

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.0 Summary of the Research

This research report is a theoretical and critical analysis of the construction of negative-other representation in the media, and its effectiveness in influencing the mental models of social actors into affecting a desired outcome. The focus of this research is the construction of the negative-other representation of Donald Trump and his golf complex project in Scotland by *The Guardian* e-news. The linguistic items that make up the strategies employed in the construction of negative-other representation will be examined, and the framework chosen for this research is Ruth Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach (Wodak, 2001) as its concept of interdisciplinarity recognizes the complexity of any one issue being investigated, and simultaneously allows the focal point of the investigation to be on the problem as a whole, merging them with the analysis of the linguistic realization as another source of data necessary for the formulation of the conclusion.

### 1.1 Motivation for the research

In the history of the world, one thing remains constant – the economic and social inequality between the rich and the poor. The economic gap segregates between these two groups, and having money can literally and figuratively open doors.

Most economically-advantaged people are the movers and shakers of the world, including Donald Trump, the social actor at the centre of this research paper. Trump is an American businessman who has amassed a fortune in real estate. Born to an American father and a Scottish mother, Trump was born and bred in America. Trump owns many luxury properties bearing his name, for example Trump International Hotel and Tower, Trump Park Avenue, and many more. ([www.trump.com/Trump\\_Portfolio](http://www.trump.com/Trump_Portfolio)) Trump branches out of real estate and affiliates himself with *Miss Universe Beauty Pageant*. He also hosts *The Apprentice*, a popular reality TV show in America. Having money lends Trump a power that makes him almost untouchable. Therefore, his wealth becomes an issue that would be picked on, or if not, something else about him would be picked on since the extent of his wealth would ‘protect’ him. His personal traits would be critiqued, creating a negative impression of Trump in the people’s mind, generally known as the construction of negative-other representation.

In Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the construction of negative-other representation is a discursive practice frequently used in order to discredit the outgroup. This so-called “fight” happens in an arena that is rife with manipulation, hegemonic practices disguised in common-sensical discourse. Wodak (2003, p. 133) describes this practice as the “rhetoric of exclusion”, a set of dichotomy used to characterize the In-group and the Out-group, in order to propagate their ideology and to gain solidarity with the target group. This practice is prevalent in the media, giving those with access to it the power to alter the power dynamics. The ones with access to the media are seen as having access to power to further their cause.

However, while the construction of negative-other almost always works in producing the desired outcomes, the success rate is not always 100%. Many studies conducted on the negative campaigns on political opponents have shown that the effects of negative attacks are debatable as the evidence of the effects of such smear campaigns is ambiguous (Carraro, Castelli and Gawronski, 2010).

One such case is between the e-newspaper *The Guardian*, a UK-based newspaper, against the American businessman Donald Trump in the case of the golf complex project in Balmedie, Scotland.

Given that *The Guardian* is supposed to have access to power, in their battle against another social actor, i.e. Trump, whose ‘access’ to power comes in the form of economic, social and political advantages, I have undertaken the research of this case to highlight the possible reasons behind *The Guardian*’s failure to achieve the desired outcome, i.e. the rejection of the planning approval for the golf complex in Scotland, through the employment of the negative-other representation of Donald Trump and the proposed golf complex project.

## **1.2 Background of the problem**

In 2006, Trump International, an American real estate and building corporation synonymous with Donald Trump, the billionaire developer at its helm, revealed its plan to build a world-class golf course in Balmedie, Scotland. The planning permission for this one-billion-pound project was submitted to the local council in Scotland for approval. With the support of the Duke of York himself, the project was considered a done deal. However, the project was met with much

opposition because the proposed site is actually a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), i.e. a legally-protected site, as its natural dunes are home to many species of birds and plants, hence its recognition of environmental importance. Environmental issues due to the magnitude of the destruction the project will cause were at the core of the opposition. Among the most vocal were many environmental agencies and *The Guardian's* online newspaper, a popular left-wing newspaper in the United Kingdom. *The Guardian* reported the case regularly, voicing a strong, open opposition to the project.

The local council of Balmedie approved the building permission. However, the unexpected happened when the project application was submitted to Aberdeenshire council for what was assumed to be a routine procedure. Martin Ford, a councilor, used his veto power to reject the application, causing much protest among Trump's supporters. One supporter, Alex Salmond, Scottish first minister who is also the MP for Balmedie, called the case in for an intervention by ministers at the state level, calling it a project of 'national importance'. Later, Aberdeenshire council passed a motion of no confidence in Martin Ford, with 26 votes to 10 (29 other councilors refused to participate), forcing Martin Ford out of the council. Aberdeenshire council then did a U-turn on their previous ruling, and approved the project, pending the approval of the Scottish government.

In June 2008, the public inquiry at the state level took place. Trump personally responded to questions posed by the executive committee. In November 2008, the government of Scotland approved the planning application. Trump

International was given the permission to proceed with the £1b project, leaving the project's opponents with much confusion, disappointment and anger.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The main objectives of this study are:

- 1) How the media constructs the negative-other representation of Donald Trump and his project
  
- 2) How the sociological, historical, economic and political background influence the resolution of this case.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

This research intends to uncover the strategies used by the media in order to construct the negative-other representation of the social actor, a.k.a. Donald Trump and his project. According to Wodak (2001, p. 8), strategies are a “more or less intentional plan of practices (including discursive practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim.” Therefore, I will also look out for the ways these strategies are realized linguistically, i.e. the linguistic items used to construct these strategies. More importantly, as the strategies employed by *The Guardian* online failed to bring about the desired outcome, I am also interested in finding out the possible factors that might have brought about this failure.

Therefore, the research questions for this research paper are as follows:

- 1) What are the strategies used to construct the negative-other representation of Trump and his golf complex project in Scotland?
- 2) How are these strategies realized linguistically?
- 3) What are the possible factors that affected the intended outcome?

### **1.5 Limitations of the Study**

Wodak's Discourse-Historical approach (DHA) emphasizes the importance of analysis in context, namely the sociological, historical, economic, and political background of the case. However, an in-depth, comprehensive research into all these contexts is not possible due to space and word limitation of this Research Report.

The data for this research consists of 29 e-articles from *The Guardian*, a UK newspaper, covering the case from 2006 to 2009. Being a left-wing newspaper, *The Guardian* is an ideal choice as it represents the voice of the people and act as a watchdog to the ruling government. There are other papers with a different stance on this particular case that I have not analyzed because their position is not relevant to the core issue of this paper, i.e. the construction of negative-other representation of an influential, high-profile social actor, in this case, Donald Trump.

Additionally, at the point of this analysis, other sources of information and reference, such as theories related to journalism, have not been analyzed, also due to the word limitation of this research report.

## **1.6 Significance of the Study**

In CDA, the party with access to the media has always been assumed to be the one with the power because he is seen as having the opportunity to perpetuate his ideologies en masse, and consequently maintain his power over the people. Usually, the one without access to the media is seen as the powerless, and history has proven time and again that in order to be in power, one must have access to and control of the media to propagate one's ideologies to the people. Hall (1982, p. 87) claims that the media plays a role in perpetuating ideologies and "stabilizing" the control of the ruling party. If this fails, the ruling party, as an example of its demonstration of control, can enact "laws that appear to grossly curtail basic rights to freedom of expression, and assembly" as Chatora (2009), who explores the emergence of new media in Zimbabwe, concludes about the Zimbabwean political scene under Mugabe's dictatorship. In this vein, it is interesting to note that in this particular paper, the Scottish government went as far as 'bending' the existing laws when they approved Trump's golf project. Chatora (2009, p. 12) elaborates how the media industry in Zimbabwe is owned and controlled by the government to "promote government policies". Machin (2008, p. 80) discusses the media's reliance on "official institutions and bureaucratic organizations" hence compromising the representation of truth when they publish news items based solely on information provided by agents of such bureaucratic organizations. The media's dependency on bureaucratic organizations as its source of information inherently supports the view that in the process, the media perpetuates the

ideologies of the power group and subsequently assists in stabilizing the maintenance of power of the ruling party over the people.

These observations are important because, despite the inconclusive success rate for the use of the construction of negative-other representation in bringing about the desired effects, this strategy is still widely used by the media. This phenomenon perfectly describes the case of *The Guardian* against Donald Trump and his golf project in Balmedie, Scotland

Therefore, this case is important to CDA because it demonstrates the unequal power relations between the media and the social actor, and the seemingly ineffective construction of negative-other representation against an influential Social Actor. Despite the assumption that the Media who has access to ‘power’ is considered more influential, in the end it is ‘trumped’ by the social actor, who ‘seemingly’ is at the mercy of the Media in their portrayal and construction of Trump’s negative-other representation, but who in fact has more power than the Media. The power dynamics move constantly in this case.

As Trump and his organization succeeded in obtaining the planning permission for the project, it is important that the strategies employed in the construction of negative-other by *The Guardian* be examined to discover possible factors which affected the desired outcome.

## **1.7 Overview of the Research Report**

This report consists of 5 chapters.

Chapter 1 states the purpose of this report, the problem and its significance to CDA, a summary of the sequence of events that set the background of this case,

and finally the research questions and a discussion on the limitations of this research paper.

Chapter 2 discusses the different approaches of CDA and reviews related literature on power, ideology and manipulation, the construction of negative-other representation, and the definition of some recurring keywords in this paper.

Chapter 3 is the discussion on the methodology chosen for this paper, and a brief discussion on the framework, i.e. Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach.

Chapter 4 is the analysis of data and a parallel discussion of the findings.

Chapter 5 is the conclusion of this paper whereby I will discuss my main findings and my suggestions for further research of this particular case.

In this chapter, I have outlined the background to the problem and the reasons I feel are important for me to undertake the research for this particular case, i.e. to investigate the construction of negative-other representation by *The Guardian* e-news against Donald Trump and his golf complex project in Balmedie, Scotland and the reasons it did not work.

In the next chapter, I will review past researches related to the topics of the construction of negative-other representation, the power of media as well as the involvement of politics in the economic domains of a country.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0 Introduction**

This chapter discusses the related literature on power, ideology and domination, the construction of negative-other representation in CDA, the role and power of the media and the limitations of the practice of the construction of negative-other representation in affecting social change.

Firstly, I will discuss the role of CDA as a research tool, and give an overview of the approaches that frame CDA, followed by a detailed discussion on Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach, and the various discursive notions and concepts known to CDA, through the use of power, propagation of ideologies and manipulation of the weaker group.

#### **2.1 CDA as a research tool**

The concept of power abuse to propagate ideologies that produce social inequality and injustice and to maintain domination over people is of the utmost interest to CDA, particularly because CDA is a field of study which examines how this discursive practice is perpetuated through public discourse by the "symbolic elites", a term coined by a group of academics in the discipline of Critical Linguistics (CL) in the late 70's to describe the ruling groups and/or elite groups for example the media, politicians, and academics. As the approach of these CL scholars is centered on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), they believe that language in use performs three main functions simultaneously, i.e.

ideational, interpersonal and textual functions. Fairclough (1995b, p. 25) describes ideational function of language as the speakers' experience of the world and its events, while the interpersonal function means the speakers impose their own attitudes, evaluations and opinions of such happenings onto their listeners. Afterwards, using the textual function, the speakers will produce texts that convey these messages, hence solidifying the ideational and interpersonal functions of language that have been performed earlier.

The concept of language as a 'social act' (Halliday, 1994) directs CDA practitioners to Fowler et al. (1979, p. 185) who study the relationships between the structures of linguistics and the social, and conclude that language is "an integral part of a social process" (Fowler et al., 1979, p. 189)

Since then, CDA has become the preferred research tool as its various approaches are able to bridge the research gaps left void by CL. Among these gaps, the two most crucial ones are the audiences and what they bring to formulate the interpretation of the texts. Fairclough (1995b) surmises that CL disregarded the audiences' interpretative processes by assuming that the audience interpretation would be similar because they think exactly as CL practitioners think. The other gap identified by Fairclough (1995b, p. 28) is that CL analysts are too focused on structure, i.e. grammar and lexical analysis of texts, and paid "little attention to higher-level organizational properties of whole texts", specifically the concept of intertextuality.

Bell & Garret (1998, p. 7) made this observation that CDA as it is known today is "best viewed as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches

rather than just one school.” In the 1990s, CDA became more popular, with many key figures who contributed to the CDA as we know today, namely van Dijk (Socio-Cognitive Model), Wodak (Discourse-Historical approach) and Fairclough who developed the Socio-Cultural approach, all of which will be discussed in 2.1.1.

Below are the main tenets of CDA as posited by Fairclough and Wodak (1997, p. 271-280):

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) CDA addresses social problems</li><li>2) Power relations are discursive</li><li>3) Discourse constitutes society and culture</li><li>4) Discourse does ideological work</li><li>5) Discourse is historical</li><li>6) The link between text and society is mediated</li><li>7) Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory</li><li>8) Discourse is a form of social action.</li></ol> |
|---|

### **2.1.1 Definition and Overview of Approaches**

I will now briefly discuss van Dijk’s socio-cognitive model and Fairclough’s socio-cultural approach. Wodak’s discourse-historical approach, the framework used for this paper, will be discussed in great detail in 2.1.2.

#### **2.1.1.1 Van Dijk (Socio-cognitive Model)**

Van Dijk’s socio-cognitive model focuses on the cognitive link between discourse and society. Socio-cognitive model investigates how the ruling group’s ideology is propagated through the reproduction of discourse, while giving major considerations to the target audience and their mental models, i.e. their cognition, hence the term socio-cognitive model. Van Dijk (1995, p. 18) defines socio-cognition as “the system of mental representations and processes of group

members”. He stipulates that there exists a top-down relationship between the macro and micro structures in society and their cognitive interface in processing an ideology in discourse, as represented by their mental models and socially-shared mental representations. Van Dijk (1988, p. 2) capitulates that the equation must consider the participants since discourse “...is a complex communicative event that also embodies a social context, featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production and reception processes.” Van Dijk (1995, p. 2) claims that shared mental attitudes “control how people act, speak or write, or how they understand the social practices of others.” His investigations into media discourse add another dimension of great significance to CDA, i.e. the *Us versus Them* dimension, which generally emphasizes Self’s positive traits and the Other’s negative attributes. *Us versus Them* dimension is central to most studies conducted by van Dijk on media discourse specifically when presenting minor ethnic groups.

#### **2.1.1.2 Fairclough (Socio-cultural Approach)**

Fairclough’s socio-cultural approach is based on an earlier framework, i.e. the Systemic Functional Linguistics. Over the years, Fairclough’s analysis of ideology in discourse moved away from the analysis of mere linguistic structures to evolve into the current socio-cultural approach. To Fairclough, in order to completely analyze a communicative event, three angles must be investigated, i.e. the text, discourse practice and sociocultural practice (Fairclough (1995b), Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999)).

Fairclough (1995b) perceives texts as multifunctional, i.e. in terms of representations, relations between writers and readers, and the construction of

aspects of identities. He believes that the linguistic analysis is important in identifying the absence, as much as the presence, of hegemonic representations of identities and relationships between the participants in a discourse.

Fairclough (1995, p. 60) states that the discourse practice dimension “straddles the division between society and culture on the one hand, and discourse, language and text in the other”. He posits that discourse practice has two major components, i.e. institutional processes and discourse processes, known as the concept of ‘intertextuality’, which is defined as “the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 84).

According to Fairclough (1995b, p. 62), any communicative event in a sociocultural context is bound by three facets:

- Economic – i.e. economy of the media e.g. the need for profit-making leads to the media being open to commercial pressures
- Political - i.e. ideology and power of the media, e.g. propagating the ideology of the powerful, the elite and the state
- Cultural - i.e. issues of value

To conclude, Fairclough (1995b, p. 16) advocates the importance of text-analysis when analyzing media texts, as long as it is supplemented with the “analysis of text construction and consumption” in order to make sense of the processes involved in the propagation of ideology.

Next, I will discuss Wodak’s discourse-historical approach.

### **2.1.2 Wodak (Discourse-Historical Approach)**

With communicative and/or discursive events growing more and more complex as the world is changing, a one-size-fits-all grand theory is not able to analyze and explain all the discursive practices that occur in discourse. Therefore, there rose an urgent need for a CDA method that could cater for all aspects of such complexities. Since CDA is concerned with interdisciplinary research to examine all aspects of discursive practices in discourse, Ruth Wodak developed discourse-historical approach (DHA) out of this need after researching one such complex discursive discourse<sup>1</sup>, believing in the tenet that research “in CDA must be multitheoretical and multimethodical, critical and self-reflective” (Wodak, 2002, p. 65).

To minimize “the risk of being biased” (Wodak, 2002, p. 66), DHA has one distinguishing feature, i.e. to incorporate other methods and approaches available to CDA, together with the “basis of a variety of empirical data as well as background information.” Therefore, DHA integrates all the avenues for research together with a vast empirical data and multiple sources of background information in the fields of historical, sociological and political to ensure that the discursive event under examination is dealt with as comprehensively as possible, because the context of the said event has a significant importance to the deductions of the findings. In fact, central to this particular approach is the historical contexts of the discursive discourse, which lends DHA its unique quality that sets it apart from other CDA approaches.

---

<sup>1</sup> Wodak’s 1990 research on the discourse of anti-Semitism.

Wodak believes that not only language “manifests social processes and interactions” but that it also “constitutes” these very same social processes (Wodak and Ludwig, 1999, p. 12). Therefore, this reason should follow three requirements:

- 1) Discourse...“always involves power and ideologies. No interaction exists where power relations do not prevail and where values and norms do not have a relevant role.” (Wodak and Ludwig, 1999, p. 12)
- 2) Discourse...“is always historical, that is, it is connected synchronically and diachronically with other communicative events which are happening at the same time or which have happened before.” (Wodak and Ludwig, 1999, p. 12)
- 3) “THE RIGHT interpretation does not exist; a hermeneutic approach is necessary. Interpretations can be more or less plausible or adequate, but they cannot be true.” (Wodak and Ludwig, 1999, p. 13)

DHA can best be explained by its ‘triangulatory approach’, “which is based on a concept of ‘context’ which takes into account four levels. The first one is descriptive, while the other three levels are part of our theories on context” (Wodak 2002, p. 68):

- 1) the immediate, language or text-internal co-text
- 2) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourse
- 3) the extralinguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific ‘context of situation’ (middle range theories)
- 4) the broader sociopolitical and historical contexts, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to (‘grand theories’).

To summarize, DHA integrates all available CDA methods and their characteristics and combine these with the various sources of data and background information while concentrating on the context of the discursive discourse from all possible angles, in order to ensure a full and complete examination of the said

discourse, with the intention of producing a research finding that is fair and free of bias. Wodak (2002, p. 70-71) summarizes all the main important 'characteristics' of DHA as stated below:

- 1) The approach is interdisciplinary.
- 2) Interdisciplinary is located in several levels: in theory, in the work itself, in teams, in practice.
- 3) The approach is problem oriented, not focused on specific linguistic items.
- 4) The theory as well as the methodology is eclectic; that is theories and methods are integrated which are helpful in understanding and explaining the object under investigation.
- 5) The study always incorporates fieldwork and ethnography to explore the object under investigation (study from the inside) as a precondition for any further analysis and theorizing.
- 6) The approach is abductive; a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data is necessary.
- 7) Multiple genres and multiple public spaces are studied, and intertextual and interdiscursive relationships are investigated. Recontextualization is the most important process in connecting these genres as well as topics and arguments (topoi).
- 8) The historical context is always analysed and integrated into the interpretation of the discourses and texts.
- 9) The categories and tools for the analysis are defined according to all these steps and procedures as well as to the specific problem under investigation.
- 10) Grand theories serve as a foundation (see above). In the specific analysis, middle range theories serve the analytical aims better.
- 11) Practice is the target. The results should be made available to experts in different fields and, as a second step, be applied with the goal of changing certain discursive and social practices.

### **2.1.3 Power, Ideology and Manipulation**

CDA contends with making opaque events transparent by exposing the discursive events that aim to discriminate and oppress a less-dominant group while strengthening the position of the dominant group. Central to this objective is the inevitable issues of power, ideology and manipulation. As discourse is linked to power and ideologies, we have to understand the symbiotic-like relationships between power, ideologies and social norms because they thrive on one another.

Gal (1991, p. 26) claims that “power is more than an authoritative voice in decision making; its strongest form may well be the ability to define social reality, to impose visions of the world. Such visions are inscribed in language and enacted in interaction.” In discussing discourse as ‘socially consequential’, Fairclough and Wodak (1997, p. 258) elaborate how discursive practices affect a social consequence due to their “major ideological effects” such as they can “produce and reproduce unequal power relations” through the way they “represent things and position people.” Busch and Wodak (2004, p. 5) explain that the dynamicity of ‘social power’ is ‘intertwined’ with language, as “language indexes power, expresses power, and is involved where there is a contention over and a challenge to power.” This theory is significant as it is now imperative for the ruling group to produce and reproduce discursive discourses to keep the recipients in the place where they will not or cannot challenge the authority of the dominant group, and subsequently maintain their ruling position.

