **crazy Bernie** in this discourse is categorized as the primary structure of antagonism in discourse. The noun *Bernie* represents the democratic figure, Bernie Sanders. He is the central figure of the antagonist in discourse 2. Therefore, the noun representing Bernie Sanders modified by the adjective *crazy* functions as the core structure of antagonism because this noun phrase is a label attached to Bernie Sanders, the antagonist.

The process of creating a political frontier of antagonism is drawing a line between two figures in conflict or a struggle opposing each other. Therefore, the expression or the label used to attack the opponent will become the main structure of antagonism in a discourse which control the whole meaning construction.

The adjective **crazy** not only modifies the head, the noun **Bernie,** but it also completes the form of the main structure of antagonism in discourse. Trump's political aims to undo Bernie's influence requires this form of the structure of antagonism. Therefore, the political boundary can be constructed in antagonistic ways.

This is one of the forms of antagonistic structure in discourse. The boundary is absolute, the option is only two: the insider or the outsider, vote for Trump or vote for Bernie. Naturally, the people will not vote for the antagonist. This is why the antagonistic discourse has effects and political implications.

The relationship of the core, the noun **Bernie**, and the modifier, the adjective **crazy** also shows the natural process fits for the making of the structure of antagonism. The noun refers to things, people, and any material aspects regardless of concrete or abstract. The American people understand this process, they know the noun *Bernie* refers to Bernie Sanders from the Democratic Party.

All Americans understand to whom the noun *Bernie* refers to. This is the first requirement for this structure of antagonism to work properly and to have meaning destructive enough on Trump's opponent. This structure of antagonism is not complete because of its lack of an antagonistic component. The adjective *crazy* suits the political function for this antagonism. The adjective describes the condition. The combination of the noun Bernie and the adjective crazy in the form of a noun phrase completes the main structure of antagonism in discourse 2.

Thus, the adjective *crazy* here completes the political antagonism of the noun Bernie. This relationship governs the whole structure of discourse 2 consisting of some clauses as the secondary structures. Moreover, the political function of the primary structure of antagonism (*crazy Bernie*) is to destroy Bernie Sanders' political image and making him the antagonist. The secondary structure consists of many clauses that show the political function of controlling the context of antagonism required for the primary structure to produce destructive meanings.

Discourse 3
Feb 20, 2020
Sleepy Joe Biden the other day had 68 people and now they have a new member of the crew mini mike, mini mike, no boxes, we call him no boxes, and I hear he's getting pounded tonight, you know he is in a debate, I hear they are pounding him, he spent five hundred million dollars so far and I think he has 15 points it just came out hey fake news how many points does he have right now 15, they won't tell you the truth. They just came out with a poll a little while ago **Mini Mike** was at 15 and **Crazy Bernie** was at 31, that's a lot and mini mike just spent five hundred million but the DNC, the DNC is going to take it away from Bernie again and that's ok because we don't care who the hell it is we're gonna win. We're gonna win. We have to.
Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v4eHQ6wkTPA

Discourse 3 shows three noun phrases: **Sleepy Joe Biden, Mini Mike, Crazy Bernie** that function as the core structure of antagonisms of discourse. These three phrases control the different forms of antagonism because they are nicknames for three different figures from the Democratic party. Thus, there are three different structures of antagonism in this discourse to make three different political frontiers of antagonism as well.

This discourse also proves that different antagonism can happen in one discourse. These different main structures of antagonism also control three different secondary structures of antagonism in the forms of clauses. *Sleepy Joe Biden* is the noun phrase used by Trump to construct a political frontier of antagonism against Biden. *Crazy Bernie* is a nickname, also a noun phrase used by Trump to make Bernie Sanders look bad as the antagonist. The new noun phrase of nickname here is **Mini Mike** used by Trump to attack and ridicule Mike Bloomberg from Democratic Party. This phrase also shares function as the core structure of antagonism to destroy Bloomberg's political image.