Ideology is complex as it is inextricably bound to language. Ideology manipulates, and is also manipulated by, language. Wodak et. al (1988, p. 3) defines

ideologies as “*systems of ideas* which constitute and control the large power groups” in society. Wodak et. al (1988, p. 3) categorize the main criteria of ideology as follows:

- 1) Systems of ideology serve the interests of specific groups and legitimize their predominance over other parts of the society (Peukert, 1978). Social reality produces a ‘second reality’ which is then turned into a ‘social practice’, hence an entire ‘social consciousness’, all of which is done to the advantage of specific groups who are in possession of power and control.
- 2) Ideologies are *without history*, in that they do not ‘include the historical origins of facts, myths, rites, ritualizations and symbols.’
- 3) Ideologies aim at constructing a self-contained, logical and *complete structure which claims to be the truth*. People’s inability to create a ‘rational integration’ forces them to ‘rely on second-hand information, on clichés and preselected reports in the media,’ thus preventing ‘independent reflection’.
- 4) Ideology gains a *compulsive character*. When people do not have the opportunity for independent reflection, or in the absence of possibility to scrutinize the system, ‘certain spheres are placed under taboo and therefore evade any critical discussion’.

Van Dijk (2006, p. 260) defines manipulation as a “communicative and interactional practice, in which the manipulator exercises control over other people, usually against their will or against their best interests.” According to van Dijk (2006, p. 359), manipulation exists in three spheres:

- 1) ‘socially’: manipulation is ‘illegitimate domination confirming social inequality.’
- 2) ‘cognitively’: manipulation as ‘mind control which involves the interference with processes of understanding, the formation of biased mental models and social representations such as knowledge and ideologies.’
- 3) ‘discursively’: manipulation ‘generally involves the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse, such as emphasizing Our good thing, and emphasizing Their bad things.’

Van Dijk (2006, p. 360) perceives manipulation as a discursive practice because it involves power, specifically the ‘abuse of power’, the employment of a “form of an *illegitimate* influence” that serves the interests of the dominant groups. Further, van Dijk (2006, p. 361) explains the difference between persuasion and manipulation. In manipulation, the recipients have “a more passive role”, making them the “victims of manipulation”. In persuasion, the recipients are “free to believe or act as they please”. The media, in particular, is always scrutinized for these two practices. Van Dijk’s investigations into media discourse on ethnic minority have revealed that the media attempted to influence the readers into seeing ethnic minority in Europe negatively through their *Us versus Them* representations of this group.

Power in language and/or discourse plays a big role in influencing people’s mental models. Through language and/or discourse, power can be exercised and manipulated to enforce one’s ideology onto society who will then behave in a manner that embraces this ideology. In discussing the “social power of groups and institutions”, van Dijk (2001, p. 354-355) defines this in terms of ‘control’ over “the acts and minds of (members of) other groups.” This control is obtained through ‘privileged access’ to a “scarce social resources” namely “force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, “culture”, or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication, and a vast literature on power.” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 355). This concept of ‘privileged access’ is interesting as it is central to this research report.

While power comes in many forms and is not ‘absolute’, power in the dominant group can be forced upon others when it is made into “laws, rules, norms, habits, and even quite a general consensus.” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 355) Van Dijk (2001, p. 356) asserts that control of the people is exercised by ‘controlling discourse’:

- ...through controlling discourse ‘context’ (where, when, who, which, how and what)
- ...through controlling “structures of text and talk”
- ...through controlling the question of “who controls the topics (semantic macrostructures) and topic change”

Van Dijk (2001, p. 357) concludes that the dominant group can control “virtually all levels and structures of context, text and talk” resulting in abuse of power “at the expense of other participants”.

Van Dijk (2001, p. 357) argues that ‘mind control’ is the next method used to “reproduce dominance and hegemony”, which can be effected through four contexts:

- 1) through the recipients’ acceptance of the discourse perceived as ‘authoritative, trustworthy or from credible sources’ (Nesler et al. 1993)
- 2) in situations whereby the people have no choice but to be ‘recipients of discourse’ of ‘organizational or institutional authors’ such as in educational or occupational settings (Giroux, 1981)
- 3) in situations whereby no alternative information/belief is made available to the recipients (Downing, 1984)
- 4) the recipients lack the necessary ‘knowledge and beliefs’ in order to ‘challenge the discourses or information they are exposed to (Wodak, 1987)

Van Dijk (2001, p. 358) asserts that “discourse structures” are more discursive than contextual conditions listed above for their ability to influence the people through the insemination of implicit “preferred context models”, (Martin Rojo and van Dijk, 1997) which appeal to the people’s “mental representations”, thus facing less risk of being challenged.

To stay in power, one has to maintain one’s dominance over the rest of the group. Forcefully-aggressive forms of dominance produce violence, political instability, social unrest and dissent within the group. Thus, the preferred method of maintaining dominance is by employing a passive-aggressive method, i.e. control exercised through peaceful means in propagating one’s ideologies. In discussing racist discourse, van Dijk (2006, p. 373) highlights the positive-self and negative-other representation employed by the ruling group in order to maintain power and/or racial dominance. I will discuss this concept of positive-self and negative-other representation in great detail in section 2.2.

This “passive-aggressive” phenomenon is widespread in modern day democratic societies when the voice of the people is an important element in any key decision-making. This supposed ‘power’ of the people leads to what Mayr (2008, p. 14) describes as the need for the ruling group to legitimize and maintain their power through the people’s ‘consent’, i.e. giving people the illusion that they have the power to make decisions which are then enacted and endorsed by the ruling group when the fact is these ideologies are planted by the ruling group so that the people would make these very decisions that the ruling party has intended them to ‘approve’. When the people’s ‘decision’ is endorsed, the ruling group is

perceived to have acted for the people, hence they will enjoy continued support from the people to stay in power. This ‘perceived’ power-of-the-people is known as ‘generating consent’ (Gramsci, 1971) whose sole purpose is to maintain the ruling party’s dominance.

Chatora (2009, p. 77) cites Zimbabwe’s Mugabe regime’s use/abuse of the new media, as they seek to “legitimize and consolidate the dictatorship, advancing its ideology in the process.” Therefore, remodeling the people’s mental models into one collective mentality becomes a critical hegemonic practice. KhosraviNik (2008, p. 4) describes the term ‘collective mentalities’ as “fluid entities which are constantly formed and reshaped by new discourses and interdiscursive dynamisms.” When there are ideological conflicts between the groups, and when being of a collective mentality is crucial to the interest at stake, it is critical that the participants are persuaded to be more receptive so that they will consent to the ideology in question. If one means of persuasion does not work, another one must be employed to influence the people and to affect the desired outcome. The construction of negative-other representation is one of them.

## **2.2 The Construction of the Negative-Other**

In examining the political discourses of the rhetoric of exclusion in Europe, Wodak (2003, p. 133) simplifies the strategy of a negative-other representation as the ‘*Us*’ versus ‘*Them*’, which allows “positive self representation of the speakers/writers” and “negative other representation of opponents”, which is central to this discursive practice. Wodak (2003, p. 133) further explains that once

the 'In-group' and 'Out-group' have been identified, the positive-self representation will be constructed to characterize the In-group as 'positive' to establish solidarity 'with the In-group', consequently allowing "for negative characterization" to 'debase' the Out-group. If this discursive practice is successful, the result will be that the Out-group will be blamed for "certain social phenomena, which usually have more complex causes" (Wodak, 2003, p. 133). This simplification of complex causes leads to "common argumentative strategies" which Wodak (2003, p. 134) lists as "scape-goating, blaming the victim, victim-perpetrator reversal, trivialization, and denial". These strategies are employed to influence the people to agree with the dominant group's decision to legitimize 'restrictions' to complex social issues such as 'restricting immigration'. Once the people accept that this restriction is legitimate, the decision is then seen as the voice of the people, not the dominant group propagating this idea in their mental models. Wodak (2003) also identifies the specific strategies employed to construct the negative-other, which will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Wodak (2003, p. 141) observes that members of populist movements experience feelings of insecurity due to 'globalization and changing economies', which "may lead to a cry for nationalistic identities and for unification" while at the same time calls for the "exclusion of 'others'." This point is interesting as one of the social actors in this paper, i.e. Martin Forbes, a fisherman whose land is at the centre of Donald Trump's controversial golf project, plays on the nationalism of the people of Scotland to 'persuade' them to side with him against Trump, the American.

When investigating the partnerships between political and corporatist groups, Leonard (2009, p. 279) concludes that the legacy of Irish Prime Minister Bertie Ahern, i.e. the neo-liberal and neo-corporatist policy framework, “favours accelerated and reckless infrastructural development while excluding community concerns about health and environmental issues.” Kirby (2006, p. 182) notes that for “all the illusion of success, Ireland flies on one wing as long as it allows (indeed, actually actively fosters through public policy) the enrichment of an elite and the marginalisation of growing numbers of its citizens from the benefits of economic growth.” This is another interesting observation because the government of Scotland actually approved the proposed luxury resort in Balmedie on the grounds that the people of Scotland would reap the benefits of economic growth that this mega project is projected to produce.

### **2.3 The Media and the Negative-Other Strategy**

Over the years, the media is seen as one of the establishments which frequently employ the construction of negative-other to propagate its ideology to the masses. Bantimaroudis and Kampanellou (2009, p. 175) claim that “the press has had a profound impact on people’s perceptions of national consciousness”, thus making the media an important agent in influencing and forming collective mentalities. Extending this idea, van Dijk (1987, p. 41) claims that the media holds a critical function in reproducing public characterizations of Out-groups, because they have the social conditions to do so, i.e. they belong to a ‘group membership’, or they have an ‘institutional position or profession’ that facilitates this function.

The construction of negative-other representation always paints a negative picture of the Other/Out-group such as through the use of “understandable insinuations” which taps into the people’s “collective knowledge” (Wodak, 2006, p. 184). Discursive statements such as “It is typical of them, isn’t it?” allude to an information on the negative trait of the Out-group that all members of the In-group are aware of, and are now expected to agree with.

Another interesting point is the fact that usually the Out-group is the less-dominant social actor with no power on his side, as in the case of the Jewish minority ethnic group in Austria (Wodak and Reisigl, 1999). However, in this particular paper, the ‘Out-group’ is Donald Trump, an American magnate with access to one of the limited social resources, i.e. money, which translates into power and influence.

Many strategies can be exploited in the construction of negative-other representation, using various factors as their point of reference. Bantimaroudis and Kampanellou (2009, p. 173) explain “cultural frames” as “media constructs pertaining to descriptions of conflicts attributed to cultural differences” is one factor that can be employed, claiming that the “concept of framing describes a media process of content selection and exclusion. It represents a form of bias.” This concept is widely used to construct the idea of a culture’s (thereby its people’s) inferior or superior status, and will be examined in my investigation of this case.

However, the construction of negative-other does not always work. Interestingly, van Dijk (1991, p. 43) argues that the media possesses a “nearly exclusive control over the symbolic resources needed to manufacture popular

consent”, the word ‘nearly’ suggesting that there are other entities more powerful than the media which are in control of generating ‘popular consent’, hence the many cases of the negative-other representation which failed to produce the desired effect. The affective factors for these failures differ from situation to situation, making identification of patterns a challenge to CDA analysts. While many researchers have found that person-based negative attacks involving politicians have produced the backlash effect in terms of intended outcomes in the target groups’ judgments (e.g. Budesheim, Houston, & DePaola, 1996; Haddock & Zanna, 1997; Hill, 1989; Matthews & Dietz-Uhler, 1998; Lau et al., 2007;), Carraro et al (2009, p. 5) conclude that a “clear message that emerges from the present study is that both actors—the source and the target of negative campaigns—will experience negative outcomes.” This point is worthy of note as there is a parallel with the case being investigated in this paper.

The negative-other representation is normally employed by the dominant group to negativize the less-powerful ‘Other’ through discursive discourses. The dominant group is almost always successful in propagating these ideologies, resulting in a social inequality, and retention of power. However, in this particular research paper, the opposite is true. The ‘Other’ is Donald Trump, who is a powerful person in terms of being in access of social resources (money), which places him in a powerful social position. He is a highly-influential Other. Very few studies have explored this scenario whereby a powerful person is posited in the position of the Other. Therefore, this paper hopes to fill this research gap and finds

some answers as to the reasons the construction of negative-other of the social actor fails to produce the intended outcome in this particular case.

Next are the descriptions of some CDA terminology that are recurrent throughout this paper.

## **2.4 Description of Some CDA Terminology**

Throughout this paper, there will be many recurrent CDA terminology, hence the need for a brief description of some of these terms.

### **2.4.1 Discursive practice**

Discursive practice refers to any kind of action whose particular purpose is to generate, produce and construct a social condition by disseminating an ideology that discriminates and alienates any specific person or group resulting in the retention of power of the dominant group.

### **2.4.2 Hegemony**

According to Simon (1982, p. 23), hegemony is “the practices of a capitalist class or its representatives to gain state power and maintain it later.” In CDA, this terminology is used to describe discursive practices and ideologies, markedly those propagated by the dominant group with the purpose of gaining and subsequently maintaining their authority having obtained it through the “supposed” public consensus.

### **2.4.3 Representation**

Van Leeuwen (1996, p. 38) states that “representations include or exclude social actors to suit their interests and purposes in relation to the readers for whom

they are intended.” Therefore, the term ‘representation’ implies an image which is discursively constructed with the intention of persuading and influencing the collective mental models of society into accepting that image of the social actor.

#### **2.4.4 Social Actor**

A social actor can be an individual person or members of a group involved in the discursive event. Van Leeuwen (1996) came up with a taxonomy that defines social actors into many representations such individuals or members of group(s), or through their functions , allocated roles, their position , their relations to other people and so on.

#### **2.4.5 Negative-Other**

Wodak (2003, p. 133) describes negative-other as the clear division of ‘*Us*’ versus ‘*Them*’, whereby “various linguistic strategies and tools are used to ‘debase’ the other and to characterize the In-group as positive.” The term ‘negative-other’ illustrates the representation of a social actor in a fault-finding manner in an attempt to affect a prejudiced opinion and disapproval of the said person among the target audience.

#### **2.4.6 Us versus Them**

Wodak (2003, p. 133) delineates the strategy of negative-other representation in terms of ‘*Us*’ versus ‘*Them*’, which entails the emphasis on the Self’s positive traits and the Other’s negative traits, with the aims of discriminating and alienating the Other.

### **2.4.7 Strategy**

According to Wodak (2001, p. 8), a strategy is a “more or less intentional plan of practices (including discursive practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim.” Strategies are concrete techniques employed to realize discursive practices. Additionally, each one of these techniques has various sub-strategies, hence giving them a clear structure. These strategies are what Wodak (2001, p. 8) refers to as “discursive strategies”.

### **2.4.8 Negative-Other Representation: The Strategies**

Reisigl and Wodak (2001) classify these strategies into these specific categories, i.e. reference, predication, perspectivation and/or involvement, intensification and/or mitigation, and finally argumentation. These strategies will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

## **2.5 Summary**

In this chapter, I have reviewed and discussed the relevant literature on CDA as a research tool, and given an overview of the approaches that define CDA. I have also discussed Wodak’s DHA, and various literatures on the concepts of power, ideology and manipulation in CDA, the construction of negative-other and the media. I have also explained some terminologies that are recurrent in this paper.

Next, I will discuss the methodology that I have chosen to carry out the examination of this research paper.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### **3.0 Introduction**

In this chapter, I will discuss the data choice for this report, the theoretical framework (Wodak's DHA), the method for data analysis and the strategies for the construction the negative-other representation.

#### **3.1 Choice of data**

In this section, I will discuss the data chosen for this research, i.e. data collection and data selection, and the rationale for these choices.

##### **3.1.1 Data Collection**

The data collected are online articles from *The Guardian*, UK, totaling 29 e-articles from April 2004 to August 2009, i.e. from when *The Guardian* started reporting on the case until the planning permission was awarded to Trump's golf project. As they covered the case for this duration, hence acting as the watchdog, *The Guardian* provides an abundance of material for this particular analysis. Despite their openly critical opposition to the project, Trump and his golf project nonetheless secured approval to proceed. Thus, these are suitable materials to answer the questions raised in this paper.

Table 1 lists these 29 e-articles with each one given a reference number (Article 1 to Article 29) based on a chronological order. The actual e-articles are appended in Appendix A.

**Table 1: List of Reference Numbers for *The Guardian's* e-articles**

DATE OF ARTICLE	LABEL	NO. OF PAGE(S)
30 Apr 2006	Article 1: Attacks grow on Trump's golf plan	1
27 Nov 2006	Article 2: Billionaire Trump pursues his Scottish links	2
29 Nov 2006	Article 3: Trump meets opposition over plans to build links resort near Aberdeen	2
20 May 2007	Article 4: Greens fight Trump over £1bn golf courses	2
9 Sept 2007	Article 5: Businesses rally in Trump's support	2
9 Oct 2007	Article 6: Trump says golf plans will save Scots dunes	1
10 Oct 2007	Article 7: Just go home: what the Scots fisherman told Donald Trump	2
20 Nov 2007	Article 8: Trump's foes in court threat over golf resort	1
21 Nov 2007	Article 9: US tycoon gets go-ahead for Scottish golf resort	2
24 Nov 2007	Article 10: The Scottish fisherman who didn't want to play golf	2
29 Nov 2007	Article 11: Scottish councilors reject Trump's £1bn golf course	2
30 Nov 2007	Article 12: Developer trumped by fisherman in row over golf complex	2
4 Dec 2007	Article 13: Northern Ireland pitches for Trump golf course	2
5 Dec 2007	Article 14: Salmond steps in to save Trump's billion-dollar Scottish golf course	1
6 Dec 2007	Article 15: Donald, where's your golf course?	2
12 Dec 2007	Article 16: Trump triumphs in golf course battle	2
17 Dec 2007	Article 17: Trump attacks 'malicious' political meddling over golf course	2
8 June 2008	Article 18: Trump to face a public grilling	2
9 June 2008	Article 19: Trump snubs experts over golf course threat to rare dunes	2
10 June 2008	Article 20: Heir of Stornoway: Trump's flying visit to the family home	2
11 June	Article 21: The world's greatest golf course: take it or leave it,	3

DATE OF ARTICLE	LABEL	NO. OF PAGE(S)
2008	bullish Trump tells public inquiry	
12 June 2008	Article 22: Trump has overshoot the green	2
13 June 2008	Article 23: Scotland's gullible politicians are the victims of a colossal Trump try-on	3
4 Nov 2008	Article 24: Donald's luck	2
4 Nov 2008	Article 25: 'World's best golf course' approved – complete with 23-acre eyesore	3
5 Nov 2008	Article 26: Dune and out – the sands that have been sacrificed to golf	1
29 Dec 2008	Article 27: Neighbourhood watch – Trump moves in next to 'local hero'	3
11 Jan 2009	Article 28: Trump's golf course sparks building boom	2
6 Aug 2009	Article 29: Great Scott! It's Trump v Selina round two...	2

### 3.1.2 Data Selection

From these 29 e-articles, the data was selected based on DHA (Wodak, 2001) framework, i.e. using sociological, historical, economic and/or political contextual background. These e-articles were selected based on the relevance of their contents to this research. All 29 e-articles were tagged and coded according to the strategies provided by Wodak (Wodak, 2001).

### 3.2 Theoretical Framework

The data will be analyzed based on Ruth Wodak's DHA (Wodak, 2001). Specifically, I will only focus on the strategies used to construct a negative-other representation of Trump and his golf project, excluding Wodak's fields of action as it is not relevant to the research questions for this report (see section 1.4).

In discussing CDA, the investigations of the historical viewpoint are crucial because “social processes are dynamic, not static” (Wodak, 1989, p. xvi). Given the perceived dynamicity of social processes, Wodak and Ludwig assert that discourse “always involves power and ideologies” as no “interaction exists where power relations do not prevail and where values and norms do not have a relevant role” (Wodak and Ludwig, 1999, p. 12). DHA’s emphasis on the contextual background of the event ensures the identification of the complex underlying factors that shape the discursive event (Wodak, 2001). For example, when analyzing political discourses in postwar Austria, Wodak (2002) discovered that to further their political agenda, some speeches made by Austrian politicians are heavily laced with many anti-Semitic prejudices embedded in their insinuations and allusions which depend on sufficient shared social knowledge and contexts for them to be understood.

To understand the construction of negative-other employed by *The Guardian* against Donald Trump and his golf project, it is important that some, if not all, background of the sociological, historical, political and economic dimensions be taken into account, rather than limiting its analysis to the constraints of specific linguistic items. Thus, this framework allows me to analyze the case in its entirety, i.e. the complex sources of information and contexts that an event is normally embedded with, offering a broad spectrum to the possible conclusions of this research. As discourse is deeply historical, this framework allows me to establish the links between the text and society, a co-dependency that dictates the ruling party has to understand and also to manipulate the society’s collective

mentality in order to successfully disseminate an ideology crucial to maintaining this co-existence. The contextual background is central to this report as they would make possible more plausible explanation and lend more credible conclusions to the findings of this particular research.

Therefore, DHA (Wodak, 2001) is the chosen framework for this paper in order to ensure that the conclusion of this paper one is based on a balanced analysis of the data and supported by the historical, sociological, economic and political aspects surrounding this case.

### **3.3 Data Analysis (Qualitative)**

The data is analysed qualitatively by looking at the linguistic items employed to realize the strategies in the construction of the negative-other representation of Trump, his golf project and his supporters. The linguistic items are necessary in order to illustrate the ways language is manipulated to influence the readers' mental models and to bring about the desired effects through the construction of negative-other representation of Trump and the golf project.

Specifically, the framework central to this analysis are:

#### **1) The content of the data**

These e-articles are analyzed for the content and message, with the focus on the sociological, historical, economic and political aspects, and the possible rationale for them.

## **2) The discursive strategies employed**

In this case, the discursive strategies employed under the banner of the negative-other representation are identified and analyzed, along with the discussion on the possible effects they would have on the readers' mental models.

## **3) The linguistic realization of these contents and strategies.**

The analysis also focuses on the ways these discursive strategies are realized through linguistic manipulation in bringing about the desired effect. These linguistic items are then categorized based on common themes (e.g. 'personality traits', 'wealth' etc) through which they are realized using these strategies.

### **3.4 The Negative-Other Representation: The Strategies**

The data chosen for this research is analysed for the strategies employed in the construction of negative-other representation of Donald Trump and his golf project. The findings will be discussed in detail using Wodak's DHA framework. These analytical categories are referential, predication, argumentation, intensification/mitigation and perspectivation/involvement.

#### **3.4.1 Referential**

Referential strategy labels social actors either positively or negatively, using many sub-strategies, for example the categorization of the In-group and Out-group (see section 2.2), to other categories such as exclusion and inclusion. Direct references to the social actor's physical attributes are common, as is the identification or construction of the social actor in relations to their personal, social, and/or work life, all of which carry prejudices that marginalize the social actor.

Wodak (2001) outlines various discourse structures that make up referential strategy, but for this research, two structures, namely ethnonyms and xenonyms, are discussed for their extensive employment to prejudice the readers against the social actor.

#### **3.4.1.1 Ethnonyms (ethnification)**

As the word suggests, ethnonyms discriminate the social actor's ethnicity through specific word use such as *Eastern European*, *American* and many more. In

#### **3.4.1.2 Xenonyms (Explicit dissimulation)**

Xenonyms are specific linguistic choices that explicitly dissimilate and discriminate the social actor by putting him in a category which is different from the In-group, such as *foreigner*, *outsider* and *alien*.

#### **3.4.2 Predication**

In this strategy, specific linguistic choices are used to show prejudice towards social actors, commonly with “stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits in the linguistic form of implicit or explicit predicates” (Wodak, 2003, p. 140), which involves the construction of negative-other categorization (see section 2.2). Predication overlaps with the referential strategy because it also carries an identity marker bearing the usual aspects of stereotyping and prejudice of the *Us versus Them* structure. The social actor could be predicated through his social activities (*He loves gambling*), or allocation of passive role (*The immigrants must be checked for diseases*) or agentive role, i.e. he is the perpetrator of the negative action (*Trump rejected the plans*). (van Leeuwen, 1996)

### 3.4.3 Argumentation

This strategy aims to justify the allocation of negative-other attributes to the social actor through the use of discourse structures such as topos, fallacy and story-telling.

#### 3.4.3.1 Topos/Topoi

According to Wodak and Reisigl (2001, p. 74), topoi are “parts of argumentation that belong to the obligatory, either explicit or inferable, premises’. Topoi, such as topos of number, topos of displacement, and topos of difference, are the basic principles that differentiate *Us* from *Them*, usually employed to discriminate the social actor and mark him as an entity that is different from members of the In-group.

#### 3.4.3.2 Fallacy

Fallacy paints a negative picture of the social actor without the presence of sufficient support or evidence, hence it goes against the laws of logic and rational argumentations (Wodak and Reisigl, 2001). Among the popular ones is the fallacy of relevance, for example *ad hominem*, i.e. attacking the person instead of the issue for example by highlighting his personal attributes against him. For an example of *ad hominem*, consider this conversation:

A: I believe Science and Math should be taught in English, not Malay.

B: Of course you would say that; you’re an English teacher.

A: But what about all the facts we have just discussed?

B: Well, they don’t count, because you’re an English teacher, so of course you would have to support that Science and Math be taught in English.

This example shows fallacy of relevance is at work, i.e. the rules of logic and rationale are violated as A's personal attribute comes under attack.

### 3.4.3.3 Story-telling

Story-telling is the strategy of telling uncorroborated stories which strengthen the good or bad evaluations of in-group and out-groups (Wodak, 2001), usually in the form of personal anecdotes and experiences that the listener is not a part of. For example:

"I've met many celebrities, you know I have a friend who works for a radio station, so I've met Justin Bieber. Awww...he's so cute. He asked for my number too."

### 3.4.4 Intensification / Mitigation

This strategy is employed to mitigate Self's negative traits while intensifying the Other's negative attributes and vice versa. Some structures under this strategy are:

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| a) denial of prejudice     | <i>e.g. I'm not a racist, I just prefer non-Asian neighbours.</i>  |
| b) supposed sympathy       | <i>e.g. I feel sorry for him, but in my opinion, he asked for it.</i>  |
| c) supposed understanding. | <i>e.g. I do believe girls should get the highest education they could get, so they could become educated mothers when they get married.</i> |

### 3.4.5 Perspectivation/Involvement

Wodak (2003, p. 140) states that perspectivation/involvement is when "speakers express their involvement in the discourse, and position their point of view in the reporting, description, narration or quotation of discriminatory events or utterances." The social actor attempts to justify his stance and to influence the

others to agree with him by virtue of another authoritative figure's perspective, quotation or narration of the said event. This is usually tinged with condescension to intimidate listeners into agreeing with his position. Consider this example:

- I would advise you take the manager's suggestions carefully if you know what's what, because you are new in the business whereby for me and for him, with our years of experience in investment banking, we could do it with our eyes closed.

### **3.5 Summary**

I have discussed my research methodology, my rationale for choosing the framework, i.e. DHA (Wodak, 2001), and the discussion on the discourse structures that make up the main negative-other representation strategies, namely referential, predication, argumentation, intensification / mitigation and perspectivation / involvement.

In the next chapter, I analyze and discuss these 29 e-articles based on the contextual dimensions outlined by DHA (Wodak, 2001) framework.

## CHAPTER 4

### ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION

#### 4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the e-news articles are examined for the strategies (see section 2.3) employed by *The Guardian* through their linguistic realization and to find the factors these strategies may produce to affect the outcome of this case and answer my research questions (see section 1.4). I attempt to establish the links between these strategies and the contextual aspects, i.e. sociological, historical, political, and economic factors, if any, as outlined in DHA (Wodak, 2001), and to explain the rationale behind the strategies employed to construct the negative-other representation of Donald Trump and his golf project, and the impact this representation has on the outcome of this controversial case. (Please refer to Appendix A for the actual *The Guardian* e-news articles)

The analysis of the data shows the strategies *The Guardian* has used to construct the negative-other representation of Donald Trump and the project, in order to influence the members of the council from granting Trump Organization the planning permission to build the “world’s greatest” golf complex on the SSSI. The analyses and discussion on each strategy is presented in this order, i.e. Referential, Predication, Argumentation, Perspectivation and/or Involvement and Intensification and/or Mitigation. In discussing these strategies, some analyses overlap, particularly between the strategies of Referential and Predication as a negative reference can also be classified as a predication.

## 4.1 Referential

The referential strategy discriminates by marking out *Us versus Them* characteristics through labeling social actors. In the analysis of the data, four common themes are identified, i.e. Trump's American status, his wealth, his career title and his personality traits.

### 4.1.1 Identity as an American (Ethnonym)

To be accepted by the people, a social actor needs to establish a common identity with the group he is trying to influence. In this case, Trump plays his Scottish heritage card in his attempt to achieve solidarity with the Scottish people.

Trump always cites the reason for his decision to build a golf course in Scotland is to honour his Scottish heritage, as his mother was born in Scotland.

Consider this example:

- ... "if Jack Niklaus tried to do this he'd have a zero chance....but I am who I am and my mother is Scottish." (Article 23)

Comparing his position to Jack Niklaus, Trump is saying that, despite being a golf legend, Niklaus would not get an approval because he does not have Scottish blood, whereas Trump does. It is his birth right; hence the people of Scotland should support his plans to build in Scotland because he is just as "Scottish" as the best of them.

Unfortunately for Trump, even though his mother was born in Scotland, he himself was born and bred in America, making him very American, and therefore is not 'Scottish' in the real sense. *The Guardian* continuously make references to Trump's American status such as:

- “American billionaire” (Article 2)
- “the US billionaire” (Article 4)
- “American property tycoon” (Article 4)
- “New York-based property tycoon” (Article 27)

These explicit references remind the Scottish people that despite Trump’s claims to be a Scot, he is not one of them. He is an American, and an outsider, and Trump is also predicated by these references.

Historically, America was once a British colony. Over the years, America has risen in the world as a formidable economic power. There has been an influx of American businesses into Europe. In the United Kingdom (The UK) alone, there are now collaborations of 2,500 companies between the two countries, among others, Citi, FedEx and American Airlines. (The British-American Business Council, 2012)

There have also been many hostile takeovers. For example, the mega-takeover of a British institution, the UK confectioner Cadbury’s for £11.7bn, by Kraft, a major US food group in 2010, which forced the UK to pass *Cadbury’s Law* because Kraft renegades on its promise to keep a factory in Bristol in operation, causing thousands to lose their jobs. (www.FT.com, February 9, 2010). This incident has affected the dynamics of an otherwise good economic standing between the two countries.

Unfortunately for Trump, his reputation as a ruthless businessman only reinforces these negative perceptions. Hence, Trump’s “American-ness” is used in order to create prejudice against him, as is evident from the examples discussed here.

#### 4.1.2 Wealth (Xenonym)

These same examples in 4.1.1 also show that Trump's wealth is another factor that is used against him, marking him firmly as belonging in the out-group. The e-articles constantly refer to Trump as the 'billionaire', 'tycoon', 'magnate' and so on, referring to his wealth, and again carry negative connotations.

Firstly, they imply how economically-advantaged he is compared to the locals; he is a very rich man; the average Scotsmen are not. The word 'billionaire' implies that Trump lives a privileged life, which is very different from the average Scotsmen. Consider this example detailing Trump's brief visit to his mother's birthplace in June 2008:

- Trump...“stepped off the steps of his personalized Boeing 727”...(Article 20)
- ... the word 'Trump'... “gleaming in gold on its black fuselage”...(Article 20)

This reference to his private plane clearly delineates Trump's different lifestyle compared to that of an average Scotsman, who presumably does not travel via private jets on a daily basis, let alone owns one. Trump's gifts to his Scottish cousins consist of “his own autographed homilies to wealth-creation” (Article 20). Trump is again portrayed as having nothing in common with the Scottish people, that he is not one of them.

Secondly, these references to Trump's wealth suggest the possibility that he takes advantage of his economic position to get what he wants. The fact that he has already bought their land, the proposed site for his project that includes a strip of land which is an SSSI, demonstrates this assumption. Underhandedness is also

suggested, i.e. Trump probably uses his money to ‘buy’ people in order to get what he wants.

- Alex Salmond, Scottish first minister and also the MP for Balmedie...“intervened to save the £1bn project”...(Article 14)
- Alex Salmond had... “dinner with the property magnate in New York”...(Article 14)
- The review for the planning permission will be... “led by John Swinney, the cabinet secretary for finance who is responsible for planning and a close ally of Salmond’s.” (Article 14)

These references are damning as underhandedness is strongly implied here.

All these references imply that underhandedness might have taken place to further Trump’s cause. Whether or not it really happened is another matter; once the notion is planted in the readers’ mind, the damage is done, taking us back to the view on the media’s role in the influencing the people’s mental models by reinforcing a specific social memory to suit their purpose (van Dijk, 2002).

#### **4.1.3 Career Title**

Trump is constantly referred to as the ‘property developer’ and/or ‘real-estate developer’ in these e-articles. These references (also predications) are made because they define Trump’s main line of business, i.e. luxury real estate/property developer, and that building a golf course is a departure from Trump’s specialty.

Golf is the national pride of the Scottish people as it is in Scotland that the game of modern golf was born ([www.golfing-scotland.com/history](http://www.golfing-scotland.com/history)). Scotland is the ‘home of golf’ ([www.scotland.gov.uk](http://www.scotland.gov.uk)). As a testament to golf, there are over 550 golf courses throughout Scotland, with The Old Course at St. Andrews leading the way. In the golfing world, it is a privilege to play at The Old Course which is

steeped in history and tradition. Then, Trump has expressed his interest to build “the world’s greatest golf course” in Balmedie. Not only is his plan superfluous as Scotland already has many golf courses, but the fact that he boasts that his golf course would be the “world’s greatest golf course” is insulting to Scotland, particularly to The Old Course at St. Andrews, the “Home of Golf”, where golf has been played for 600 years (<http://www.standrews.org.uk/About-Us/History.aspx>).

Trump is associated with his real estate developments. These references imply that golf courses are not Trump’s strong point; real estates are. Therefore, his hidden agenda is revealed through these references, i.e. his real motive for building the golf course is not to pay homage to Scotland, his mother’s birthplace, as he has frequently expressed, but rather he wants to break into the property market in Scotland by building his property portfolios around the golf course in Balmedie, which has revealed to include:

- ...“950 holiday homes”...(Article 28)
- ... “36 villas”...(Article 28)
- ... “500 executive homes”...(Article 28)

Playing on the Scottish sentiment about the sport, the golf course is referred to as the “Trump sweetener”. Therefore, these references to Trump’s career titles attempt to expose his hidden agenda to the public, i.e. making profits from developing luxury properties, not about building a golf course in honour of his mother. Compared with the logistics of the luxurious residential properties in the Trump Plan, the golf course is much reduced in significance.

If the plan went ahead, the locals would be faced with another sociological issue that would rise out of the properties that Trump has in his plans. Trump plans to build high-end properties which very few locals would be able to afford. If this happened, an exodus of outsiders into Balmedie could be expected, which could be unsettling to the locals. Their ‘neighbours’ would be wealthy outsiders, possibly foreigners. This possible sociological issue is unsettling because the influx of wealthy outsiders into Trump’s golf complex might compromise the local cultural traditions and social dynamics. Hence, *The Guardian* keeps referring to Trump as the ‘real estate developer’ in order to raise awareness among the Scots that Trump’s golf project is only a ploy to gain approval to build luxurious residences in Balmedie, and that apart from the controversial environmental threat, it might also cause a sociological problem to the community.

*The Guardian* also refers to Trump as a ‘businessman’, portraying him as a person whose only interest is in making profit. The word ‘businessman’ also reminds the readers that while the SSSI project site might be of a personal and sentimental value to them, to Trump it is just business. Hence, Trump comes across as a ruthless and cold businessman whose main objective is to make profits from his business deals.

Trump has also been referred to as a ‘television star’ due to his TV show *The Apprentice*. This reference reminds the Scottish people that Trump is a TV celebrity, a status synonymous with fame and fortune. *The Guardian* implies to the Scottish people of the differences between Trump’s life and theirs. Therefore

Trump is not one of the In-group, and that he can never be one of the (Scottish) lads.

#### 4.1.4 Personality Traits

Finally, there are also direct references to Trump's personality traits that represent him as the Other.

- “flamboyant” (Article 2)
- “showman” (Article 3)
- “bullish Trump” (article 21)
- “Trump’s boast” (Article 21)
- “Trump try-on” (Article 21)
- “sharp-talking billionaire” (article 24)
- “loudmouth bully” (Article 24)
- “cocky billionaire” (Article 26)

These references are damaging to Trump's image. When the readers read the words ‘flamboyant’ and ‘showman’, an image of a person who is loud and flashy would come to mind.

Next, consider this statement:

- (Trump as a) ...“billionaire with no shame, little sense of style, large amounts of hair and unlimited ambition has injected a strong sense of theatre and unreality into the sober business of Scottish planning.” (Article 25)

Compare this image of Trump with these descriptions:

- Martin Ford, the Aberdeenshire councilor is a... “far more low-key, and important, opponent”... (Article 15)
- David Tyldesley is the...“quiet-mannered town planner hired by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds”... (Article 21),

Next to these ‘low-key’, ‘important’ and ‘quiet-mannered’ Scotsmen, Trump’s image portrayed as the ‘flamboyant’ ‘showman’ would fall short.

The other references mentioned earlier have clearly been chosen to paint a negative picture of Trump. Article 21 which reports the crucial public inquiry makes a reference to “bullish Trump” when he gives an ultimatum to Scotland, i.e. approve his golf project or he will take it elsewhere. “Bullish” is defined as (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bullish>):

1. suggestive of a bull (as in brawniness)
2. a) marked by, tending to cause, or hopeful of rising prices (as in a stock market)  
<a *bullish* market> <*bullish* policies> <*bullish* investors>  
b) optimistic about something’s or someone’s prospect <bullish on the company’s future>

Based on these definitions, the term ‘bullish Trump’ suggests that Trump attends the executive inquiry with a confidence that the outcome would be in his favour.

Article 24 refers to Trump as a ‘loudmouth bully’, suggesting that he rules through fear and intimidation in order to get what he wants. A bully might get his way, but the fact is nobody likes a bully, thus *The Guardian* is urging the people of Scotland to stand up to Trump and his bullying tactics.

Trump the ‘billionaire’ comes with some unflattering adjectives<sup>2</sup> such as ‘sharp-talking’ and ‘cocky’. However, this does not give him the license to be ‘cocky’. Considers these examples:

---

<sup>2</sup> As adjectives are evaluatory, they can also be considered as a part of the predication strategy, and such, there are overlaps of findings in both the reference and predication strategies. (See section 4.0)

On his failure to discover he had bought an SSSI:

- Trump to Martin Ford: *“Nobody has ever told me I don’t know how to buy property before. You’re the first one. I appreciate your advice.”* (Article 21)

On his TV show *The Apprentice*

- Trump to his Scottish cousins: *“If you get ratings, you’re king, like me, I’m a king.”* (Article 20)

On his political connections and self-importance:

- Trump to his Scottish cousins: *“They all want Trump because I do the highest level of work, and I’m known for that. People know that our level of work is the best, and when the project is finished, it’s going to be the best, and that’s why governments call me. They have a piece of land in a certain country, they call me.”* (Article 20)

In these examples, Trump talks about his popularity, his influential connections and his importance. These statements are published to negativize Trump in the eyes of the readers as an arrogant billionaire who has neither tact nor class.

*The Guardian* also makes many references to Trump’s personality, as in these examples:

- “flamboyant” (Article 2)
- “showman” (Article 3)
- “Trump’s boast” (Article 21)
- “cocky billionaire” (Article 26).

As mentioned in section 4.0, the words ‘flamboyant’ and ‘cocky’ show an overlap with the Predication strategy. Trump is portrayed as a man who loves trumpeting his “fame and success as a property magnate and host of the US version of *The Apprentice*” (Article 20). A Scottish cousin is reported to have said “Donald is just Donald” (Article 20), i.e. the cousin assumes everybody knows that Trump does

and says what he does and says because that is his “flamboyant” personality, and it is no secret that he is a “cocky billionaire”. Therefore, the words ‘cocky billionaire’ instantly portrays Trump as the arrogant man who blows his own horn and snubs anybody he wants to because he is a ‘sharp-talking billionaire’ and no one is better than he.

Article 23 refers to the term “Trump try-on” when reporting the decision by the government to approve the golf complex project after the public inquiry. This term is discursive because it insinuates that a crafty request is being made, with the full knowledge that the request is so outrageous that the person making the request is in fact expecting it to be refused point blank. However, playing on the gullibility of the person granting the permission, should the impertinent request be granted permission, then the person making the request has managed to trick the people, and he might use this trick again. If breaking into the European market is Trump’s main objective, then the golf complex in Scotland is the ‘trial’, almost like a soft launch to test the waters in Europe. Scotland is Trump’s “try-on”, a testing ground to gauge the reception of the Trump brand in Europe. If Trump fails in Scotland, then he will be able to learn from it and fine-tune his next approach. If he is successful in Scotland, then the rest will be easy. In this case, the people of Scotland are being ‘tried-on’ with the golf course as the sweetener for what is coming next, i.e. the real estate development around the golf course. It is a ‘try-on’ because the back nine of the golf course has been planned to be built on an SSSI location, the design of which is ‘non-negotiable’, hence violating sensitive environmental as well as legal issues. Therefore, the people of Scotland are

seriously cautioned to regard Trump’s project with duly suspicion, and to see it for what it is, i.e. a profitable real estate development at the cost of the fragile environment (the SSSI) which is under the protection of Scottish laws. If they gave in to this ‘try-on’, the question they would soon have to ask would not be “what next?” but “where next?” “Trump try-on” implies an element of deception, and so this strong reference to “Trump try-on” reveals Trump as a person who makes impossibly shocking demands masked in an innocent proposal when all the time it is shrouded in underhandedness and deception.