The adjective **mini** modifies the noun **Mike** in this phrase to complete the antagonistic meaning of underestimating Mike Bloomberg. This phrase constructs the political meaning: **[Mike Bloomberg is not a great person], [Mike Bloomberg is not worthy to be a president of the US].** This noun phrase does not function semantically nor has any semantic meaning. Mike Bloomberg is indeed shorter than Trump, but this phrase is not about physical appearance but it is more about creating the political boundary of antagonism of Trump versus Bloomberg to make Bloomberg look like the antagonist in the 2020 US presidential race.

Based on the analysis so far, we know that all noun phrases that function as the core structure of antagonism in Trump's political speech do not have a semantic and pragmatic function. All of their functions are political at the level of antagonistic discourse to destroy and undermine the political image of Trump's opponent. The phrase *mini Mike* is no exception. Thus, the adjective *mini* is not a reference to Bloomberg's height whatsoever, it functions as Trump's antagonistic discourse instead, to control voters' decision not to vote for Bloomberg because he is not worthy to be a US president. This process creates a destructive meaning in Bloomberg's image.

This is also a finding in this research, the noun functions as the governor of antagonism in Trump's political discourse. The adjective still modifies the noun in the form of a noun phrase, but the modifying process does not happen semantically and pragmatically, it happens for a political reason in the war of discourse between Trump versus his opponents, the antagonist in the US presidential run.

The adjective **sleepy** also shows the same process of modifying the noun **Joe Biden** politically, not semantically nor pragmatically. The noun phrase *sleepy Joe Biden* is not a reference to Joe Biden is still sleepy because of lack of sleeping, but it is a core structure of antagonism which creates the meaning **[Joe Biden is not worthy to be US president]**. This form of political and antagonistic meaning construction is shared among different core structures of antagonisms in Trump's political discourse. Trump shows the process of cognitive control in his antagonistic discourse, all of these noun

phrases or antagonistic nicknames for his opponents exert control of understanding not vote for those Democratic figures.

The process of controlling peoples' understanding not to vote by using discourse happens because peoples understand the political meaning naturally. That is why Trump uses a clear phrase of antagonism in his political discourse, so the antagonistic meaning construction can be understood by the voters. American voters understand the context and meaning. The antagonism in discourse intensifies this process. Trump has to use the noun phrase or nicknames to make peoples or American voters understand not to vote for those Democratic figures.

The noun phrase *Mini Mike* also shares this process of creating a political frontier of antagonism. The noun *Mike* as the core of the phrase and the adjective *Mini* as the modifier does not show any semantic function, both words operate only at the level of political discourse which is destructive to Mike Bloomberg's political credibility. Thus, the noun *Mike* and the adjective *mini* have lost their semantic function and operate purely as a core structure of political antagonism. This political function diminishes semantic function. This phenomenon only happens in the core structure of antagonism, whereas the secondary structures of antagonism still have their semantic and pragmatic function.

The noun *Mike* also shows the governing process over other words, phrases, and clauses. This is quite similar to the other nouns in the core structure of antagonism in this research. The noun functions as the core binding other words. This finding proves that the political frontier of antagonism cannot happen without people's names. all names are nouns. This is the key process of why antagonistic discourse can have political implications because all political figures have their names.

Trump's attack of discourse on Mike Bloomberg shows similar patterns he uses on other democratic figures. Trump used a clear noun phrase, *Mini Mike.* All American voters can understand this phrase easily. This clear-cut phrase creates a political frontier of antagonism because peoples understand it and decide to put Mike Bloomberg outside the circle as the antagonist. Of course, not all Americans will accept Trump's political discourse of antagonism, but at least the people choose to vote for Trump more frequently.

The political frontier of antagonism cannot happen if the main structure of antagonism cannot be easily understood by the people or the voters. Trump knows this aspect very well, so he used a clear nickname in the form of a noun phrase to attack his political opponents in his speech. Without the name of those opponents, this antagonism will fail and Trump's political discourse will not have any effect whatsoever. Thus, it is clear that the annihilating dynamics of meaning that operates in this political antagonism can only function under the controlling process of the noun of the names of Trump's political rivals.

The logic of discourse also applies here. Trump can't support his political opponents from the Democratic party nor he will ask the voters to choose them. So, Trump's discourse of antagonism is natural in the battle of politics. It is just common sense for Trump to destroy the political image of his opponents. The use of noun phrases as nicknames and the core structure of antagonism proves to be effective to

create a clear antagonistic political boundary between Trump versus his rival including Mike Bloomberg.