#### 4.1.5 Other Discriminative References

There are many other references in the e-articles that negativize Trump, such as these examples:

- Trump is the...“owner of Miss World beauty pageants” (Article 8)
- Trump is the host of the TV show... “*The Apprentice*” (Article 18)
- Trump the... “businessman” (Article 24)
- Trump’s ‘hair’ in *Heir of Stonorway* (Article 20), with the pun on the word ‘heir’
- “Donald’s hair piece” (Article 22)
- Trump’s...“artfully-contrive hairdo” (Article 20)

Trump as the owner of a beauty pageant is highly charged with negative connotations. While current beauty pageants have moved away from the earlier objective, i.e. to look for the prettiest woman, beauty pageants in general have long been an issue of controversy because their worship of the physical beauty demeans women and is offensive to many, regardless of the various dignified slogans<sup>3</sup> or charitable objectives that these pageants purportedly uphold and champion. Thus,

---

<sup>3</sup> “Beauty with a Purpose” is the slogan of *Miss World* pageant, ([www.missworld.com](http://www.missworld.com)) and the winner will be able to work towards helping her favourite charity while in term. *Miss Universe*’s motto is *One Dream, One Night, One Crown*.

this reference to Trump as the owner of a beauty pageant insinuates that Trump supports activities/events that objectify women.

Similarly, the references to Trump as the host of “*The Apprentice*”<sup>4</sup> also evoke the image of a celebrity. In the show, he is famous for his catch phrase “You’re fired!” when dismissing the contestants. Therefore, this reference is very defining as it shows how ruthless Trump can be in his business dealings. The reference ‘the businessman’ is also negative as it portrays Trump as a person whose only concern is making profits. As evident from his TV show, *The Guardian* is warning the people of Scotland that Trump is a businessman and, like all businessmen, making profit is the main priority.

Finally, the references made about his hair. While these references are personal, the impacts of these references are profound. People are always fascinated by the authenticity of his hair. Trump always maintains that it is real, thus fuelling further speculations over its authenticity. If it is indeed real, then it is Trump’s misfortune to have hair that looks like a fake hairpiece. If it is a fake, Trump would be seen as a vain person. *The Guardian* knows this fact well and use it to their advantage, hence there are many references mocking his hair. These references to Trump’s hair overlap with one of the argumentation discourse strategies, i.e. fallacy, specifically *ad hominem*, or the fallacy of relevance, which will be discussed later (see section 4.3.2.1(b)). These references are personal attacks on his character as they show Trump in an unflattering light. The shared knowledge is that his hair is a fake, and any denials on Trump’s part will only draw more attention

---

<sup>4</sup> In the series, a group of contestants go through a series of grueling business challenges and the last person left standing becomes an apprentice in Trump Organization for a year.

and more ridicule to his person, thus diminishing his caliber as a serious businessman.

Another reference is “Trumpton” (Article 24), which describes Trump’s golf complex. Due to the scale of the project, *The Guardian* reports that Trump has been accused of “dropping a new town on the area” (Article 6). The word “Trumpton” brings the readers’ attention to the future of Aberdeenshire if Trump’s golf complex is approved. This is because Trump is famous for naming his properties after himself, “...penile things called Trump...” (Article 10). If the golf complex is approved, and is planned to be christened as “Trump International Golf links Scotland” (Article 16), there is also a big possibility that the people of Scotland will be living in “Trumpton”:

- “...the Trump hotel, the Trump car parks, the Trump golfing villas, the Trump timeshare apartments, the Trump housing estate...” (Article 10)
- The coast road called... “Trump Boulevard” (Article 25).

These mocking references to Trump brand are significant because *The Guardian* gives the people of Scotland a taste of what their future might be like if the golf project is approved.

Therefore, through these references, *The Guardian* negativizes Trump and invokes a mental model of Trump as a cocky, loudmouth American billionaire real estate businessman who bullies everybody into submission through fear and intimidation.

In the next section, I discuss the strategy of predication.

## 4.2 Predication

Predication is another evaluator strategy which negativizes the social actor by giving him negative attributes that mark him as a member of the out-group. The analysis of the articles for the predication strategy yields an overlap with the referential strategy discussed in section 4.1 because of the difficulty of mapping out a clean-cut categorization of the findings. The overlap is that the main themes are also Trump's character traits and the golf complex project which are predicated repeatedly in order to gain the readers' opposition to the project. Some examples of Trump and the project being portrayed in both the agentive and passive roles (See section 3.4.2) by these predications will be highlighted.

### 4.2.1 Trump's Character Traits

The predication strategy focuses on Trump's character assassination to depict him negatively in the readers' mental models. Again, his image as a 'bully' and a ruthless businessman who is full of his own self-importance is predicated repeatedly throughout the e-articles.

In a passive role

- ...“the business tycoon was accused of blackmailing the people of Scotland...” (Article 1)

In an agentive role

- Trump was...“keen to forge a link with Scotland.” (Article 2)
- Trump is ...“in the throes of building” (Article 2)

In these e-articles, *The Guardian* portrays Trump as a calculating, ruthless businessman who bullies and blackmails people, as implied from the “threats” that he is always reported to be making (Articles 4, 16 and 18). In the agentive role,

Trump is shown as desperate to gain support for his project so he keeps playing his Scottish-blood card to validate that he is indeed one of the (Scottish) lads. The last example given above suggests that Trump's ambition for this project has reached a level that can only be described as obscene, and predicates Trump's character negatively.

The agitive role is constantly employed to portray Trump's negative character traits. He is always reported to have repeatedly "rejected" expert advice pertaining to the case, thereby coming across as a ruthless and obtuse businessman for regularly rejecting good advice unreasonably.

- Trump... "completely ignored advice"... (Article 9)
- Trump... "snubs experts"... (Article 19)
- Trump... "rejects views of his own consultants"... (Article 19)
- Trump... "rejected repeated warnings"... (Article 19)

Trump is also predicated for his arrogant personality who loves giving ultimatums, the evidence of which is also abundant:

- Trump... "issues the latest of many ultimatums that have punctuated his conduct during this saga"... (Article 15)
- ... "blunt ultimatum you would expect from"... Trump (Article 21)
- At the public inquiry, Trump... "stalked in"... (Article 21)
- Trump makes... "bold assertion"... (Article 22) when he pointedly refused to compromise on the site of the back nine of his proposed golf course by saying that the request is "out of the question" (Article 23).
- Trump... "branded" and "lashed out"... (Article 9) at Selina Scott, the Scottish journalist he has accused of sending out discriminating tapes to all councilors.

Again, these predications allocate an agentive role to Trump, portraying him as the perpetrator of many negative actions. Trump's image is thus constructed as an arrogant, stubborn, hot-headed bully in the readers' mind.

There is also an obvious predication of Trump's wealth, suggesting underhandedness:

- Trump has...“faith in the mighty Trump dollar” (Article 10)
- Trump's supporter, Scotland's first minister, Jack McConnell, employed... “enthusiastic lobbying”...to the Aberdeenshire council to secure the project for Trump (Article 2).

The phrase “enthusiastic lobbying” suggests underhandedness. It insinuates that the Aberdeenshire council members might have been put in a tight spot, or bullied into submission, as the first minister himself is lobbying in favour of the project. Trump's alliances with many important personalities in the UK/Scotland (e.g. Duke of York, Sir Alex Salmond, Jack McCornell etc) have been reported many times throughout the case, implying underhandedness.

The predication of Trump as an arrogant, pompous man full of his own sense of grandiose self-importance is portrayed repeatedly in these e-articles.

- ...“like the man himself, the project is not modest”... (Article 3)
- ...“golf courses are not his strongest point”. (Article 3)
- Trump is a... “man so unscrewed by vanity”...(Article 10)
- Trump named...“his son Baron Trump”. (Article 10)

These references clearly imply that the golf plan would be as over-the-top as Trump himself, while simultaneously questioning Trump's capacity as a golf-course

builder. What is implied here is that Trump's strong point is building luxurious properties, which is what he intends to do in Scotland. Trump is ridiculed for his arrogance that he deliberately names his son "Baron", thus wittingly gives himself a 'title', i.e. "Baron Trump". Hence, when people address his son in full, it is almost as if Trump has tricked these people into calling him "Baron Trump".

Trump's image as an arrogant and yet obtuse businessman is also captured in the predication strategy.

At the public inquiry

- Trump shows... "no sign of converting to nature-loving humility"... saying he was unwilling to change his plan in order to save the environment. (Article 10)
- Trump says that he does not do anything... "half-assed"... (Article 21)
- Trump... "spoke with typical bravura"... (Article 21)
- Trump showed the... "sort of appalling arrogance"... (Article 22)
- Trump made... "much play of his Scottish ancestry"... but... "seemed completely ignorant"... of the local laws (Article 22)
- Trump... "was accused of not reading his own environmental assessment" (Article 23)
- "Trump has a scheme" (Article 23), i.e. a plan that is hidden from the public

When facing the critiques and possible rejection to the project

- Trump... "reversed his former eulogy"... about the beautiful Scottish landscape that he had previously praised. (Article 23)

These examples allocate Trump in an agentive role as a stubborn man for insisting on building the back nine on the SSSI regardless of the environmental impacts it will cause. The word 'typical' (Article 21) taps into the readers' shared knowledge, i.e. Trump is commonly associated with speaking with 'bravura'. Trump is also portrayed as a businessman who conveniently closes his eyes to the critical

environmental issues, and the fact that he overturns his former admiration for the Scottish shoreline further predicates his character. (Article 23)

Consider these predications (Article 15):

- Trump’s face is...“well-fed, smug”...
- Trump is...“imbued with infuriating sense of entitlement”...that one “would love to punch him”...
- Trump’s personality and...“indeed his hair” makes him a “ludicrous figure”...
- Trump’s...“funny ways of doing business”...
- Trump’s...“belligerent, counterproductive conduct”... “belies his reputation as a deal-maker supreme”
- Trump’s...“silly grandstanding”...

Given all these predications, *The Guardian* paints a negative image of Trump as an arrogant, self-absorbed person whom everyone loves to hate.

In Article 20, covering Trump’s visit to his mother’s birthplace, Trump’s character is again under attack:

- The visit is a...“minutely choreographed homecoming”...
- Trump boasts...“repeatedly of his Scottish roots”...
- Trump boasts...“of his fame and success as a property magnate and host of the US version of *The Apprentice*.”

Trump’s visit to his mother’s hometown was a failure as the brevity and the timing of the visit reveal it as what it really was – a staged visit. Again, these predications negativize Trump’s character.

Trump’s personal appearance, specifically his hair, often becomes the object of ridicule, giving the impression that he is vain, untrustworthy and ridiculous, thus degrading his image as a man of respectability as he becomes the target of these predications. For example, his hair is referred to in Article 20 as:

- ...world’s most famous comb-over...
- ...artfully contrived hairdo...
- ...his trademark ducktail...
- ...briefly hung in the air like an impromptu halo...

Again, these predications are powerful in that the readers could ‘picture’ him and his hair. Such predications about his infamous hair certainly do a lot of damage to his reputation as a serious, successful businessman.

Trump is also predicated for his ostentatious display of wealth, his love of luxury and status symbols, hence strengthens the *Us versus Them* factor. Consider these predications in Article 20:

- Trump is on a...“flying visit”... to his mother’s birthplace.
- His... “personalised Boeing 727”...
- His private plane has...“the letters TRUMP gleaming in gold”...
- His gifts for his Scottish cousins are contained in cases stamped... “Trump: How to get rich” and “Never give up”.
- His team...“requisitioned” “the island’s only Porsche Cayenne 4x4”... from the island’s millionaire, rented for the day of his visit to his mother’s birthplace.

#### **4.2.2 The Golf Complex Project**

*The Guardian* predicates the golf project in two specific themes, i.e. the controversy surrounding the project and the opposition it receives. The controversy surrounding the project is cited to highlight the possible destruction the project will pose to the environment and to insinuate to underhandedness.

Some examples of the threats the project poses to the environment:

- The chief objection is that the environmentally sensitive links...are home to hundreds of thousands of birds... (Article 4)
- ...a threat to nature haven... (Article 4)
- ...wants to turn a stretch of sandy coastline into a £1bn European version of his resorts... (Article 4)
- ...will destroy... (Article 4)
- ...an important designated site of Special Scientific Interest... (Article 4)
- ...the development would destroy or damage 2 to 4 percent of key sand dune habitats... (Article 4)
- ...The destruction of up to a third of an important designated SSSI is unacceptable... (Article 4)
- These adverse impacts... (Article 4)
- Stabilising them...will destroy them. (Article 4)
- ...designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest...broad-brush proposals... (Article 8)
- ...transform sand dunes into sand traps...(Article 18)
- ...designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest...broad-brush proposals... (Article 8)
- ...transform sand dunes into sand traps...(Article 18)

Trump plans to build the back nine of the golf course on a stretch of land which is legally-protected as its dunes are home to many species of birds and plants. Despite numerous experts' advice regarding the extent of destruction the plan<sup>5</sup> will cause to the environment, Trump insists that building the course on the dunes is 'non-negotiable'. The fact that those dunes are "legally-protected" also shows Trump's lack of respect for the Scottish people and Scottish laws.

---

<sup>5</sup> The plan includes stabilizing the dunes, which environmental experts have warned would cause irreversible damage to the environment since this stabilisation will destroy the natural dynamics between nature and the environment.

The possibility of bribery and the abuse of political connections to gain approval for the project have also been predicated in these articles:

- ...rallying to the Trump’s flag... (Article 5)
- ...are also wading in to show their support. (Article 5)
- ...has been trying to drum up additional support from local ... (Article 5)
- ...to address a special meeting to promote the resort project. (Article 5)
- Salmond is MP for the Balmedie area... (Article 5)
- ...John Swinney, the cabinet secretary for finance....a close ally of Salmond’s. (Article 15)

The term “the Trump’s flag” clearly depicts Trump’s supporters as traitors who betray their own country for the sake of money. Underhandedness is also suggested as the “special meeting” clearly hints that the businessmen who attended to the meeting would ‘gain’ monetary benefits from the project. The references to Alex Salmond and John Swinney give a strong indication that Trump uses his political connections, and possibly resorts to underhandedness to obtain the approval for his project.

In Article 1, underhandedness is insinuated in these phrases:

- ...after it emerged that...
- ...to accommodate his...

The word “emerged” indicates that this information was previously hidden from public knowledge. The phrase “to accommodate” suggests that Trump is accorded a special treatment which is not available to other people.

The predication strategy also highlights the financial motive for the reason the project is generating support from local businesses and politicians. Some examples of the businessmen’s show of support for the project:

- ...will bring in millions, argue bosses... (Article 5)
- ...will be a profitable landscape... (Article 10)
- ...will bring spinoff opportunities worth millions of pounds... (Article 5)

These statements clearly reveal that money is the motive behind the show of support for Trump by the local businessmen.

The strong opposition is also cited to further predicate the project because the environmental agencies have voiced their concerns many times, to no avail.

- (The project is)...facing further criticisms... (Article 1)
- ...objections to the proposal are mounting (Article 3)
- (The project is)...facing growing opposition... (Article 4)
- A battle between business and the environment is being waged...(Article 5)
- ...have voiced their concerns and oppositions to the plan... (Article 5)
- Local protesters and environment groups claimed he is effectively dropping a new town in the area. (Article 6)
- Environmental experts – including his own- disagree. (Article 26)

These predications are highlighted to influence the Scottish public that despite the show of support from local businessmen and some politicians, the general public, especially the champions of the environment are objecting to it. They are mounting their opposition to the project, and that more and more people are joining their cause, hence the ‘growing’ opposition that Trump is facing.

Given all these predications, the controversies surrounding both Trump and the project are highlighted to construct the negative-other representation of Trump.

In the next section, I discuss the strategy of Argumentation.

### 4.3 Argumentation

As discussed in section 3.4.3, the argumentation strategy is characterized by three main discourse structures namely topos/topoi, fallacy and story-telling with the aim of justifying the allocation of negative-other attributes to the social actor.

#### 4.3.1 Topos/topoi

In my analysis of the e-articles, numerous topoi (see section 3.4.3.1) have been identified, most notably the topos of number, topos of danger and/or threat, topos of bully and the topos of deception. The main issues identified using these topoi also overlap with other strategies, i.e. the magnitude of and/or threats posed by the project, the allusion to bribery, the deception regarding Trump's ambition of building luxurious residences, as well as Trump's character and his golf complex, all of which construct a negative representation of Trump, the golf project and his supporters.

##### 4.3.1.1 Topos of number

The topos of number is used mostly to describe the magnitude of the project, simultaneously drawing attention to the sociological, economic and environmental problems that it poses.

The whole complex will (Article 25):

- cover ...“2,000 acres”...of land
- include not one, but...“two 18-hole championship courses”...

The complex will have (Article 25):

- ...”four blocks of 950 timeshare flats”...
- a... “450-room five-star hotel”...
- ...”500 ‘exclusive’ homes”...
- ...“36 villas”...
- ...” a golf academy”...
- ...housing for 400 staff...

These numbers are very effective in creating a mental image of the magnitude of the project and the project's hidden 'residential' ambitions which also reveals that the planned golf course is merely a facade for Trump's luxury residential plans. With such big numbers of luxurious residential homes, there would be an enormous influx of wealthy outsiders into Balmedie, raising many sociological issues. These numbers will show the people of Scotland that this is not just a golf course, but a mega golf complex complete with luxury residential homes which implies affluent clientele, thus widening the *Us versus Them* divide in the readers' mental models. The construction cost of £1b is staggering, clearly indicating that the project is not just a mere golf course but is in fact a hugely expensive investment, and as with any other investments, its main objective would be to make huge returns, unfortunately at the expense of the people of Scotland and their country.

The topos of number also details the extent of destruction that Trump's project will cause to the environment, notably the dunes and the wildlife that make them their 'home'.

- The golf complex is planned to be built along... "an 800-acre stretch of coastline off the Menie estate"... (Article 1)
- The project will destroy... "one of the top five dune habitats in Britain"... (Article 4)
- Environmentalists are concerned that... "40 percent of the development is within a designated site of special scientific interest (SSSI)"... (Article 4),
- The dunes are home to... "hundreds of thousands of birds"... (Article 4)
- The dunes are home to... "19 nationally important species of lichen and fungi and a wide range of plants and invertebrates" (Article 4).

The topos of number employed in these articles warns of the vast bionetwork of flora and fauna native to these Scottish shores that would be destroyed (and possibly extinct) for the sake of ONE golf complex project. Hence, these numbers are quoted to effectively convey the enormity of the destruction this particular project would cause to the environment and wildlife in the SSSI. Therefore, the topos of number is used repeatedly to create a moral 'panic' among the people of Scotland as it conjures up the image of the sizeable bulk of the environment and wildlife that would be destroyed as the direct result of the golf complex.

Article 25 also uses the topos of number to report that initially Trump promoted that the project would create 300 jobs, then 400 jobs and as opposition grew, this number ballooned to 6,000 jobs, including 1,400 which will be local, and that the project will last for as long as ten years. The topos of number is employed to show the ludicrousness of the plan, for how could the project start with a measly 300 jobs, and yet as it faces more opposition, ends up with a whopping 6,000 jobs? The same goes for the statement that the project will last for as long as ten years, suggesting the project would keep the economy<sup>6</sup> secure for quite a while. Given the cloud of uncertainty over the economy, these big numbers imply job availability for the locals for a substantial duration, and so the big numbers are quoted by Trump to appease and turn the opponents of the project into supporters.

When the government of Scotland intervened, Trump was given the planning permission with these conditions:

---

<sup>6</sup> The economy of Aberdeenshire depends on the North Sea oil, and the problem is that the oil reserves are drying up. (www.telegraph.co.uk, 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009, <http://business.scotsman.com>, 14<sup>th</sup> December 2005)

(Article 25) Trump has to build:

- ...a 225-pupil primary school...
- ...shops...
- ...98 low-cost houses...
- ...50 starter homes...

Compared with Trump's grand plan for the exclusive golf complex, these numbers are insignificant. Again, these come across as yet another sweetener to placate the local people, peace offerings in exchange for the damage the project would cause to the environment.

Another number that is mentioned regularly is Trump's personal net worth of £2.9 billion. This fact is important as it implies that Trump is not just a rich man, but he is super rich, thus the connotations are that he is able to manipulate people with his money, he is concerned with making profits, and his immense wealth sets him apart from the average local there.

The topos of number is also applied to suggest that Trump has used his financial dominance to buy people out. Therefore, the e-articles report on the varying high offers starting from £350,000 to £750,000, with a £50,000 a year salary for "an unspecified job", that Trump had made to buy the lands off the Michael Forbes<sup>7</sup>, who keeps refusing, making him Trump's 'enemy'. Trump's final offer of £750,000 to buy Forbes' lands was counter-offered by Tony Bowman, a Cambridge ecologist and businessman, for "£1.5m to stay (put)" (Article 23). The topos of number is successfully employed to paint a negative picture of Trump who tries to use his wealth to buy people out. In this case, however, his money did not work.

---

<sup>7</sup> Forbes' 23-acre farm sits right next to the proposed golf complex.

The topos of number is also employed to persuade the people that the world does not need another golf course, especially not in Scotland, the birthplace of modern golf.

- There are...“some 32,000 golf courses in the world, of which more than 15,000 are in the United States”... (Article 4)
- ... “1,000 new golf courses are reported to be built worldwide each year”... (Article 4).

These numbers illustrate that there are already many, or perhaps too many, golf courses throughout the world so we definitely do not need another one, especially at the expense of the environment.

Scotland, the birthplace of golf, is not short of golf courses. According to the official website, <http://golf.visitscotland.com>, there are over “550 golf courses” in Scotland, some of which are recognized as the world’s greatest golf courses, in particular, St. Andrews Links, which is steeped in tradition and history as this is where the game of modern golf originated. St. Andrews Links boasts of seven celebrated golf courses, with the Old Course<sup>8</sup> being the most prestigious of them all, for the historical importance it carries for the game of golf. Therefore, the topos of number employed in this case highlights the statistics of great golf courses throughout the world, and in particular, many exceptional ones in Scotland, and therefore, implies that Trump’s “greatest golf course” plan is ridiculous, if not downright insulting to the people of Scotland, and to the game of golf in general.

---

<sup>8</sup> In discussing this point, it is crucial that we discuss the Open Championship, a major golfing event which is played on a links course, i.e. one which is built along the shorelines, as there are many factors that would come into play with every single golf shot made. Since 1873 when the Open Championship started in St. Andrews, the Old Course has hosted this prestigious tournament 27 times. The Open Championship returned to the Old Course for the 28<sup>th</sup> time in 2010, which is of a historical significance as it marked the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first Open Championship. Every year, the professional golfer who wins the Claret Jug, the much-coveted Open Championship trophy, will join the ranks of legendary golfers who have won since the tournament started. To many of these winners, this victory would be that much more momentous if it was won at The Old Course, St. Andrews, Scotland.

In Article 20, the topos of number is also used to negatively describe Trump's briefest of visit to his mother's birthplace. While his sister has visited the place "24 times" throughout the years, Trump "has done so only once", when he was still a young boy. During Trump's second visit on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2008, he was reported as spending merely "97 seconds inside his mother's birthplace", and the whole trip "lasted a little more than 180 minutes", with the damaging emphasis on the words 'seconds' and 'minutes' to demonstrate the importance, or rather, the lack thereof, of this visit. The fact that he spent just a little over a minute inside the house where his mother was born and had a quick meeting with his Scottish cousins there show the readers that, contrary to his many claims of paying homage to his Scottish mother, Trump has neither the time nor the sentimentality for the place and its people. The fact that this visit took place one day before the public inquiry into his project reveals that the visit was only a public relations event "minutely choreographed" to gain support for the project. The topos of number is employed successfully to show that it was a staged visit. It was not a short social visit; it was strictly a 'business' trip meant to obtain support for his golf project.

#### **4.3.1.2 Topos of danger/threat (To the Environment and Scottish Laws)**

This topos constructs the danger and/or threat the project poses to the environment and to the people of Scotland.

- The project is... "a threat"... (Article 4)
- Opponents to the project... "fear"... (Article 4)
- The project will... "destroy"... (Article 4)
- The project will... "damage"... the designated SSSI (Article 4)
- The... "destruction"... of the SSSI will cause... "adverse impacts"... (Article 4)
- The people of Scotland... "are in the throes of a grave multi-dimensional ecological crisis" (Article 22).

These words have been carefully chosen to create a moral panic as they depict the project as an undertaking destructive to the environment, so the people of Scotland should take this threat seriously.

The topos of danger is also evident in Article 19 in depicting the danger/threat the project would pose both to the environment and the country:

- Two independent ecological surveys...“warn in great detail”...
- The golf project will have...“a severe and significant effect on the dunes by halting their natural movement and harming rare plants and wildlife living there.”
- ...“near eradication of mobile dunes and the major loss of rare plants would have severe impact on the site”...
- The project would...“severely damage a rare and legally protected stretch of dunes”...
- The golf project will be built over...“part of a large but very fragile stretch of dunes”.

The use of topos of danger/threat above warns that the circle of life, one in which every living thing is co-dependent, is at stake, i.e. the destruction of one will inevitably result in the destruction of the other, thus condemning the golf project as detrimental to the environment and the survival of all other creatures that depend on it. The topos of danger/threat outlined throughout Article 19 draws attention to the magnitude of destruction this project will cause to the environment. It is not a minor one. Rather, the enormity of the consequences would be colossal. The word ‘fragile’ evokes a sense of something precious that has to be handled with great care, or it will break disastrously.

The fact that these ‘rare’ dunes are ‘legally protected’ heightens the point that they have the sanctity of Scottish laws behind them. Therefore, the topos of danger/threat is employed to remind the readers that it is the duty of the lawmakers in particular, and the people of Scotland in general, to uphold their laws. Turning their backs on the laws would be to declare that the sanctity of Scottish laws could be flagrantly violated as and when the lawmakers see fit, compromising the rights of the Scottish people and their lands, and that the laws of Scotland do not apply to Trump and/or other foreigners, especially those who come with monetary offerings. When reporting the approval of the project, Article 24 puts this perspective in plain terms:

- “Donald Trump has been given the freedom of Scotland”
- “The Trump’s been given the Full Monty”

These statements reveal, and at the same time condemn, the legislative system that has failed to protect both the land and the people. Therefore, the topos of danger/threat employed here illustrates that not only is the environment threatened, but also that a much bigger matter is at stake.

The topos of danger/threat appeals to the people of Scotland’s patriotism that it is their duty to uphold the sanctity of Scottish laws in order to protect themselves and their lands against threats and/or danger.

#### **4.3.1.3 Topos of bully**

The topos of bully is effectively employed to negativize Trump’s character. This choice of topos shows Trump as a bully who likes things to either be done his way, or no way.

- Trump was... “accused of blackmailing” the people of Scotland. (Article 1)
- Trump...“threatened”... to take his mega project elsewhere. (Article 1)  
Trump...“singled out Mr. Forbes for attack”...(Article 7)
- Trump...“warned”...the people of Scotland at the public inquiry (Article 14)
- Trump gave them a...“30-day-ultimatum”... (Article 14).
- Trump...“had stalked in”...(Article 21)
- Trump...“addressed Martin Ford”...“with lethal charm as ‘Martin’” (Article 21).

The phrase ‘accused of’ insinuates that Trump’s action is against the law, while ‘threatened’ and ‘blackmailing’ reek of the topos of bully. Trump is depicted as a bully who intimidates and terrorizes people who dare stand up to him, i.e. Michael Forbes<sup>9</sup>. The words ‘warned’ and ‘ultimatum’ suggest that the people of Scotland would be in trouble if they did not approve Trump’s proposal, exposing Trump as a bully who will use arm-twisting ploys to get what he wants. Examples in Article 21 suggest Trump as an arrogant person who wields control and power. The fact that he addressed Martin Ford<sup>10</sup> by his first name is rude, because it means that Trump thinks Ford is inferior to him. *The Guardian* categorically places Trump in the same group as schoolyard bullies who rule the school playground through intimidation and fear.

Therefore, the topos of bully is employed frequently by *The Guardian* to negativize Trump, conveying the message to the people of Scotland that, like Forbes the fisherman and Ford the ex-councillor, they should not be afraid to stand up to bullies.

---

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Forbes is the Scottish fisherman who has repeatedly refused Trump’s numerous offers to buy his lands which border the golf complex project site.

<sup>10</sup> Mr. Ford is the ex-councillor who used his decisive veto power to oppose Trump’s project, effectively putting Trump’s ambitions in Scotland to a screeching halt, thus Trump did not bother to disguise his dislike for the man even at the public inquiry that would determine the fate of his project.

#### 4.3.1.4 Topos of deception

Another recurring topos is the topos of deception which insinuates that Trump's real intention is not to build the golf course, but that his hidden agenda is to develop profitable luxurious properties.

- The golf project is...“just another real estate development for the benefit of Mr. Trump and his rich friends.” (Article 11)
- There were...“questions about the need for 500 private houses, which did not form part of Aberdeenshire council's local plan”... (Article 11).
- Trump...“must admit that his proposal is, at its core, a property development and not a personal calling to build the “world's greatest golf course””. (Article 15)

The word ‘just’ suggests the topos of deception as *The Guardian* directs the readers to look beyond the golf courses and see the proposal for what it really is, i.e. luxurious property developments, not the golf course. The word ‘another’ refers to other golf courses that Trump has developed, thus warning the readers that the Balmedie might not be an isolated case. The reference to “questions” implies that there are hidden issues surrounding the project due to the lack of transparency. The phrase ‘must admit’ urges Trump to come clean about his project, i.e. profitable luxurious real estate developments, not a golf course to honour his mother.

- It...“emerged that the Trump Organization had met Alex Salmond, the first minister, the day before the application was called in.” (Article 17)
- It...“has also emerged that, on the day ministers called in the application, Trump representatives were with the government's chief planner, Jim Mackinnon, during a phone call to the council's chief executive.” (Article 17)
- A...“Lib Dem leader told parliament that the government “smells of sleaze”...(Article 17)

The topos of deception is prevalent when it is reported that Trump executives have met up with two high-ranking Scottish officials, i.e. Alex Salmond<sup>11</sup>, and Jim Mackinnon<sup>12</sup> one day before the public inquiry. The word “emerged” highlights Trump’s deception as it implies that important information which was withheld from the public has now been uncovered, i.e. Trump’s executives consorting with a high-ranking government official at a very crucial moment for the project. This insinuates the possibility of an underhandedness involving politicians. Trump is portrayed as a person who abuses his political connections to extend their weighty influence to his project.

Trump’s visit to his mother’s hometown also reflects the topos of deception.

- When describing his hair blowing in the wind, it was...“the only misstep in a minutely choreographed homecoming for the world’s most famous property developer to his mother’s modest birthplace” (Article 20).
- Trump has...“ignored several previous requests from the local council”...for the restoration of Lewis Castle but finally agreed to... “consider funding their £10m restoration plans”...one day before the public inquiry (Article 20)
- The...“timing of Trump’s visit has been met by wry amusement on Lewis”...(Article 20)

The emphasis on the word ‘choreographed’ suggests a staged visit meant to gain support, and not out of Trump’s sentimentality for the place. Thus, the topos of deception mocks Trump’s claims that he wants to build the golf course in Scotland in honour of his mother, because the brevity of his visit to his mother’s birthplace contradicts his claims. After numerous refusals to lend financial assistance to help

---

<sup>11</sup> Alex Salmond is a Scottish first minister, and also the MP for Balmedie.

<sup>12</sup> Jim Mackinnon is the chief planner for the Scottish government.

restore Lewis Castle in the past, Trump's sudden agreement to "consider funding funding their £10m restoration plans" is also suspect. It is perceived as another publicity stunt to gain support for his project. The example about the "timing" of Trump's visit reveals the obvious, i.e. it was only a public-relations appearance to secure the approval for his project as Trump had to face the public inquiry on the very next day. Thus, doubts about Trump's character, and the true nature of his interests in investing his money in Scotland seep into the readers' mental models.

The topos of deception is employed to highlight these issues and negativize Trump's character, and alluding to the possibility of deception and underhandedness in the people's mental models.

#### **4.3.1.5 Other topoi**

The topos of revelation/exposure of truth is also used extensively in the e-articles. Article 21 employs this topos, particularly in lifting the facade of Trump, the good man, and exposing his real character at the public inquiry.

- Trump... "was exposed, and several times seemed to lose his cool"
- Trump was... "clearly exasperated" before calling parts of the dunes as "sort of disgusting".
- Trump was... "forced to admit"... that he did not read the reports submitted by his own environmental experts... after he was "asked three times if he had read their advice"
- Trump was... "forced to concede"... that he did not know about the right to roam laws, which means the people of Scotland have access to his 'exclusive' golf course and the surrounding areas.

The examples given above reveal Trump was not a decent person he portrays himself to be. Rather, he is exposed as an arrogant and rude businessman who does not care about the consequences of his actions on the environment.

Another recurring topos used to negativize Trump and his project is the topos of a boxer/fighter which is extensively employed in Article 21:

- Trump...“had stalked in with the heavy-shouldered roll of a prize-fighter”...as a...“phalanx of photographers and camera crews bathing his path in flashlight.”
- Trump looked...“tense and sober”...
- Trump...“was exposed, and several times seemed to lose his cool – but only just.”
- Trump showed...“flash of irritation”...when he was...“forced to concede”...that he had no idea about Scotland’s strict right to roam legislation
- It was...“a rare confrontation”...when Trump finally...“locked horns”...with Martin Ford and ...“doused (Ford) in sarcasm”...
- Trump used his...“lethal charm”...by addressing Ford by his first name
- Trump said he had...“slayed”... his opponent and...“knocked it out of the box.”

The topos of boxer/fighter depicts Trump as a strong yet arrogant, over-confident boxer whose calm façade hides his irritation at being interrogated by anybody, much less by the public inquiry which came about due to Martin Ford, whom he finally met at the inquiry. Article 21 concludes by quoting Trump as saying that he had won the fight. Thus, the topos of boxer/fighter portrays Trump as that of a fighter we love to hate because he is the champion who is arrogant and does not fight fair, as is evident from Trump’s perceived arrogance and disrespect at the said public inquiry.

In reporting Michael Forbes, the local fisherman who refuses to sell his lands to Trump, the topos of hero and the topos of number are identified in many articles. The topos of hero elevates Forbes' status to that of a defiant hero fighting against a more-powerful villain. Consider these examples:

- Forbes is...“all that stands between Donald Trump and worldwide hegemony” (Article 10)
- Forbes is... “our stubborn hero”...(Article 10)
- Forbes' ...“staunch refusal to sell”...his lands...“angered Trump”...(Article 11)
- Forbes...“consistently refused”...Trump's numerous offers to buy his lands (Article 11)
- Trump and his...“forces can be defeated provided their opponents were stubborn, quaint and Scottish enough” (Article 10).

In these examples, Forbes is portrayed as the local hero for standing up against Trump. Forbes' perseverance and strength of character are contrasts to Trump's reliance on his financial influence. The term “Scottish enough” invokes the patriotism, elevating Forbes status to a Scottish patriot.

The topos of number is also employed to illustrate the superiority of Forbes, the Scottish fisherman, over Trump, the American billionaire.

- Forbes has...“lived here for 40 years”...(Article 10)
- Forbes is...“one of few salmon netters left”... (Article 10),

The first example confirms that Forbes is a true native of Scotland, as opposed to Trump, the out-group whose only claim to Scotland is through his Scottish mother. The topos of number also depicts Forbes as one of the last defenders of the traditional Scottish way of life, pitting him against Trump who represents the

American corporate, possibly unschooled in the Scottish traditional way of life hence widening the *Us versus Them* divide.

Based on all the examples, we can conclude that the use of topos/topoi in the argumentation strategy negativizes and ‘others’ Trump and his project.

#### **4.3.2 Fallacy**

The strategy of fallacy (see section 3.4.32.) has also been identified throughout the e-articles in the construction of Trump’s negative representation, particularly the fallacy of relevance such as *ad populum* (appeal to the masses), *ad baculum* (appeal to authority), as well as *ad hominem* (attacking the person instead of the issue).

Fallacies usually carry the element of deception or half-truths as the information is not fully substantiated and is just employed to derail logical argumentation. This strategy is also evident in the analysis of these articles, with a twofold objective, i.e. to construct the negative-other representation (of Trump and his supporters), and to expose the fallacies employed by the proponents of the project, i.e. Trump supporters.

##### **4.3.2.1 Fallacy of Relevance**

The fallacy of relevance, specifically *ad populum* and *ad baculum*, occurs in much of the data. It is used by Trump and his supporters to win the people’s approval, as well as by *The Guardian* to gain support from the Scottish public. However, both *ad populum* and *ad baculum* used by Trump are published by *The Guardian* with the intention to expose to the people of Scotland the fallacies that

Trump and his faction are trying to spread. Another fallacy of relevance, *ad hominem*, i.e. attack of the person instead of the issue, is also identified.

#### **4.3.2.1 (a) *Ad Populum* (Appeal to the Masses) / *Ad Baculum* (Appeal to Authority)**

Consider these examples in Article 5:

- The...“chambers of commerce, trade organisations and tourism businesses”... have...“hailed (the project) as the biggest thing since the discovery of North Sea oil”
- They...“believe”...the project...“will bring spin-off opportunities worth millions of pounds.”

*Ad populum* and *ad baculum* are identified as the local Trump faction, i.e. the local businesses, is reported to have shown their support for the project, dubbing it “the biggest thing since the discovery of North Sea oil”<sup>13</sup>. These businessmen “believe” the golf project “will bring spin-off opportunities worth millions of pounds.” These are fallacies concocted by Trump supporters. These claims are merely generalizations with no statistics to support them. Just because these businessmen “believe” that the golf project will boost the economy by bringing in quick profits worth “millions of pounds”, it does not make these claims true.

A golf complex, much less one which is in Balmedie, can hardly boost the economy the same way North Sea Oil does. The construction of a golf complex only offers a temporary fix, and it might not yield the same profitable effect that the oil industry has been providing. Therefore, to draw the same parallel as the discovery of North Sea oil is a fallacy fabricated to influence the people of Scotland

---

<sup>13</sup> The discovery of North Sea oil earned Scotland the title “the Oil Capital of Europe”, and has been sustaining the economy of Scotland since the 60’s.

to support the project. As the project seemed to be in trouble that point, the businessmen resorted to telling *ad populum* fallacies in their effort to gain the people's support for the project. Conversely, *The Guardian* published these statements to show the Scottish people about how ridiculous these claims are.

Article 6 also reveals an *ad baculum* (appeal to authority) fallacy being used by Trump in order to justify his plan to build the golf course over the SSSI:

- Trump claims that the SSSI is...*“a piece of land which is disappearing...it's blowing all over the place. Our stabilisation expert was saying “You're doing a tremendous service to the area.”*

This is a fallacy because this claim is not well-substantiated. Trump has offered no expert data to support his claims. The dunes in Balmedie have been there for hundreds of years, and Trump's plans to build over them would cause a massive destruction to the bionetwork in the area. Trump knows this, hence his attempts to justify his actions with this fallacy. Trump takes to using the appeal to authority, i.e. by citing his “stabilisation expert” in order to persuade the people that this claim is made by some authority on the topic, therefore these claims must be true. Again, Trump does not produce any concrete data in the form of an environmental study to support his claims. In fact, articles 19, 21 and 24, for example, have reported that studies conducted on the issue have concluded otherwise, and at the executive inquiry, Trump has been exposed to have repeatedly rejected these environmental studies because the conclusions are not favourable to his project, i.e. building on the SSSI would cause an irreversible damage to the environment. Therefore, *The*

*Guardian* published these fallacies told by Trump and his faction to represent them in a negative light to the Scottish public.

In defending his plan for luxury homes, Trump also resorted to the *ad baculum* fallacy:

- Trump claims that the luxury homes...“were central to the project” or else golfing there would be...“prohibitively expensive”... (Article 6).

This is a fallacy because Trump assumes that everybody knows he is a successful property developer, therefore he is an authority in property development. Hence, this statement is an *ad baculum* fallacy because if he, the authority in property development, says the luxury homes are central to the project otherwise golfing there would be costly, then the Scottish public must take it as the truth.

The issue here is the geographical location of Balmedie in relation to other golfing destinations. It is located “on the same latitude as Southern Alaska” (Article 26), and so Balmedie is cold all year long, making it highly unlikely that people would go there to play golf, let alone to live there all year round. Trump argues that due to these factors, it is imperative that these luxury homes be built to accommodate these golfers, or else nobody would want to go to Balmedie and play golf there. Compared to other established and high-profile golfing destinations in Scotland, for example, The Old Course in St. Andrews, Trump’s statement is ironic because the average golfer would not automatically choose Balmedie as a golfing destination, due to its location and the average cold temperature. Thus, Trump’s statements about building “the greatest golf course in the world” seem to be “geographically misplaced as well as grammatically challenged” (Article 22).

Therefore, *The Guardian* published these claims to show the Scottish public that they are just fallacies concocted by Trump and his supporters to justify their plans and to gain support for the project.

The *ad baculum* fallacy is also employed when appealing to the Scottish public to oppose the project by showing the extent of destruction the project will cause to the environment through citing the environmental authorities.