Finally, the political function and political purpose of discourse are intertwined. This is a reason why there is no different function and purpose in CDA. These two aspects always converge at the end of the course. Then the political implication of the noun phrase Mini Mike as the antagonist and that is why he is not a proper candidate for the presidential race is also intensified by the secondary structures of antagonism in this discourse. The noun phrase *Mini Mike* controls these clauses as the secondary structures of antagonism in this political discourse: *no boxes, we call him no boxes, and I hear he's getting pounded tonight, you know he is in a debate, I hear they are pounding him, he spent five hundred million dollars so far and I think he has 15 points it just came out hey fake news how many points does he have right now 15, they won't tell you the truth. They just came out with a poll a little while ago.* These clauses are bound to the antagonistic meaning constructions created by the noun phrase *mini Mike* as one of the core structures of antagonism in this discourse.

These clauses provide the context of antagonism and control it to intensify the political implications of the main structure of antagonism, the noun phrase *mini Mike.* Therefore, the annihilating dynamics of meaning in this discourse are constructed in the form of destructive meaning constructions on the political image of Mike Bloomberg: **[Mini Mike is not worthy to be US president]**. All of Trump's antagonism in his political discourse show the same orientation to destroy the political image of his opponents.

The structural relationship of this secondary structure of antagonism in the form of many complex compound clauses with the noun phrase as the main structure of antagonism proves language is a political instrument to control peoples' understanding, belief system, decision, and action. This point is the key language phenomenon studied in CDA. This analysis also provides more insight into the relationships and dynamics of the main structure of antagonism with the second one in political discourse.

Trump also used some repetition when he spoke that night. The noun phrase *Mini Mike* is repeated to intensify the destructive and antagonistic meaning construction in peoples' understanding about Mike Bloomberg. So even the repetition of this phrase has a political function. Then, the political frontier of antagonism between Trump versus Mike Bloomberg happens by putting Mike Bloomberg in an antagonistic position. When the American people understand this antagonistic political frontier, the political implication on their decision on who to vote for will kick in.

The noun phrase **sleepy Joe Biden** controls the secondary structure of antagonism in the form of the following clause *the other day had 68 people and now they have a new member of the crew.* This clause has semantic and pragmatic functions unlike the core structure of antagonism which has the pure political function of discourse. This supporting structure of antagonism intensifies the political implication of the core structure of antagonism. This secondary structure helps to provide more context for peoples' cognition to understand and accept the belief of Joe Biden being the antagonist.

The clauses of the secondary structure of antagonism not only provide the context for the primary structure but also control the context for people to understand the core structure of antagonism more deeply. This understanding is also controlled by the process of the core structure of antagonism and the secondary one in Trump's political discourse. When people or the American voters believe in Trump's political discourse, they will not vote for Mike Bloomberg, Joe Biden, and Bernie Sanders. This is what Trump wants to achieve by using his political speech in the context of the 2020 US presidential race.

It is clear that Trump's political discourse is not about the structure of information it provides, but it is all about what political functions it exercises. This political function includes the aspects of political purpose because both aspects seem to converge in the data so far. Trump's political discourse functions to control peoples' understanding and belief system on the antagonistic Democratic leaders like Bernie, Warren, Biden, Trump's political purpose is that control understanding. So, the aspects of functions and purpose seem quite similar here.

The next core structure of antagonism in this discourse is the noun phrase **crazy Bernie.** This main structure of antagonism functions to construct the political frontier of antagonism between Trump versus Bernie Sanders. The adjective **crazy** in this phrase modifies the noun, **Bernie**. This modifying process is purely political at the level of discourse, it has no semantic and pragmatic function and meaning. This noun phrase is used by Trump to destroy the political image of Bernie Sanders. Its function is not for communication but to destroy Bernie's credibility. This noun phrase also shows the destructive meaning of construction **[Bernie Sanders is not worthy to be a president of the US]**.

Three different noun phrases in this discourse *sleepy Joe Biden, Mini Mike, and Crazy Bernie* share similar functions as the core structures of antagonism in this discourse. However, each of them controls a different form of antagonism including different secondary structures. Meaning they share the political function of antagonism but they are not reducible to each other.