- Opponents of the Aberdeenshire development include the *Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Scotland*, which says wind-swept, shifting dunes on the shore are an important habitat for skylarks, lapwings and shelducks. (Article 2)
- *The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and the Scottish Wildlife Trust* are concerned that 40 percent of the development is within a designated site of special scientific interest (SSSI). (Article 4)
- *The Scottish Wildlife Trust* claims that plans to “stabilise” the dunes to prevent sand blowing on to the new courses will destroy their value as a wildlife habitat. (Article 4)

While there is a possibility that these published claims might be true, similarly, no supporting data, such as the results of environmental studies, have been made public to substantiate these claims. Therefore, *ad baculum* is also employed as these statements made about the extent of destruction the golf project would cause to the environment are published by *The Guardian* simply with the logic that if they were made by these authoritative bodies on the environment, then they must be true. Hence, the people of Scotland should believe them and show their opposition to the golf project.

#### 4.3.2.1 (b) *Ad Hominem* (Attack of person, not issue)

In constructing the negative-other representation of Trump, *ad hominem*, i.e. attacking the person and not the issue is in abundance.

- ... “Heir of Stornoway”...(Article 20)
- “world’s famous comb-over”...(Article 20)
- ...”artfully contrived hairdo”...(Article 20)
- ... “his trademark ducktail”... which...“briefly hung in the air like an impromptu halo”...(Article 20)

These examples mock the authenticity of Trump’s hair. The title of the article, “Heir of Stornoway”, places the pun on the word ‘heir’ as referring both to Trump as being half-Scottish, and his hair. There are many examples of *ad hominem* in this particular article, all drawing attention to Trump’s hair, hence taking the significance away from Trump’s accomplishments and qualities. These humiliating references attack Trump the person, instead of his controversial golf complex.

Therefore, *ad hominem* is employed effectively to tarnish Trump’s reputation in the readers’ mental models because these references show how comical Trump looks with his “artfully contrived hairdo”, as opposed to the successful businessman that he is.

#### 4.3.3 Story-Telling

Story-telling is widespread in the argumentation strategy because it allows the story-teller a platform to propagate his reality without the listener being able to challenge the factual accuracy of the said ‘reality’ simply because the listener is not present when the said event takes place, or he does not know the third party

involved on a personal level. Thus, even though these stories are questionable, they have a strong force of persuasion to gain the listener's approval.

In the analysis of the data, there are many examples of story-telling. Like fallacy, the use of story-telling are also twofold, i.e. it is used by *The Guardian*, Trump and his supporters to influence the Scottish people, and secondly, *The Guardian* also uses Trump's and his supporters' own story-telling strategy against them. By doing so, *The Guardian* legitimize their own position and delegitimize the positions of Trump and his supporters.

- Local businessmen said that...*“having spoken to Donald Trump ourselves, we believe that they will try everything possible to deal with these issues.”* (Article 5)

This is an obvious story-telling. The readers, who did not speak to Trump, are excluded from the privileged information these businessmen have because, unlike the businessmen, they did not speak to Trump. Therefore, the readers are expected to just believe this statement as true, even though it is vague and lacking in details as to how Trump will “deal with these issues”. Thus, the story-telling exposed here also stirs up questions and possibly doubts in the readers' mental models as specific facts are not made known.

Trump also resorts to story-telling, mainly when he is talking about himself, for example when Trump met his cousins in Lewis.

- Trump claims ...*“they all want Donald Trump....that's why governments call me....they call me”* (Article 20)

The fact that this might not be true is irrelevant as Trump's cousins were not present when those 'governments' called Trump, so they have to believe Trump's claims as the truth. Therefore, Trump's story-telling is published to portray him as a man who tries to impress people with his self-importance and supposed political connections.

The use of story-telling to construct Trump's negative-other representation could also be seen in Article 7:

Martin Forbes is reported to have:

- ...“refused several offers from the billionaire's lawyers to buy his 23 acres of land, offers that have slowly edged up to £375,000.”
- said that he...“has had a series of visits”...from various agencies to check up on various farming issues, and while he admitted...“these visits could be coincidence”...Forbes also...“believes the pressure to sell will intensify.”

This is again a character comparison in the *Us versus Them* dimension. Story-telling in this case elevates Forbes to the status of an incorruptible man, based on his supposed refusals to the money. Consequently, it negativizes Trump as a shady businessman who abuses his financial position to get his way. Regarding the visits from local agencies, this information is a merely uncorroborated story, but it can influence the mental models of the people into assuming that Trump has put up those agencies against Forbes, and that Trump will again send his people with more offers for Forbes's lands. Thus, story-telling or not, Trump is portrayed negatively in the people's mental models, while Forbes becomes the honourable hero.

Under the argumentation analytical category, I have discussed topos/topoi, fallacy and story-telling which have been used by *The Guardian* to construct the negative-other representation of Trump, the golf project and his supporters.

Next, I discuss the strategy of perspectivation.

#### **4.4 Perspectivation/Involvement: *Us versus Them***

This strategy is also widely-used in the construction of negative-other representation of Trump and his project. The analysis of these e-articles for this strategy reveals the *Us versus Them* motives whereby both Trump's supporters and opponents are quoted by *The Guardian* to negativize Trump and the project in the mental models of the readers.

*The Guardian* quotes Trump's perspectives regularly and uses Trump's own words against him.

- *"We have incredible ocean frontage, incredible dunes and unbelievable land. When we put it all together it will be the greatest golf course anywhere in the world."* (Article 2)
- *"I have never seen such an unspoilt and dramatic seaside landscape."* (Article 23)
- *I'm a big fan of the UK – it's a place I know very well.* (Article 2)

These statements reveal the irony of Trump logic. After praising the beautiful "unspoilt and dramatic landscape", Trump then revealed his plans to build "the greatest golf course" that will cause destruction to these very same legally-protected landscapes that he so admires. Trump's contradictory statements give *The Guardian* an opportunity to use the perspectivation strategy to their advantage. The Topos of

displacement is also evident in these quotes. If Trump really knew the UK “very well”, then he would have known that the proposed site is an SSSI, and that Scotland’s right-to-roam laws means anybody can enter his ‘exclusive’ golf complex.

Linguistically, an interesting finding in these examples is Trump’s use of pronouns “we” and “I”. When describing the beautiful landscape of Balmedie, the site of his golf project (Article 2), Trump uses the pronoun “we”. “We” can be both inclusive and exclusive. Trump, the outsider, is trying to establish solidarity with his fellow ‘Scotsmen’ and therefore intentionally refers to himself as belonging to the In-group through the pronoun “we”. Hence, Trump’s perspective is quoted by *The Guardian* to demonstrate Trump’s desperate attempt to ‘belong’ to the In-group. However, Trump has also been quoted as using the exclusive form of “we”, such as in this perspective:

○ *“The housing and the golf course are non-negotiable for us, but we did compromise on other issues.”* (Article 11)

In this particular example, Trump’s point of view is quoted to show two things; 1) that he is still building the back nine of the golf course on the SSSI, despite the environmental destruction it will cause; 2) he switches to the exclusive “us” and “we”, referring only to Trump and his company, Trump International. Contrary to his previous attempts at establishing solidarity with the people of Scotland, he now excludes them from his In-group, and the decisions they make for the project. This exclusion is important because *The Guardian* shows the people that Trump has his

own agenda which does not include the people of Scotland. Now, consider Trump's

- *"Everyone wants it to happen. If I don't do it here I'll do somewhere else, but I'd rather do it here than somewhere else."*(Article 2)
- *"I am at the point in my career that if it is not going to be the best, I would not want to build it."* (Article 19)

The use of the pronoun "I" is significant as it shows the readers that when it comes to the project, Trump is now Trump the American businessman, and the Scottish people are no longer a part of his decision-making. He moves away from the In-group that he has been trying to be accepted in, i.e. being a Scotsman. Therefore, Trump's use of the personal "I" is very powerful, and perspectives such as the examples above are intentionally quoted by *The Guardian* to expose Trump's character and his insincerity to the readers.

The idea that Trump is doing it for profit, not for golf, is hinted many times in these articles. The construction of the golf course is revealed to be just the front for his luxury residential plans, his money-making ambitions.

Trump says...

- *"In order to at least get some kind of returns, I have to build houses. Golf won't sustain a project of this magnitude."* (Article 6)
- *"To make this work as a viable business model there needs to be an element of real estate involved but really we want people to know that this project starts with golf and ends with golf."* (Article 3)

In these examples, *The Guardian* publishes Trump's views to expose to the people of Scotland Trump's real motive, i.e. to make money through his real estate developments, as golf alone would not yield him "returns" like real estate would.

Opponents of the project have also been quoted to show Trump's profit-making intentions:

- *“Basically this is just another real estate development for the benefit of Mr Trump and his rich friends.”*(Article 3)
- *“There are a lot of quick profits to be made.”* (Article 11)

The perspectivation strategy is employed to expose Trump's real plans, i.e. 'another real estate development' that yields high returns for Trump. Golf is just the “sweetener” for Scotland.

The fight for the environment is strengthened by intensifying the danger and the destruction the proposed project will pose.

- *“If the plan proceeds in its current form, this development will destroy one of the top five dune habitats in the whole of Britain.”* (Article 9)
- *“The destruction of up to a third of an important designated scientific interest is unacceptable. These adverse impacts...are not outweighed by any over-riding need for this development.”* (Article 4)
- *“It is difficult to imagine how the golf course design can be accommodated without causing significant permanent damage and disturbance to the SSSI.”* (Article 4)
- *“Dune ecosystems are based on a successional system...Stabilising them to prevent sand blowing onto the golf course will destroy them”.* (Article 4)

These views of the environmental experts have been published to highlight the magnitude of the destruction the proposed golf complex will cause. As these are expert opinions, the readers would believe that the proposed project will indeed cause a significant and permanent damage to the environment and so they will show their opposition to the plan.

Perspectivation also portrays Trump as a businessman who is an arrogant bully. Trump's points of view are published frequently to negativize him.

- *“He (Duke of York) gave a presentation here to make sure I spend £1bn in your country and that’s what I’m going to be doing.” (Article 2)*
- *“Our stabilisation expert was saying “You’re doing a tremendous service to the area”. (Article 5)*
- *“If you get ratings, you’re king, like me, I’m a king. If you don’t get ratings, you’re thrown off air like a dog.” (Article 20)*
- *“They all want Donald Trump because I do the highest level of work, and I’m known for that. People know that our level of work is the best and when a project is finished, it’s going to be the best, and that’s why governments call me. They’ve a piece of land in a certain country, they call me.” (Article 20)*

These statements are quoted by *The Guardian* to show the extent of Trump (and his supporters’) arrogance and their perceived self-importance that they belittle other people, including the Duke of York, who was described as if he had in fact ‘begged’ Trump to invest in Scotland. These perspectives also demonstrate the power Trump possesses that even governments “call” on him, insinuating the possibility that he uses his political connections to get ahead.

Next, consider these comments made by Trump’s executives:

- *“No. We’re not that sort of developer. We have some of the largest residential buildings in the world. We think big.” (Article 12)*
- *“There’s a view we are arrogant. We are not arrogant. We set certain standards. It may be incomprehensible to smaller minds, but we have always set high standards. We presented them with a plan and hoped they could open their minds, but it was too much for them.” (Article 12)*

Immediately after the golf complex was rejected, these strong statements are published by *The Guardian* to negativize Trump and his people. Trump and his

team come across as condescending and arrogant, and have very low opinions of the Scottish people. Any Scottish person reading these quotes would be shocked at such a display of arrogance, and possibly would not support the project. Thus, the perspectivation strategy is manipulated to portray Trump and his associates negatively by making their own words backfire.

When the plan was approved by the Scottish government, the perspectives of the representatives of the Scottish government and local Trump's supporters were published, many hinted that the people of Scotland are not able to make a reasonable decision on the matter. These perspectives are rude and condescending because they have insulted the people of Scotland as being incapable of making important decisions; decisions should be left in the hands of the Scottish politicians. Their perspectives are published to construct a negative picture of Trump and his project, tapping into the readers' existing prejudices about Trump and his team.

- *“The Scottish government quite rightly feels this application raises issues of such importance that they require scrutiny at a national level. If the decision of the ministers to call this application in keeps it alive, then we welcome this intervention.”* (Article 13)
- *“We felt this was something that had to be debated at the national level, following the huge public support.”* (Article 13)
- *“We feel it couldn't be in better hands. We felt something like this was required. We'd been looking at all the other options – an appeal, special hearings and other stuff. I think ministers have made a brave decision, because I think the government has listened to the people.”* (Article 14)
- *“For us, it is a validation or affirmation and it did not surprise us as we have support of the people of this region and I think politicians who are representing them listened.”* (Article 16)

The opposition's perspectives have also been published to show the people's confusion and disappointment over the Scottish government's approval. Also, the reasons for the approval given by the government came across sounding more like excuses, hence hinting at underhandedness.

- *“The world has gone loopy. I wasn't aware that someone can have their application called in without lodging an appeal. This doesn't usually happen with normal members of the public.”* (Article 13)

The opponent's viewpoint above is quoted to question the government's approval for the project as they have bent the laws to accommodate Trump - a concession that is not usually accorded to 'normal members of the public'. Therefore, underhandedness is again insinuated at, as in these perspectives below:

- *(The government)“...smells of sleaze.”* (Article 17)
- *“It appears that the desires of one high-profile overseas developer, who refused to compromise one inch, have been allowed to override the legal protection of this important site.”* (Article 24)

The strong view (Article 7) is published as it makes a direct accusation of underhandedness, i.e. the Scottish government, or some of its members, have voted in favour of the project in exchange for some monetary rewards. The next perspective clearly criticizes the government's approval of the project at the expense of the environment that the laws are supposed to protect. The word 'desires' suggests a 'want', not a 'necessity' that the country cannot do without, thus drawing a parallel to a parent giving in to a spoiled child's unreasonable

whims. The phrase ‘override the legal protection’ is powerful as it condemns the government for bending the rule to accommodate Trump’s golf project.

- *“This is a very, very bad precedent indeed and sends out a bad message about the protection in Scotland of our natural heritage sites. It appears to me to be a vanity project. I don’t think we can claim this, a nationally important development, and it certainly did not need to be built on this site.”* (Article 25)

This particular point of view is published as it openly criticizes the government’s approval of the project. The phrase ‘a very, very bad precedent’ refers to future projects that would be similarly approved by the government at the expense of Scottish laws and the environment. The phrase ‘vanity project’ stresses the lack of importance this project is to Scotland other than to accommodate Trump’s vanity. The reference to the project site is another strong criticism on the government’s decision to give in to Trump’s arm-twisting, i.e. let him build the back nine of the course on the SSSI or he would take the project elsewhere. The Scottish government could have stood up for the SSSI and ordered Trump to build it on a different site, but they did not. Hence, the government is criticised here for sacrificing an SSSI in favour of the mighty Trump dollar.

- *“I used to be proud to be a Scotsman, but I’m going to take both of my kilts out and burn them after this”.* (Article 25)

*The Guardian* published this particular comment by the opposition to criticize the government for making such a poor call of judgement in approving the project that the people of Scotland are ashamed of being Scottish, and for being governed by

the current members of the government whose conduct are considered by some as unpatriotic.

- “*He’s made a fool of the government, he’s made a fool of the council but he won’t make a fool out of me.*” (Article 27)

This perspective sums up what the people of Scotland think of Trump, the council and the Scottish government. Trump is depicted as a conman who tricks everybody in office, but the average Scotsman is wise to his tricks. At the same time, this is another harsh criticism of the council and the Scottish government for the way they handled the case. The people in power are seen as to have succumbed to the monetary promise that the project will bring that they close their eyes to the impacts this project has on Scotland.

Therefore, the perspectivation strategy is used extensively in these articles to negativize Trump and his project in the *Us versus Them* structure, and also to criticise the government on their decision to grant the planning permission.

Next, I discuss the strategy of intensification and/or mitigation.

#### **4.5 Intensification/Mitigation**

This strategy overlaps with the strategies of predication and argumentation in that the focus of the construction of negative-other representation of Trump is similar, i.e. Trump’s personality traits, the threat and destruction to the environment, the opposition to the project and the influence of money. In discussing the intensification/mitigation strategy, I will outline them in this order, i.e.

Supposed Self-Importance, Supposed Sympathy, Seduction of Money and Opposition to the Project/Destruction of Environment.

#### 4.5.1 Supposed Self-Importance

Trump's supposed self-importance is intensified by *The Guardian* to negativize him, as is evident below:

- Trump mentions Duke of York, "a great guy" who... "*gave a presentation here to make sure I'd spend £1bil in your country.*" (Article 2)
- Trump said that if... "*it is not going to be the best, I would not want to build it.*" (Article 19)
- To his Scottish cousins, Trump says... "*that's why governments call me. They've a piece of land in a certain country, they call me.*" (Article 20)
- Trump says... "*If you get ratings, you're king, like me. I am king.*" (Article 20)
- Trump boasts that he has received... "*many environmental accolades and awards*"...and considers himself an... "*environmentalist in the true sense of the word.*" (Article 21)

*The Guardian* clearly published these perspectives because Trump's conviction in his own self-importance provides ample opportunities for *The Guardian* to use them against him and in so doing, intensify their negativization of him.

Trump has a weakness, i.e. he thinks highly of himself and likes to blow his own trumpet and resort to name-dropping in order to impress others, and in so doing, portrays himself as a conceited man. His condescending remark about Duke of York is insulting since Trump insinuates that the Duke has begged him to invest in Scotland. Trump boasts that he has accomplished much that he does not care for second-rate developments, and that his quest for perfection leaves his plans no room for compromise, even if it means bringing destruction to the environment,

and/or breaking the law. The final example intensifies Trump's supposed self-importance and at the same time doubles as a self-mockery and a self-contradiction because it is ironic that Trump who considers himself an environmentalist is also planning to cause a substantial destruction to the environment. These examples show that Trump's negative-other representation are intensified through his own supposed self-importance, subsequently portraying him as an egotistical person. Thus, the supposed self-importance strategy is used by *The Guardian* to intensify Trump's character trait negatively by making Trump do the job himself.

#### **4.5.2 Supposed Sympathy**

The intensification strategy is also employed to construct Trump's negative-other representation through the use of supposed sympathy, specifically in Article 23. This article, written after Trump faced the public inquiry, projects a supposed sympathy for Trump and the ordeal he has to face in Scotland.

- “You have to feel sorry for Donald Trump. He came to Scotland this week to spend 97 seconds being pictured in front of his mother Mary Macleod's birthplace on the island of Lewis, and then flew his private jet across Scotland to an inquiry into his plan for a billion-pound property development by the sea at Balmedie. That the site should be occupied by a cussed fisherman and a nature reserve of European importance was the kind of thing, as George Bush would say, “*I leave to my lawyers.*”
- “Then the British taxpayer subsidised the Aberdeen Renewable Energy Group to locate 33 giant wind turbines offshore, plump in front of Trump's “magnificent view of the ocean.” (Article 23)

These statements contain various facets of mockery and irony. As Trump is wealthy, influential and gets his way with regards to his project, he is far from

needing any sympathy that one has “to feel sorry for” him. His brief trip to his mother’s birthplace is mentioned for two reasons. Firstly, Trump always cites his Scottish blood as the reason for choosing to build the golf complex in Balmedie, even though it is just a front for his real estate plans. Secondly, the trip was just a last-minute public relations event gone wrong. His ostentatious display of wealth and his £1billion-pound property development are ridiculed. The “sea at Balmedie” is mentioned to intensify the dangers the project poses to the environment, and the fact that Trump will have to contend with facing 33 environmental-friendly wind turbines planned to be installed in the waters just in front of his 5-star golf resort. The fact that he “encountered Michael Forbes” intensifies the focus on Trump’s failed attempts to buy out the “the cussed fisherman” who is not afraid to stand up to Trump. Therefore, one must ‘sympathize’ with Trump for all the ‘challenges’ he has to go through to secure the project, only to find that his grand plan is flawed.

Therefore, these examples of supposed sympathy serve to intensify the folly of Trump’s grand plan as well as lending a kind of poetic justice to the case.

#### **4.5.3 Seduction of Money**

The intensification strategy is also used to describe the monetary appeal that underpins the case.

- The project will...“bring spinoff opportunities worth millions of pounds”... (Article 5)
- ...“the seduction of money” and the “power of industrial capitalism”... (Article 10)
- There are...“a lot of quick profits to be made”...(Article 11)
- The project makes...“some local businessmen understandably salivating” ... (Article 23)

These examples show the monetary gains this project is believed to bring, hence intensifying the idea that Trump's local supporters are supporting his golf project for the monetary motivation. This seduction of money could 'buy' people over to Trump's side, even at the expense of the environment.

Among all these events, one in particular stands out, i.e. the saga between Trump, the American businessman and Michael Forbes, the local fisherman.

- Trump...“had initially tried to negotiate with Mr. Forbes”...(Article 7)
- Trump was...“trying to prevent him (Forbes) from crossing the billionaire's dunes to the sea to set his salmon nets”...(Article 7)
- Forbes believes it was...“a campaign to unsettle”...him (Article 7)
- Forbes believes...“the pressure to sell will intensify.” (Article 7)
- Forbes was also offered...“a promise of work”...for some indefinable jobs at the resort. (Article 27)

In these examples, Trump's repeated attempts to use money to buy land from Forbes, the local hero, were met with many rejections. Later, Forbes claims that Trump resorts to harassment tactics to force him into selling. Trump's negative character traits are further intensified when it was revealed that Trump offered Forbes a high-salaried position in exchange for the sale of his lands. Thus, Trump's character traits are negatively intensified as once again he tries to lure people with money so that they will give in to his demands.

Article 23 intensifies the criticism of the government's approval of the planning permission:

- “Scotland's gullible politicians have been taken in by a New York billionaire”.
- Every...“environmental outrage committed in the name of quick commercial gain, whether claimed for “jobs” or “investment” or “modernisation”, is later regretted, from the Algarve to the Amazon forest.”

These examples intensify the notion that the Scottish government has fallen for the monetary appeal that this project promises. In the process, they have sacrificed the environment in exchange for a boost to the economy, even though history has proven that such a pact will bring much regret later on.

#### **4.5.4 Opposition of the Project/Destruction of the environment**

*The Guardian* also uses the intensification strategy to strengthen the case for the opposition of the project by highlighting the destruction that the project will cause to the environment.

- The project site is...“a protected wildlife habitat”...(Article 2)
- The site is home to...“hundreds of thousands of seabirds”...(Article 3)
- The project incurs...“strong opposition from environmentalists and some local residents”...(Article 9)
- The project would cause...“a destruction of up to a third of an important designated site of special scientific interest”...which is...“unacceptable”... (Article 4).
- The project...“had divided locals on economic and environmental grounds” (Article 11)
- The...“environmentalists and some local residents were vociferous in their criticism of the development”...(Article 11)

These examples show that the project’s controversial nature is highlighted many times. Environmental groups, including the *Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Scotland* and the *Scottish Wildlife Trust* are reported to have condemned Trump’s decision to build on the SSSI. The opposition to the project is intensified as it gains strong support from environmental groups and residents, hence strengthening the focus to the strong opposition the project is getting.

#### 4.6 Discussion of Affective Factors

The analysis of these e-articles reveals that *The Guardian* has employed all the analytical categories, namely referential, predication, argumentation, perspectivation and intensification in the construction of negative-other representation of Trump and his golf complex project in order to influence the outcome of the project by highlighting many issues in their content selection namely:

1. The destruction of the environment
2. The allusion to bribery, underhandedness and abuse of power
3. The seduction of money
4. Deception of intention: Golf versus Real Estate development
5. Trump's wealth, negative personality traits, and his American status.

Using all these strategies, *The Guardian* was able to construct a strong negative-other representation of Trump and the golf project, and gained both sympathy and support from the people of Scotland. However, the fact remains that *The Guardian* was unable to influence the government to reject the project, so Trump's golf complex was approved. This leads us to the issue of the possible factors affecting the conclusion of the employment of these strategies, i.e. the platforms that the opposition of the project used to influence the case, the power of the minority over the majority, the battle between the environment against the economy and finally the social actors involved in this case.

#### 4.6.1 The Platforms for the Opposition of the Project

To highlight the plight of the SSSI and to garner the people's support for their cause, The Guardian has mounted their opposition to this project on these platforms:

- a) The project is detrimental to the environment as the back nine of the golf course would be built over an area with an SSSI status, which is home to many species of animals and plants.
- b) The developer – Donald Trump – is not a native of Scotland in the real sense, having been born and bred in the United States of America. His supposed 'connection' to Scotland (his mother was Scottish) often becomes the object of ridicule. Trump's personality provides ample scope of critique – from his brashness and arrogance to his hair, to his unapologetic displays of wealth, which is central to the construction of negative-other.
- c) There are numerous allusions to underhanded practices including bribery and abuse of power by both Trump and local politicians, as they get rid of 'obstacles' and find loopholes in the legal system to make this project possible.
- d) Golf is just a 'Trump sweetener' when the real motive for the project is to profit from the luxury residential homes that are a major feature in the plan.

From the analysis, it is possible that *The Guardian* has used too many issues as their platforms in constructing the negative-other representation of Trump and the project, that they shift the focus away from the *main* issue, i.e. the destruction of an SSSI and loss of many species of animals and plants, to other *less important* issues such as Trump's hair. When too many issues are tackled all at once, the people will be distracted from the real significance, i.e. the destruction of an SSSI. Focus should have been mounted on and not waver from the extent of the

destruction that the project would cause; focus on any other platform would only cause a distraction and shift the attention away from the main problem.

Now, I will discuss another affective factor, i.e. the power of the minority over the majority.

#### **4.6.2 The Power of the Minority over the Majority**

One of the earliest theories on the power of the minority is Karl Marx's 'power of the elite'. Mark (1964, p. 78) observes:

“The class which has the means of production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production.”

Therefore, when discussing the power struggle at this particular point, the findings of this case are largely reminiscent of Marx's power of the elite, i.e. the minority, exercise control over the masses, i.e. the majority. In this case, the dominant minority employ their authority through exploits that aim to maintain their dominance and social power over the others.

Despite the extensive strategies employed in the construction of Trump's negative-other, the outcome expected by *The Guardian*, i.e. the rejection of the planning permission for the golf complex project, did not materialize. Usually, any attacks on a person's personality would be enough to swing the outcome of any issue, such as the 2008 US presidential election whereby Barack Obama won over John McCain<sup>14</sup>. In the case of *The Guardian* against Donald Trump and his golf complex project in Scotland, the failure to affect the outcome of this case is not due

---

<sup>14</sup> McCain's character assassinations included his stance on the War in Iraq as well as his desperate appointment of Sarah Palin who was virtually an unknown politician, to run as a candidate, and who herself received negative publicity on many personal issues which in turn, influenced the American people's votes. Coupled with other issues raised by the candidates, the American people believed in the negative picture constructed by the media, and they acted by voting for Obama as their first 'black president' and changed the face of American politics forever.

to the lack of public support, but it is because the power to make decisions lies in the hands of the dominant minority, i.e. the government of Scotland, the government-appointed officials as well as Donald Trump himself. The majority, i.e. the people of Scotland and *The Guardian*, have neither the power nor the authority in the decision-making. They are the powerless majority, who, while big in terms of numbers, are the less-dominant group because they do not have the power to make key decisions. Granted these strategies have succeeded in constructing the negative-other representation of Trump and the golf project as far as the citizens of Scotland are concerned, but these small, insignificant successes have no bearings in effecting the rejection of the planning permission to the project, because ultimately, power is still in the hands of the dominant minority, i.e. the Scottish government and the influential Donald Trump.

The case of *The Guardian* against Donald Trump is a completely different scenario compared with the 2008 US presidential election. While the Scottish people were able to voice their opposition, their voice carries no weight. The people of Scotland were not properly represented and were excluded from this key decision-making exercise. This translated to the failure to affect the outcome of this case. The majority group has to come up with another plan to ensure that their voice is taken into account, and to lobby for some sort of a People's Law to be passed, a law which respects the people's opinion. For example, when there is an opposition by the people to an issue of national interest (e.g. going to war, or building over an SSSI), a public voting should be conducted. The government then weighs these votes and makes a decision based on majority votes. Besides, the government is put

in office by the people to be their voice through a democratic means, so their authority must also be exercised democratically.

From CDA point of view, it is interesting to see the power struggle between the groups involved, particularly to see the reclaim of power back to the ruling group, i.e. the government of Scotland, after the case was thrown out by a small group representing the people, i.e. the local council of Aberdeenshire. As the local council did not deliver the expected outcome, i.e. approval of the project, an influential Trump supporter, i.e. Alex Salmond, arranged for a public inquiry at national level, claiming the project is of national importance. When this shift of power occurs, the ruling group effectively strips the people of their rights to make decisions, rendering their previous decision invalid, hence hegemony has occurred. In this case, a few government officials have acted on behalf of all the people of Scotland. The fact that the government itself approves the project, the decision is deemed to have been made for the good of the people which the majority is unable to either comprehend or foresee. In doing so, the Scottish government is maintaining their dominance over the people by making it seem like the people of Scotland now fully support the project, thus legitimizing their actions and decisions. Therefore, the majority, i.e. the people of Scotland, do not have the power to affect the change that they want because the minority, i.e. the Scottish government, has the power to override the people's perceived rights to make decisions for themselves and for the country.

To conclude, by declaring Trump's golf complex project as a project of 'national importance' and taking over the approval process from the people, and

finally granting the project the planning permission, the Scottish government has exercised its minority but powerful control over the people of Scotland, the less-dominant majority.

#### **4.6.3 The Battle between the Environment against the Economy**

This controversial golf project is an important case study because the parcel of land, on which the back nine of the golf course will be built, is legally-protected under Scottish laws. Despite much opposition, the project finally got its planning permission, in an unprecedented move that shook the core of Scottish laws for how could a law be passed to protect its lands and its people and is then taken back as soon as there is monetary profit to be gained from breaking it?

Trump was accorded a special treatment by the Scottish government under the assumption that the mega resort will boost the economy, even if it is at the expense of the environment. Understandably, Scotland can only depend on their North Sea Oil for so long, as oil reserves around the world are depleting, including Scotland's, and alternative sources of renewable energy is slow in coping with the demands. When the oil wells dry up, Scotland will have to depend on other resources to sustain its economy. Tourism and golf, unlike the oil wells, has always been a great asset that is not in danger of 'drying up'. Therefore, any issues that conflict with the health of the national coffers will have to take a hit. There are many examples throughout the world where the environment was sacrificed for the economy, such as logging in Madagascar (Green and Sussman, 1990), the controversial mountaintop removal coal mining in America that is destroying the Appalachian (<http://www.examiner.com>, 2009) and the numerous dam projects that

have wiped out thousands of species of flora and fauna around the world forever. Therefore, in this particular case, the environment is the collateral damage to Scotland's fight for its economy.

Thus, the government of Scotland's act of approving the planning permission for the golf complex project can be likened to forging a treacherous economic "social partnership" at the expense of the environment and the people. Leonard (2009, p. 280) maintains that this "social partnership" in fact "represents in reality the triumph of neo-liberalism, naked greed and cronyism over local concerns."

#### **4.6.4 The Social Actors**

In this case, there are four groups of social actors involved in the power struggles between the dominant and the less dominant groups.

Firstly, there is *The Guardian*, who represents the media, and the 'supposed' power they possess to produce and disseminate their propaganda to the people. However, we have established that *The Guardian* has no 'real' power in this case. Their so-called 'power' is limited because they have no authority to make key decisions for the people.

The next social actor is the people of Scotland. Like *The Guardian*, they can show their opposition to the project as much as they want, but the fact remains that they, the majority, hold no real 'power' either. They have handed over their 'perceived' power-of-the-people to a small group of politicians whom they trusted to work in their best interests and elected this elite group to represent them in the Scottish government.

Thirdly, there is Donald Trump, the high-profile American tycoon. While he is in the minority, Trump has access to sources of social power in terms of his wealth and political connections. He has the means to ‘production’, and possesses a small measure of power to influence key decisions in this case. His power might be small, but is certainly dominant in that it enables him to influence governments and change laws in his favour.

Finally, the government officials and/or councilors (the Scottish government) who use their power in the crucial decision-making. The people of Scotland can protest against the golf project, but it is this small group of people who hold the elite power, making them the dominant minority. Whether or not underhandedness in terms of monetary gains as suggested by *The Guardian* really occurred to sway the Scottish government to intervene in favour of the project, the fact remains that this is *the* group responsible for making key decisions - decisions of ‘national importance’. They are the minority with the elite power, and they will take action that can be construed as manipulative, and they will make (unpopular) decisions in order to maintain that power over the others, and ensure that it remains the ‘power of the elite’.

#### **4.7 Summary**

In this chapter, I have analysed all the e-articles and discussed the analytical categories of the construction of negative-other representation employed by *The Guardian* against Donald Trump and his golf project in Scotland. The analysis has shown the various ways the analytical categories were employed to negativize Trump and his project. However, these strategies failed to bring about

the desired effect, i.e. the rejection of the planning permission for the golf complex project due to some significant findings, most importantly the fact that the power lies with the dominant minority, namely the Scottish government and its officials, and the American billionaire Donald Trump.

Next, I briefly summarize my findings and conclude this research report.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **5.0 Introduction**

In Chapter 4, I analyzed the data of *The Guardian*'s 29 e-articles and discussed the analytical categories employed by the said e-newspaper in their construction of the negative-other representation of Donald Trump and his golf complex in Scotland. Based on my findings, I have also offered the rationale for the possible factors affecting the outcome of the case.

In this particular chapter, I summarize my findings and their implications, propose recommendations for future research and conclude this research report.

#### **5.1 Summary of Findings**

From the analysis and discussion, *The Guardian* has employed all the strategies for the construction of negative-other of Donald Trump based on Wodak's DHA framework. There are numerous examples of Reference, Predication, Argumentation, Perspectivation and Intensification in these e-articles.

##### **5.1.1 Referential**

In the referential strategy, *The Guardian* focuses the construction of negative-other construction of Trump on four themes, i.e. Trump's identity as an American, Trump's wealth, Trump's career titles and his personality traits. Trump the American is always highlighted to remind the Scottish people that while Trump's mother is Scottish, the fact remains that Trump is an American. Thus,

Trump is portrayed as an American who does not belong in their In-group, not even through association of his Scottish mother.

The next theme is Trump's wealth. Again, *The Guardian* portrayed Trump's wealth negatively as he is referred to in numerous adjectives such as 'billionaire' and 'tycoon', which entails two issues, i.e. Trump's lifestyle is different from the average person in Scotland, and secondly, these references also suggest that Trump abuse his money to influence people to support his project.

Thirdly, Trump's career titles, in particular 'property developer', 'real estate developer' and businessman. These references reveal to the Scottish people that while Trump might have claimed that he is building the golf course in Scotland to honour his Scottish mother, they have to remember that it is the real estate developments that Trump is really interested in because his specialty is real estate, not golf courses. Another issue raised by these references is that when the luxury residential homes are completed, there would be an influx of wealthy outsiders into Balmedie because only rich people can afford to buy these expensive residences.

Finally in this strategy, *The Guardian* focuses on constructing the negative-other presentation of Trump based on his personality traits.

- "flamboyant" (Article 2)
- a "showman" (Article 3)
- "Trump's boast" (Article 21)
- "cocky billionaire" (Article 26)

achievements in the people's mental cognition.

"Trump try-on" is another reference that *The Guardian* has used, i.e. suggesting that Trump is using this project in Scotland to test the reception of future

Trump projects in Europe, and of blackmailing the people of Scotland to accept the project as per his plans or he would move it elsewhere. This is then followed by other references which negativize Trump's character in the people's perception:

- "sharp-talking billionaire" (Article 24)
- "loudmouth bully" (Article 24)
- "bullish Trump" (Article 21)

### **5.1.2 Predication**

In this strategy, *The Guardian* works along the same themes as the referential strategy to negativize Trump, with numerous references to Trump's personality traits, assumptions of underhandedness, the insincerity of the visit to his mother's birthplace, and also his infamous 'hair', whereby Trump is predicated either in an agentive or passive role.

*The Guardian's* attack on Trump's personality traits predicated him as an arrogant person full of self-importance. Therefore, he refers to himself as 'king' and christened his son 'Baron Trump'. These predications are also directed at his "bullying" and "blackmailing tactics", hence negativizing him. Trump's lack of regards for the environment is also predicated because he repeatedly rejects expert reports about the destruction that the project will cause to the environment. Trump's wealth is also predicated such as his private plane with Trump emblazoned in gold depicts him as an extravagant showoff. He is also predicated for having "faith in almighty Trump dollars", insinuating underhandedness in securing the approval for the golf project. Trump's visit to his mother's birthplace is also predicated as

having been ‘choreographed’, due to the brevity of and the timing for the visit, i.e. just before the executive inquiry.

The next theme in the predication strategy is the golf complex project, i.e. the controversy surrounding the project, and the opposition it receives. The project is predicated for the threat it poses to the environment. Therefore, there are many predications, among others:

- ‘...chief objection is that the environmentally sensitive links...’ (Article 4)
- ‘...a threat to nature haven...’ (Article 4)
- ‘...will destroy...’ (Article 4)
- ‘...destruction of up to a third of an important designated SSSI is unacceptable...’ (Article 4 )

Predication also suggests underhandedness might have taken place to secure the project, including possible abuse of power as predicated in these examples:

- ‘...Salmond is MP for the Balmedie area...’ (Article 5)
- ‘...John Swinney, the cabinet secretary for finance....a close ally of Salmond’s.’ (Article 15)

Finally, there is also the allusion to monetary promise, thus, the predication strategy also highlights the strong opposition the project receives as it faces:

- ‘...further criticisms...’ (Article 1)
- ‘...objections to the proposal...’ (Article 3 )
- ‘...growing opposition...’ (Article 4)
- The local oppositions ‘...have voiced their concerns and oppositions to the plan...’ (Article 5)

### 5.1.3 Argumentation

In argumentation, three strategies have been used to construct the negative-other of Trump and his project, namely topoi, fallacy and story-telling.

Topoi are used extensively, especially the topos of number which evokes a sense of moral panic as it details the magnitude of destruction the project it will cause to the environment, the money involved (e.g. the huge sums of money offered to buy Forbes' lands), the scale of the complex with its various luxury residential buildings, and so on. The staggering numbers mentioned in this topos serve to make a significant impact on the readers' mental models.

*The Guardian* employs topos of danger/threat to illustrate to the readers that the project is a detrimental to the environment. The topos of bully focuses on Trump's negative character traits as a man who terrorizes people in order to get what he wants:

- Trump is reported as having... 'singled out' Mr. Forbes for 'attack' (Article 7)
- Trump... 'threatened'...(Article 1)
- Trump... 'warned'...(Article 14)
- Trump gives an... 'ultimatum'... to the people of Scotland (Article 1)

The topos of deception is employed to reveal Trump's real ambitions regarding the project, i.e. to build luxury residences. Also, carefully-chosen words such as 'emerged' and 'smells of sleaze' point to deception, i.e. the possibility of underhandedness in the handling of the case by Trump and Scottish officials.

In fallacy, the fallacy of relevance becomes the focus, specifically *ad populum* (appeal to the masses), *ad baculum* (appeal to authority), and *ad hominem*

(attacking the person instead of the issue). For example, Trump uses *ad baculum* when justifying his plans to build the golf course over the SSSI.

- The SSSI is... “*a piece of land which is disappearing...it’s blowing all over the place. Our stabilisation expert was saying “You’re doing a tremendous service to the area.”* (Article 6)

*The Guardian* also resorts to *ad baculum* in defence of the environment by citing many environmental groups such as *Scottish Natural Heritage* as showing objections to the project.

*Ad hominem* is employed to negativize Trump through numerous attacks on his person, instead of the project, such as Trump’s personality traits, or his ‘hair’, to smear Trump’s reputation in the readers’ perception.

The next strategy is story-telling, which is used both by *The Guardian* and Trump. Trump and his faction turn to story-telling to gain support for the project, while *The Guardian* employs it to negativize Trump and his supporters.

#### **5.1.4 Perspectivation/Involvement**

In perspectivation, the views of both the supporters and opposition of the project are published, showing the *Us versus Them* dynamics at work. Trump’s quotations are published as a double-edged sword to negativize him.

- “*I like it. I feel very comfortable here. It’s interesting when your mother, who was such a terrific woman, comes from a specific location, you tend to like that location. I think I do feel Scottish.*” (Article 20)

Because Trump was born and bred in America, this perspective sounds like a desperate attempt to be accepted as a Scotsman.

The notion that Trump has no sentimentality for the choice of location for this project other than in the monetary gains is implied many times.

- Trump is quoted to have said that in order to...*“at least get some kind of returns, I have to build houses. Golf won’t sustain a project of this magnitude”*... (Article 6)
- Trump reasoned that to make the project work... *“as a viable business model, there needs to be an element of real estate involved”*... (Article 3)

Another theme is Trump’s personality traits, whereby Trump’s perspectives are quoted to portray him as a man who is arrogant, condescending and full of self-importance.

- When talking about his television show *The Apprentice* ... *“If you get ratings, you’re king, like me, I’m a king.”* (Article 20)
- When implying his self-importance and political connections, Trump said that they (i.e. governments of many countries)... *“all want Donald Trump because I do the highest level of work, and I’m known for that. People know that our level of work is the best and when a project is finished, it’s going to be the best, and that’s why governments call me. They’ve a piece of land in a certain country, they call me.”* (Article 20)

Perspectivation strategy is also used to portray the Trump faction as arrogant and condescending, for example when one of Trump’s top executives is quoted to have said:

- *“There’s a view we are arrogant. We are not arrogant. We set certain standards. It may be incomprehensible to smaller minds, but we have always set high standards. We presented them with a plan and hoped they could open their minds, but it was too much for them.”* (Article 12)

The opposition's perspectives are quoted numerously to highlight the destruction the project will pose to the environment, such as:

- The...*“destruction of up to a third of an important designated scientific interest is unacceptable. These adverse impacts...are not outweighed by any over-riding need for this development.”* (Article 4)

The opposition's views are also quoted to insinuate that underhandedness is possible, such as these examples:

- *“The world has gone loopy. I wasn't aware that someone can have their application called in without lodging an appeal. This doesn't usually happen with normal members of the public.”* (Article 13)
- The government... *“smells of sleaze”*... because it... *“appears that the desires of one high-profile overseas developer, who refused to compromise one inch, have been allowed to override the legal protection of this important site.”* (Article 17)

Therefore, the perspectivation strategy is employed by *The Guardian* extensively to construct the negative-other representation of Trump and the project.