Therefore, the political function of the noun phrase *crazy Bernie* as the main structure of antagonism is to attack Bernie' Sanders' political standing as one of the presidential candidates from the Democratic party. This noun phrase is supported by the other clauses in this discourse as the secondary structures providing and controlling the context of Trump's political discourse. A similar finding is also found in the previous data.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Based on the results of the analysis, Trump used nominalization to classify his political rivals as the antagonist and bad politician. The nominalization occurs in the use of nouns to represent Trump's political rivals as the obstructionist, antagonist, and bad decision-makers. Trump also used the nouns as the destruction process on his rivals' political image.

The primary structures of antagonism found in the data consist of noun phrases, nouns, and clauses that have the political function as the instrument of Trump's political attack on his rivals. The main structure of antagonism is used by Trump to construct antagonistic meaning constructions that are destructive to his opponent's political image and influence. Meaning, the core structure of antagonism is the core of political attack on Trump's rivals. The noun phrase on the names or the nicknames of Trump's political opponents also shows the political function of the noun and the adjectives. The noun functions as the core of the phrase creating the meaning construction on Trump's opponent's identity. The adjective is the modifier to complete and intensify the antagonistic meaning constructions on Trump's political rivals.

The secondary structures of antagonism consist of the clauses to intensify the antagonism and the political implication of the mains structure of antagonism by providing and controlling the context and narrated theme in the political discourse. This process finally controls the understanding of the cognition of the American voters not to vote for Trump's opponent.

The antagonism in Trump's political discourse is a direct political attack on strong figures and candidates from the Democratic party. This political function dictates the role of the noun as the governor which controls the internal grammatical relationship among clauses, phrases, words, and meaning construction. The reason for this different fact from that of the conventional and formal linguistic phenomenon is human identity. This is the part of the language function of the noun is responsible for. Trump attacked his opponents politically. Those opponents have names as their identity.

One of the major findings in this research is the political function of the noun and adjective in Trump's political discourse. The phenomenon of antagonism in the political discourses orchestrated by Trump has revealed the political function of the noun to control and construct the antagonism against other political figures or Trump's opponent. The main structures of antagonism are governed by the noun of the names of Trump's opponent. Meaning, the antagonistic discourse requires the noun of the names to function properly. The reason for this because the antagonism requires the process of controlling peoples' understanding. Peoples' understanding also requires the name of a figure or group to understand the structure and the meaning of antagonism in discourse. This is one of the main findings of this research.

Moreover, the political function of the adjective in the main structure of antagonism is the function as the modifier of the noun to complete the main structure of antagonism and its destructive meaning construction against Trump's opponents. So, the adjective does not function as a modifier known in formal linguistics. The modifying process here is political and has destructive implications on Trump's political opponents. This finding proves that the noun and adjective have a political relationship in the phenomenon of antagonism in political discourse. This process has an impact on peoples' understanding especially the voters in the next 2020 presidential run in the United States. The result of this process is the political frontier of antagonism.

REFERENCES

Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Company.

Dixon, R. M. W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory: Volume 1 Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. 1978. History of Sexuality: Vol 1 An Introduction. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical Study of Language.* New York: Longman Publishing.

Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hooker, C. A. (1977). Methodology and Systematic Philosophy. In Butts, R. E. and Hintikka, J. (eds). *Basic Problems in Methodology and Linguistics.* Dordrecht: Springer Science +Business Media.

Howarth, D. and Stavrakakis, Y. (2000). Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis. In Howarth, D. et al. *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies, and Social Change*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004). Language and Politics. In Thomas, L. et al (eds). *Language, Society, and Power: An Introduction 2ⁿᵈ Edition.* London: Routledge.

O'Dwayer, E. (2003). *The Rising of the Moon: Language of Power*. London: Pluto Press.

Phakiti, A. (2014). *Experimental Research Methods in Language Learning.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Trask, R. L. (2007). *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts.* Oxon: Routledge.

Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse Studies – Important Concepts and Terms. In Wodak, R. and Kryzanowski, M (eds). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Wodak, R and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.