### **5.1.5 Intensification/Mitigation**

This strategy intensifies negative-other qualities in order to negativize Trump and the project in the readers' mental cognition. This strategy focuses on similar themes of Trump's personality traits, the threats to the environment and the influence of money, using supposed self-importance and supposed sympathy, as is evident in this write-up when *The Guardian* writer says:

- “You have to feel sorry for Donald Trump. He came to Scotland this week to spend 97 seconds being pictured in front of his mother Mary Macleod’s birthplace on the island of Lewis, and then flew his private jet across Scotland to an inquiry into his plan for a billion-pound property development by the sea at Balmedie. That the site should be occupied by a cussed fisherman and a nature reserve of European importance was the kind of thing, as George Bush would say, “*I leave to my lawyers.*” (Article 23)

The strategy also intensifies the theme of the seduction of money. For examples:

- The project has... “*some local businessmen understandably salivating*”...(Article 23)
- In criticizing the Scottish government’s approval of the planning permission... “*Scotland’s gullible politicians have been taken in by a New York billionaire.*” (Article 23)

All of these statements intensify the notion that underhandedness is prevalent. The intensification strategy also highlights the opposition to the project and/or the destruction of the environment. Therefore, the intensification strategy is employed by *The Guardian* to intensify the negative image of Trump and his project, and to highlight the destruction the golf complex project would cause to the environment.

To sum up, *The Guardian* uses all these strategies from referential to intensification to construct a strong negative-other representation of Trump and his project, if not in the cognition of the Scottish government, at least in the mental models of their readers.

## 5.2 Power: Dominant Minority versus Less-Dominant Majority

Despite their best efforts, *The Guardian* still fails to affect the outcome of this case because *The Guardian* and the people of Scotland only have a ‘perceived’ power; a limited ‘power’ which allows *The Guardian* access to publicity and manipulation, and the people of Scotland have the freedom of expression. However, this power does not allow them to make decisions to change the course of events. They are the majority, and have the ‘power’ to voice their opinion, but this power is lacks the authority to make decisions. Ultimately, it is not this power that counts. They are the less-dominant majority; powerless against the dominant minority who possesses the power of the elite.

We have established that Trump, the minority, holds more dominance than the majority. Trump is not just a businessman; he is a conglomerate, a brand name with strong connections to many influential people in power, and he is wealthy too. Trump, who has privileged access to social power through his money and political connections, also possesses a small measure of power – but one has to agree that while his power might be ‘small’, Trump’s so-called ‘small’ power in fact carries a substantial dominance and is very influential, that the government of Scotland, i.e. the power elite, bend their laws to accommodate him.

The most dominant power in this case is wielded by the minority yet very powerful group, i.e. the Scottish government. This minority group have the ‘real’ power, and they exercise their dominance over the majority, i.e. the people of Scotland, by reclaiming the case, and ‘bending’ the laws to accommodate the golf project. They are able to influence the expected conclusion of this case, hence

rendering the construction of negative-other representation of Donald Trump and the project by *The Guardian* a failure in preventing the approval of the planning permission for Trump's golf complex project in Balmedie. The Scottish government can be said as asserting their control over the people by using the term "controlling discourse" (van Dijk, 2001), i.e. through opting to consider the golf complex project a case of "national importance", thus concluding the outcome of the case.

Therefore, the minority power elite holds dominance over the majority of the people as theirs is the power that really matters.

### **5.3 Implication of Findings**

The case of the environment losing to the economy is not a new thing, and neither is Balmedie an isolated case. Despite *The Guardian's* best efforts in championing the case for the environment by showing a strong opposition to the golf complex project by constructing a negative-other representation of Trump/project, after much drama, the project was approved by the Scottish government. Based on the conclusion, we can see that the power of the elite, in this case, the Scottish government and Trump, have exercised their control over the majority, i.e. *The Guardian* and the people of Scotland, to affect the outcome of this case. The important implication of the findings of this paper lies in the obvious power struggle between the dominant minority (Donald Trump and the Scottish government) against the less-dominant majority (*The Guardian* and the people of Scotland).

### 5.3.1 Power of the Dominant Minority versus Less-Dominant Majority

Throughout this case, the power struggle is evident among all the parties concerned, i.e. the opponents and the supporters of the project. The power dynamics shift continuously between these two distinct groups from the moment this case started to the time the planning permission was granted.

*The Guardian* is assumed to have a privileged access to social power as they have the means to influence the people's mental models, because the media belong to a "group membership" and "institutional position" which gives them the opportunity to manipulate the "recipients of media discourse". (van Dijk, 1987, 2006) However, from the conclusion of this case, we could see that *The Guardian's* employment of the construction of negative-other representation of Trump and the project worked only insofar as the people of Scotland are concerned, but not with the Scottish government. Inevitably, their access to 'power' is limited because while they are able to use their 'power' to manipulate and influence the people's mental models, *The Guardian* has neither the mandate nor the authority to make decisions. Unless these mass media are government-controlled organizations such as those mentioned by Chatora (2009), this holds true for other media around the world, i.e. the media have "nearly<sup>15</sup> exclusive control over the symbolic resources needed to manufacture popular consent" (van Dijk, 1997, p. 43).

Secondly, we can also deduce that the people of Scotland do not have the power to affect the outcome of this case either. The power of the people has been taken back by the minority group, i.e. the Scottish government. Like the media, the

---

<sup>15</sup> The italicized 'nearly' is my own, not van Dijk's, in order to place the emphasis on the meaning, i.e. 'not full or complete' exclusive control.

people of Scotland also have very limited ‘power’; i.e. the freedom of expression that enables them to voice their opposition to the project, but that is where their power ends. This perceived ‘power’ is ‘artificial’ and can only be exercised insofar as it does not interfere with any issues deemed to be of ‘national importance’.

Thirdly, the social actor Donald Trump, who is in the ‘minority’ for so many factors, making him a likely target for the construction of negative-other representation by the media. Both Trump and *The Guardian* are in possession of the so-called ‘social power’, albeit of different varieties. While *The Guardian* has the means to propagate their ideologies to the masses, Trump, on the other hand, is in possession of two very influential social resources, i.e. economic privilege and political connections, making Trump a dominant minority too.

Finally, let’s look at the power of the dominant minority, i.e. the Scottish government. This power elite controls the majority because they have been given the mandate by the people, and therefore, not only do they have the authority over the people, they also have the people’s ‘consent’ to exercise this power over them. When the council of Aberdeenshire rejected the project, the people’s ‘power’ was swiftly taken away by the dominant minority, i.e. the Scottish government, by declaring it a project of ‘national importance’, resulting in an executive inquiry, and approval for the project. The declaration that the project is of ‘national importance’ is a classic example to illustrate the dominant minority group’s “ability to define social reality, to impose visions of the world” (Gal, 1991, p. 178).

Next, I make some suggestions for future further research.

## **5.4 Suggested Further Research**

Further research on this particular case could take into account these following suggestions, based on Wodak's Fields of Action (2002).

### **5.4.1 Law-Making Procedure: Interviews with the Scottish Government**

#### **(Officials)**

As the Scottish government has 'bent' Scottish Planning Regulations in favour of this project, calling it a project of 'national importance', it will be interesting to know the criteria that this project has that moved the Scottish government to deem it to be of a 'national importance', that necessitated the bending of the existing Scottish Planning Regulations which has been drawn up for years to protect the Scottish citizens and the lands, given that the project has been touted as detrimental to the environment, i.e. the SSSI.

### **5.4.2 Formation of Public Opinion and Self-Representation**

This golf complex project has decidedly divided the local citizens into two factions, i.e. the supporters and the opposition. The confirmed supporters are the local businessmen while the opposition comes from many environmental groups and individuals who are concerned with the magnitude of destruction this project would pose to the SSSI. However, the stance of the rest of Scotland is largely unknown. Since the Scottish government bent Scottish Planning Regulations to accommodate this project, the opinion of the Scottish people does matter, because the decision affects them as abiding citizens of Scotland. Therefore, a survey and/or interviews with the people living in various areas of Scotland (e.g. Balmedie, and other areas further away from Aberdeenshire such as Edinburgh, St. Andrews,

Glasgow and so on to see if there is a ‘disconnectedness’ caused by geographical factors) should be conducted in order to find out their views on this matter i.e. if they agreed with the government’s decision, even though it is at the expense of their environment, and their reasons for their agreement/disagreement.

I would also recommend that interviews be carried out with *The Guardian* to uncover their rationale for using various platforms in their reporting of the case, and other possible methods they would employ to influence the outcome of similar cases should they arise in the future.

### **5.5 Concluding Remarks**

It is unmistakable that Trump is only a minority in this case. However, he has access to a dominant social power through his financial status and his political connections, and thus placing him as being in possession of a more dominant power than *The Guardian* and all the people of Scotland put together. His social power garners him the support from another powerful minority group, i.e. the Scottish government, who not only holds dominance over the majority, i.e. the people of Scotland, but who has also taken away the power of the people to make decisions in a shocking move that leaves Scottish laws open to compromise. In the case of the environment against the promise of monetary rewards and boost to the economy, the Scottish government has made it clear as to which one is more important by their show of support for the golf complex project. *The Guardian*’s constant reporting on Trump’s negative personality traits fails to bring about the desired result because it distracts people from the real issue, i.e. the destruction of the environment, and more importantly, because *The Guardian* does not have ‘real’

power to change the outcome of this case. The power elite are far more powerful and dominate the less-dominant majority. Based on this conclusion, all the strategies used to construct Trump's negative-other identity fail to influence the outcome of the case.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1) Bantimaroudis, P. & Kampanellou, E. (2009). The cultural framing hypothesis: cultural conflict indicators in *The New York Times* from 1981 to 2007. *Media, War & Conflict, SAGE Publications, Vol. 2(2):* 171–190.
- 2) Bell, A. & Garrett, P. (Eds.) (1998), *Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. p. 1-20.
- 3) Budesheim T. L., Houston, D. A., & DePaola, S. J. (1996). Persuasiveness of in-group and out-group political messages: The case of negative political campaigning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 523-534.
- 4) Carraro, L., Gawronski, B. & Castelli, L. (2010) Losing on all Fronts: The Effects of Negative versus Positive Person-Based Campaigns on Implicit and Explicit Evaluations of Political Candidates. *British Journal of Social Psychology.*
- 5) Chatora, A. (2009). *The Role of New Media in Fostering Democracy in Africa's Dictatorships: Zimbabwe a Case Study*. University of London.
- 6) Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 7) Downing, J. (1984). *Radical Media: The Political Experience of Alternative Communication*. Boston: South End Press.
- 8) Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- 9) Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 10) Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- 11) Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- 12) Fairclough, N.L. and Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In T.A.van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp 258-84). London: Sage.
- 13) Fowler, R. and B. Hodge (1979). *Critical Linguistics*. In R. Fowler et al (Eds.). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul. pp. 185-213.
- 14) Gal, Susan (1991). 'Between speech and silence: the problematics of research on language and gender', in M. di Leonardo (ed.), *Gender at the Crossroads of*

- Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Post-Modern Era*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 175-203.
- 15) Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*. London. Falmer Press.
  - 16) Gramsci, A. (1971). *Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.
  - 17) Green and Sussman. "Deforestation History of the Eastern Rain Forests of Madagascar from Satellite Images." *Science*. v248 n4952. 13 April 1990. p.212-215
  - 18) Haddock G., & Zanna, M. P. (1997). Impact of negative advertising on evaluations of political candidates: The 1993 Canadian Federal Election. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 204-223.
  - 19) Hall, S. (1982). The Rediscovery of 'ideology': return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevich, T. Bennet, J. Curran, and J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Culture, Society, and the Media*, pp 56-90. London. Routledge.
  - 20) Hall, S. (ed.), (1997). *Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Open University Press.
  - 21) Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
  - 22) Hill, R. P. (1989). An exploration of voter responses to political advertisements. *Journal of Advertisements*, 18, 14-22
  - 23) Hitchon, J. C., & Chang, C. (1995). Effects of gender schematic processing on the reception of political commercials for men and women candidates. *Communication Research*, 22, 430-458.
  - 24) <http://www.babc.org/about/index.php>
  - 25) <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/df9d3054-1062-11df-a8e8-00144feab49a.html>
  - 26) <http://www.golfing-scotland.com/history.asp>
  - 27) <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Releases/2002/07/1933>
  - 28) <http://www.standrews.org.uk/>
  - 29) <http://www.standrews.org.uk/About-Us/History.aspx>
  - 30) [http://www.forbes.com/lists/2010/10/billionaires-2010\\_Donald-Trump\\_U5WX](http://www.forbes.com/lists/2010/10/billionaires-2010_Donald-Trump_U5WX)
  - 31) <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bullish>

- 32) <http://www.missworld.com/>
- 33) <http://www.missuniverse.com/info/history>
- 34) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/energy/oilandgas/5779908/UK-facing-energy-crunch-as-North-Sea-oil-and-gas-cash-dries-up.html>
- 35) <http://business.scotsman.com/energyutilities/North-Sea-gas-drying-up.2686402.jp>
- 36) [http://www.forbes.com/lists/2009/54/rich-list-09\\_Donald-Trump\\_U5WX.html](http://www.forbes.com/lists/2009/54/rich-list-09_Donald-Trump_U5WX.html)
- 37) <http://golf.visitscotland.com/default.aspx>
- 38) <http://www.sprl.umich.edu/GCL/forestlab.html> "Deforestation Case Study: Madagascar".
- 39) <http://www.examiner.com/green-living-in-national/permit-approved-for-controversial-wv-coal-mine-despite-protests-against-a-topless-america>
- 40) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/2006/apr/30/transport.world/print>
- 41) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2006/27/travelnews.travel/print>
- 42) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/sport/2006/nov/29/golf.gdnsport3/print>
- 43) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/may/20/conservationandendangere dspecies.t...>
- 44) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/sep/09/conservation1/print>
- 45) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/oct/09/golf/print>
- 46) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/oct/10/golf.scotland/print>
- 47) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/nov/20/communities.scotland/print>
- 48) <http://guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/nov/21/usa.world/print>
- 49) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/nov/24/conservation.activists/print>
- 50) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/nov/29/golf.communities/print>
- 51) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/nov/30/conservation.golf/print>
- 52) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/dec/04/usa.uk/print>
- 53) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/dec/05/usa.scotland/print>
- 54) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2007/dec/06/donaldwheresyourgolfcourse/print>
- 55) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/dec/12/golf.usa/print>
- 56) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2007/dec/17/scotland.devolution/print>
- 57) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2008/jun/08/scotland.donaldtrump/print>

- 58) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/jun/09/conservation.endangeredhabitats/print>
- 59) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/jun/10/donaldtrump.scotland/print>
- 60) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/jun/11/donaldtrump.conservation/print>
- 61) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/jun/12/donaldtrump.golf/print>
- 62) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/jun/13/donaldtrump.scotland/print>
- 63) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/nov/04/donaldtrump-scotland/print>
- 64) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/nov/donald-trump-scottish-golf-course/print>
- 65) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2008/nov/05/ruralaffairs-scotland/print>
- 66) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/dec/29/donald-trump-scotland-golf-course/print>
- 67) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jan/11/donald-trump-scotland-world-news/print>
- 68) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/aug/06/donald-trump-selina-scott-golf/print>
- 69) KhosraviNik, M. (2008), British Newspapers and the Representation of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants between 1996 and 2006. *Centre for Language in Social Life*.
- 70) Kirby, P. (2006) 'Bringing Social Inclusion to Centre Stage: Towards a Project of Active Citizenship', pp. 180–99 in D. Jacobsen, P. Kirby and D. Ó Broin (eds) *Taming the Tiger: Social Exclusion in a Globalised Ireland*. Dublin: New Island.
- 71) Lau, R. R., & Pomper, G. M. (2001). Effects of negative campaigning on turnout in U.S. Senate Elections, 1988-1998. *The Journal of Politics*, 63, 804-819.
- 72) Lau, R. R., Sigelman, L., Heldman, C., & Babbitt, P. (1999). The effects of negative political advertisements: A meta-analytic assessment. *American Political Science Review*, 93, 851-875.
- 73) Lau, R. R., Sigelman, L., & Rovner, I. B. (2007). The effects of negative political campaigns: A meta-analytic reassessment. *The Journal of Politics*, 69, 1176-1203.

- 74) Leonard, L. (2009) Social partnership's boiling point: Environmental issues and social responses to neo-liberal policy in Ireland. *Critical Social Policy* 2009; 29; 279-293.
- 75) Machin, D. (2008). News Discourse 1: Understanding the social goings-on behind news texts. In Mayr, A., *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*, pp 62-89. London. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- 76) Martin Rojo, L and van Dijk, T.A., (1997). "There was a problem, and it was solved!" Legitimizing the expulsion of "illegal" immigrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 8(4), 523-67.
- 77) Marx, K. (1964). *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*. (T. Bottomore, Trans.) London: McGraw-Hill.
- 78) Matthews, D., & Dietz-Uhler B. (1998). The black-sheep effect: how positive and negative advertisements affect voters' perception of the sponsor of the advertisement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1903-1915.
- 79) Mayr, A. (2008). *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. London. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- 80) Menz, F., Wodak, R., Gruber, H., Lutz, B. (1988): Power struggles and the media: a case study. *Folia Linguistica* 22 (1988), 3/4: 439-456.
- 81) Nesler, M.S., Aguinis, H., Quigley, B.M., and Tedeschi, J.T. (1993). The effect of credibility on perceived power. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23(17), 1407-25.
- 82) Peukert, H, (1978). *Wissenschaftstheorie – Handlungstheorie – Fundamentale Theologie*. Frankfurt/Main.
- 83) Roese, N. J., & Sande, G. N. (1993). Backlash effects in attack politics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 632-653.
- 84) Simon, H. (1982) *Models of Bounded Rationality*, Vols. 1 and 2. MIT Press.
- 85) Van Dijk, T.A. (1987), *Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk*. Newbury CA: Sage
- 86) Van Dijk, T.A. (1991), *Racism and the Press*. London/New York. Routledge.
- 87) Van Dijk, T.A. (1988a). *News Analysis: Case Studies of International and National News in the Press*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- 88) Van Dijk, T.A. (1988b). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 89) Van Dijk, T.A.(1991), *Racism and the Press; Critical Studies in Racism and Migration*. London and New York: Routledge.
- 90) Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Stories and racism. In Mumby, D.K. (ed.), *Narrative and social control: Critical perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 121-142.
- 91) Van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In Christina Schaffner, and Anita L. Wenden (eds.). *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth. Aldershot. Pp. 17-33.
- 92) Van Dijk, T.A. (1998a). *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Study*. London: Sage.
- 93) Van Dijk, T.A. (1998b). Towards a theory of context and experience models in discourse processing. In H. van Oosterndop and S. Goldman, (eds). *The Construction of Mental Models During Reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 94) Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Deborah Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin and Heidi Hamilton (eds). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden: Blackwell. Pp 352-371.
- 95) Van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. In *Discourse and Society*. London, CA, India: Sage. Vol. 17(2): 359-83.
- 96) Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The Representations of Social Actors. In: Caldas-Coulthard, R.R.; Coulthard, M. (Eds.): *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London. 32-70
- 97) Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1992), *Mapping the Language of Racism; Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. New York, London: Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- 98) Wodak, R. (1987) "And where is the Lebanon?" A socio-psycholinguistic investigation of comprehension and intelligibility of news. *Text*, 7(4), 377-410.
- 99) Wodak, R. (1989). "Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse." Amsterdam. Benjamin.
- 100) Wodak, R. and Reisigl, M., (1999). Discourse and Racism: European Perspectives. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28, 175-199.

- 101) Wodak, R. and Ludwig, C. (1999). "Challenges in the Changing World: Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis." Vienna: Passagenverlag.
- 102) Wodak, R. (2001). 'The discourse-historical approach.' In Wodak & Meyer (eds.). 63-95.
- 103) Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Sage. London.
- 104) Wodak, R. and Reisigl, M. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination*. London. Routledge
- 105) Wodak, Ruth (Ed.) (2002). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, GBR: Sage Publications, p 96.
- 106) Wodak, R. (2003). "Populist Discourses: The Rhetoric of Exclusion in Written Genres." *Document Design* 4(2), 132-148. John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- 107) Wodak, R. (2006). *Mediation between Discourse and Society: Assessing Cognitive Approaches in CDA*. London/California/New Delhi. Sage Publications.